# FEEDBACK BIAS IN COLLABORATIVE SERVICES: WHEN AND WHY IT HAPPENS

**LOUISE HELENE GONCALVES FOERNGES**
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL (UFRGS)

# FEEDBACK BIAS IN COLLABORATIVE SERVICES: WHEN AND WHY IT HAPPENS

## 1. INTRODUCTION

New information technologies created a world where new possibilities of interaction are constantly developing (SWAMINATHAN *et al*., 2020; CUI *et al*., 2021). This scenario allowed the emergence of the so called "sharing economy", or collaborative services, where individuals have temporary access to goods or services, without ownership transfer (BELK, 2014b; KUMAR, LAHIRI & DOGAN, 2018). Usually, an online platform connects the users who are willing to provide a service (peer-provider) or share a resource, with users who are looking for that service or resource (peer-user) (BENOIT *et al*., 2017).

It is noteworthy that some collaborative service interactions are very personal (BELK, 2014a), that is, interactions that involve a high level of intimacy, such as when someone opens their house to a stranger on Airbnb (BRIDGES, VÁSQUEZ, 2016). One way around the risks and uncertainties such interactions may entail is through reputation or feedback mechanisms (BELK, 2014b; BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016; BENOIT *et al.,* 2017; ZERVAS, PROSERPIO & BYERS, 2021). These self-regulatory feedback mechanisms (usually in the form of ratings and/or reviews) help minimize the risks, discourage misbehavior and elicit trust among users through a reputation system (BELK, 2014b; BRIDGES, VÁSQUEZ, 2016; HOFMANN, *et al.*, 2017). However, research shows that in collaborative services feedbacks are often biased. This may happen either by users leaving "undeserving" positive feedbacks or refraining from leaving negative feedbacks (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016; ZERVAS *et al*., 2021; GUYADER, 2018, ZERVAS *et al*., 2021).

Some evidence exists that feedbacks tend to be more biased in collaborative services than in traditional ones (i.e. professional and non-collaborative, such as hotels, car rentals, restaurants etc.). Zervas et al., (2021) conducted a study comparing properties listed in the platform Airbnb to similar ones listed in TripAdvisor, which offers more 'traditional' accommodations (i.e. hotels). The authors found ratings in Airbnb to be unrealistic high and the average ratings to be significantly higher in Airbnb properties than in similar ones listed in TripAdvisor. The authors suggest that in collaborative consumption services (e.g. Airbnb), sociological aspects (i.e. features of a society) may lead users to be more diplomatic in their reviews than in 'traditional' services (e.g. hotels).

We propose that the interpersonal and prosocial nature of collaborative services (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016) may lead users to behave in a prosocial manner, eliciting anticipated guilt, which according to O'keefe (2000), is an aspect that may shape how people conduct, encouraging prosocial behavior and discouraging behavior which may be harmful to others. Prosocial behavior occurs when a certain individual behavior results in benefit to another (SIMPSON & WILLER, 2015). In line with this, Wittek and Bekkers (2015, p.579) define prosocial behavior as "a broad class of behavior defined as involving costs for the self and resulting in benefits for others".

With the development of collaborative services, recently 'professional' providers (or hosts, in the case of Airbnb) emerged (WIRTZ *et al*., 2019). In the case of professional hosts, the contact with the guest may be limited to virtual interaction, as the guest receives remotely the instructions to access the property (WIRTZ *et al*., 2019). We propose that is possible that the limited interaction with this type of host will elicit less rapport (interaction 'sync' between users) when compared to more 'casual' hosts (i.e. hosts that have a closer and more personal

interaction with the guest). This lower -or lack of rapport-, in turn, may lead users to behave less pro-socially, thus reducing anticipation of guilt and consequently resulting in less biased feedbacks than in a situation where the user interacts more personally and has more intimacy with another user.

The main goal of this paper is to shed light on social aspects possibly behind the higher feedback bias in collaborative services (compared to traditional ones). To achieve this goal, a theoretical background on collaborative vs traditional service motivations, prosocial behavior and feedback, anticipation of guilt and rapport will be presented, followed by a few propositions that may warrant further investigation in the future. Through this study we aim to answer the following question: "which prosocial aspects are possibly behind feedback bias in collaborative services?"

## 2. COLLABORATIVE VS TRADITIONAL SERVICE MOTIVATIONS

In the past few years, several academic papers on the topic of collaborative services have emerged. Belk published pioneer overviews on the subject in 2007 and 2010 and since then a number of studies on the topic of collaborative services have been developed (BARDHI & ECKHARDT, 2012; FRADKIN *et al.,* 2015, BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016; ECKHARDT *et al*., 2019; MONT *et al*., 2020; ZERVAS *et al*., 2021). It is noteworthy that there are distinctions of motivations and expectations related to equivalent traditional and collaborative services in some industries, such as hospitality (e.g. Airbnb and hotel) (GUTTENTAG & SMITH 2017) and transportation (e.g. Uber and taxis) (WILLIS & TRANOS, 2021). In this paper we will focus on the hospitality industry, since broader literature exists comparing equivalent traditional and collaborative services in this industry.

Although some providers of collaborative services are becoming more professionalized, often providers are just "ordinary" people, not professionals. Most users of Airbnb, for example, seem to use the platform for this very reason, as "authenticity" is often pointed as one of the main reasons for choosing Airbnb over hotels, for example. According to Shuqair, Pinto and Mattila (2019, p.1), authentic experiences in Airbnb entail "providing a local way of life and a higher sense of human presence". In fact, Nowak *et al*. (2015) found "authentic experience" to be one of the top motivations for people to use Airbnb, along with "cheaper price" and "location". In more 'professional' accommodation services, such as hotels, motivations seem to be slightly different as it appears to not include authenticity as a determinant for provider choice (DOLNICAR & OTTER, 2003). Mody *et al*. (2017) conducted a study with 630 hotel and Airbnb guests. Guests surveyed pointed interaction between host/hotel staff and guest and 'ambiance' as the main differences between both. Guttentag & Smith (2017) also compared performance expectations between users of hotels and Airbnb. The author found that participants expected Airbnb to outperform mid-range hotels in terms of "authenticity", "uniqueness", and "price".

However, according to Wirtz *et al*. (2019), as increasingly users no longer need to meet in person such as in professional Airbnb (some hosts may provide the guest with a code to enter an apartment, for example) social and authentic experiences seem to be diminishing. The authors argue that this is the case of some professional hosts, as opposed to more casual Airbnb hosts who offer more authentic experiences, which, as literature points out, is one of the reasons users choose Airbnb over hotels in the first place. In more 'traditional' hospitality services, such as hotels, motivations seem to be slightly different as it appears to not include authenticity as a determinant of choice. Dolnicar and Otter (2003) ranked the most 'important' hotel attributes commonly found in literature. These were, in decreasing order, "convenient location", "service

quality", "reputation", "friendliness of the staff" and "price". In a more specific context of online hotel choice, Pan *et al*. (2013) found that (again in decreasing order) "price", "ratings", "location", "amenities" and "description, look and style" were the most salient decision criteria mentioned by participants.

The difference between collaborative and traditional services extends to other aspects. Shuqair, Pinto and Mattila (2019), for example, compared post-failure loyalty in both services (in this case, Airbnb and hotels). Through experimental studies, the authors found that post-loyalty failure is higher in Airbnb than in hotels. The authors found this is due to the perceived authenticity that usually Airbnb users cherish, and positive emotions associated with the interactions with the host which are not elicited in traditional accommodations.

Another aspect that differs in collaborative and traditional services is how service quality is controlled. In Airbnb, users often share the same physical space (i.e. peer-guest stays at peer-host's property), leaving them susceptible to violence and other forms of abuse (ERT *et al*., 2016). The same happens in other collaborative services, such as on-demand transportation, like Uber or Lyft. Belk (2014b) even suggests that this "stranger danger" ended up leading hitchhiking, for example, out of practice. While traditional services usually employ trained professionals who are supervised, in collaborative services the provider is often an ordinary person with no direct supervision. To deal with these differences, nowadays most collaborative services' platforms rely on feedback/reputation mechanisms to detect members who do not behave properly and provide users a way to assess which peers might be trustworthy or not. These mechanisms are important to help users to build trust and avoid risks (RANZINI, 2017; GUYADER, 2018).

## 3. PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

Online review systems have been around for a long time: Amazon.com, for example, began to offer its customers the possibility to post product comments back in 1995 (PARK, LEE & HAN, 2007). Due to the expansion in the number of platf--orms and users of collaborative services, feedback and reputation systems, in the form of rating, written reviews and/or recommendations, became an important tool to mitigate users acting out of self-interest, to help users assess trustworthiness of others (BELK, 2014b; HAMARI *et al.,* 2016) and make sure service failures are detected and reported (BRIDGES & VÁSQUES, 2016), working as a sort of a self-regulatory mechanism (BELK, 2014b; HAMARI *et al*., 2016; HOFMANN *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, these systems have the role of motivating individuals to behave in a responsible manner (HOFMANN *et al.*, 2017).

A notable difference between collaborative and traditional services is how feedbacks tend to be more biased in the former. Zervas *et al.* (2021) conducted a study analyzing 226.594 properties from around the world, listed on Airbnb (which has a mutual evaluation system) and 412.223 hotels and 54.008 vacation rentals listed on TripAdvisor. The authors found that 95% of the properties had an average rating of 4.5 or 5 starts (ratings in the platform range from 1 to 5 starts). The authors also explored the ratings of 500.000 hotels worldwide available on TripAdvisor (where only the guests are able to evaluate the properties). The authors found that the average rating for these properties was 3.8 stars –much lower than the average rating for Airbnb properties. The authors then compared the rating of properties listed both Airbnb and TripAdvisor. They concluded that although the average rating in both platforms for the same property were similar, in Airbnb more properties received high ratings of 4.5 stars and above. The authors argue that although the difference in these results may be due to the different tastes of each platform's users, they may also be influenced by the nature of services such as Airbnb.

According to the authors, it is possible that 'sociological effects' lead people to be more diplomatic in their reviews in collaborative consumption services. The authors, however, did not test this empirically.

Bridges and Vásquez (2016) also investigated Airbnb reviews using a computer-assisted approach to identify linguistic patterns. According to the authors, the majority of the commentaries in the review section was highly (if not unrealistic) positive, with only 7% of 400 reviews having some form of complaint. The authors argue that when reviewing less than positive experiences, users prefer to leave neutral commentaries instead of negative ones. Overall, the authors found only 2% out of 400 reviews to be entirely negative. According to the authors, this may have something to do with the highly personal nature of collaborative services. Users seem to follow an implicit established 'norm' when leaving reviews (p.14-15): "Rules for online communication may be developed, negotiated and co-constructed by a community of users, or they can be set a priori and regulated by site moderators. Both of these possibilities (…) exist on Airbnb".

Controlling for feedback bias and misreporting of negative experiences is one of the main challenges for collaborative service platforms nowadays (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016; FRADKIN, GREWAL & HOLTZ, 2018; BULCHAND-GIDUMAL & MELIÁN-GONZÁLEZ, 2019; BAUTE-DÍAZ et al., 2020). While some online platforms opt for one-way feedback systems, nowadays most collaborative service platforms, including Uber and Airbnb, employ mutual feedback systems, where both users involved can evaluate one another (ZERVAS et al., 2021). Despite the importance of this mutual assessment, evidence suggests that this may be one reason for the high feedback bias in this context. To mitigate this, the platform Airbnb, for example, uses double-blind feedbacks keeping them confidential until both host and guest have written and submitted their reviews or after a period of 14 days, whichever comes first (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016). Only then, the reviews are made public; from when they can no longer be edited.

This does seem to work in reducing feedback reciprocity leading to bias. Bolton et al. (2013) found that making feedbacks blind could possibly reduce evaluation bias due to expectation of reciprocity or fear of retaliation. This is in line with Fradkin et al. (2019), who conducted a study with Airbnb listings comparing reviews revealed immediately after submission and reviews which were simultaneously revealed to guest and host after both parties had submitted their feedback (double-blind). The authors found that the simultaneous reveal did reduce reciprocity but did not eliminate feedback bias in collaborative services (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016).

According to Mody et al. (2017), social interaction is an important aspect of consumption experience. It is an especially important aspect in collaborative services where users have very close interpersonal contact, which may prompt them to behave in a prosocial manner (FRADKIN et al., 2015; ZERVAS et al., 2015; BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016; HAMARI, 2016; BENOIT et al., 2017). According to Simpson and Willer (2015), to behave in a prosocial manner means to perform voluntary acts to benefit others. Bénabou and Tirole (2005, p.1) point that "people commonly perform good deeds and refrain from selfish ones because of social pressure and norms that attach honor to the former and shame to the latter". For the authors, even though people tend to care about other's opinions, they also care about their own self-image, that is, they make moral decisions based on how another would evaluate their conduct. In line with that, Gätcher et al. (2013) point that evidence from simple games (e.g. dictator game, gift exchange game) seem to indicate that even in one-time and anonymous interactions where no positive after effect of behaving pro-socially is expected, individuals often reduce their own earnings, to increase the earnings of their counterpart.

Perhaps due to the sociological aspects involved in collaborative services, users seem to be relatively more forgiving of service failures when compared to traditional service users (GUTTENTAG & SMITH, 2017). In fact, Zervas *et al*. (2021) points that possibly due to these interpersonal aspects associated to Airbnb, individuals tend to rate other individuals "more tactfully" than they would rate firms such as hotels. Similarly, Bucher *et al*. (2018) found that the perception of authenticity in Airbnb mitigates guest's negative emotions after a service failure.

Since collaborative services have a very interpersonal nature, whereas the same seems not to be true for traditional services settings, we put forward the following proposition:

P1: Feedback in collaborative services is influenced by social aspects, hence it is positively biased when compared to feedback in equivalent traditional services.

## 4. ANTICIPATION OF GUILT

Guilt is essentially a feeling of emotional distress which encourages prosocial behavior and discourages behavior which may be harmful to others (O'keefe, 2000). Estrada-Hollenbeck and Heatherton (1998) argue that guilt is often a motivator for good deeds. For the authors, feelings of guilt are elicited when a person feels responsible for another's negative affective state or over harming them. According to the authors (p. 216), guilt serves a social function: "the initiation, maintenance, and avoidance of guilt serves a number of useful functions inside the context of interpersonal interactions".

Bénabou and Tirole (2005, p.1) point that "people commonly perform good deeds and refrain from selfish ones because of social pressure and norms that attach honor to the former and shame to the latter". For the authors, even though people tend to care about other's opinions, they also care about their own self-image, that is, they make moral decisions based on how another would evaluate their conduct. The feeling of violating or the recognition one is capable of violating a moral or social standard, is an important mechanism of social control, enabling individuals with different mindsets to live harmoniously in society (JONES & KUGLER, 1993). According to Steenhaut and Kenhove (2006), when feelings of guilt work as a mechanism to stop a certain behavior or to control a certain action, this is actually anticipation of guilt. The authors point that guilt is a moral emotion, linked to the welfare of others and the society in general. Similarly, Lindsey (2005, p.453) proposes anticipation guilt is "a motivating force behind individuals' willingness to engage in behaviors to avert the unknown-other-directed threat." That is, individuals feel anticipated guilt when they perceive their actions (or lack of) may be a threat to unknown others.

For Baumeister *et al*. (1994, p.243) "guilt is something that happens between people rather than just inside them. That is, guilt is an interpersonal phenomenon that is functionally and causally linked to communal relationships between people". The authors argue that guilt feelings are invoked not only for the self (such as to bolster self-control) but in a variety of human interactions (to apologize for wrongdoings or express sympathy, for example). The authors further add that the feeling of guilt comes from an anticipation -or the actual feeling- of the suffering of another. Therefore, according to the authors, the anticipation of guilt is responsible for an individual's performing or avoiding certain actions.

As argued by Lindsey, Yun and Hill (2007, p.469): "guilt is a form of emotional distress based in social relationships that motivates and encourages prosocial behavior". In line with this, O'keefe (2000) argues that feelings of anticipated guilt may play a role in shaping people's conduct, becoming a sort of a mechanism of social influence. Given collaborative service's

prosocial and interpersonal nature (BRIDGES & VÁSQUEZ, 2016), it seems feelings of anticipated guilt could be elicited in this context.

Therefore, due to the nature of collaborative services (i.e. Airbnb), which involve more personal interactions than in traditional services (i.e. hotels) and because guests are often aware of the power their rating has to harm the host, we propose that:

P2: Anticipation of guilt is the underlying mechanism behind positive feedback bias in collaborative services.

## 5. RAPPORT

Technology has allowed us to interact in such new ways, that acts of cooperation, such as in collaborative services, are no longer bounded to kins and communities but have expanded to include unfamiliar individuals as well (BELK, 2014b). A successful interaction where harmony, fluidity, synchrony, and flow are present is sometimes referred to as rapport (GRATCH *et al.*, 2007). According to Gremler and Gwinner (2000), the concept of rapport lacks a clear definition. The authors define rapport as an enjoyable interaction with a service provider where there is a personal connection. Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1987, p.114) define rapport simply as "a good interaction among individuals". Interactions in collaborative services' settings often implicate a high level of personal contact between users and providers (BELK, 2014a). In the case of Airbnb, Bridges and Vásquez (2016, p. 4) argue that "since Airbnb is a sharing-economy platform, there tends to be much more personal (and personalized) interaction between the 'business' (i.e. the host), and the 'customer' (i.e. the guest)". Since most collaborative services demand closer contact between users, building rapport in this condition is not only possible but may facilitate more pleasant interactions and positive experiences.

According to Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal (1990), creating rapport implicates positivity, mutual attention, and coordination. The authors argue that rapport only exists in interactions between individuals, and that it is not a personality trait, but rather (p.286) "the result of a combination of qualities that emerge from each individual during interaction". Literature points that when rapport occurs, it can facilitate interactions, including services interactions (GREMLER & GWINNER, 2000; DEWITT & BRADY, 2003). Gremler and Gwinner (2000) argue that rapport can be applied to a variety of service interactions, regardless of customers having repeated interactions with the same provider or not. Naturally, due to the advancement in service provision, rapport has also been studied in the context of virtual interactions (GRATCH *et al.*, 2007; HUANG *et al.*, 2011; GIEBELHAUSEN *et al.*, 2014; SEO *et al.*, 2017). Advances in technology coupled with increased labor costs led to the emergence of self-service technologies or "technological interfaces that enable customers to produce a service independent of direct contact" (SHAMDASANI *et al.*, 2008, p.117).

According to Giebelhausen *et al.* (2014), as exchanges between frontline employees and customers increasingly involve the use of technology (e.g. terminals, tablets etc.) rapport between parties may be compromised. According to the authors, studies in the hospitality industry found hotels to have reportedly improved customer service as a motivator for switching to technology-infused-interactions. However, the authors add that several firms have manifested dissatisfaction with adding technological interactions in their service encounters, with some firms going as far as eliminating self-checkout options and switching back to employee-customer interaction. The authors conducted a study on the role of technology in rapport building between frontline employees and customers. The authors found that (p.113) "when rapport is present during the exchange, the use of technology functions as an

interpersonal barrier preventing the customer from responding in kind to employee rapport-building efforts, thereby decreasing service encounter evaluations". However, according to the authors, if the frontline employee is not making an effort to create rapport, the use of technology may increase service evaluations as it creates an interpersonal barrier, allowing the customer to 'escape' from an uncomfortable situation.

According to Gremler and Gwinner (2000), good rapport between frontline employees and customers increases satisfaction and loyalty and reduces negative word-of-mouth (WOM). In line with this, Dewitt and Brady (2003) found that good rapport reduces negative effects of service failures. According to the authors, ongoing rapport with service providers leads to service recovery benefits, such as: increased post failure satisfaction, repatronage intentions and decreased negative word-of-mouth (WOM). Also, study results showed that customers who had developed a high level of rapport with a provider were less inclined to complain about poor service.

In the context of accommodation services, in collaborative services like Airbnb, rapport plays an important function. Moon et al. (2019), conducted a study with an online research panel with 503 guests and hosts of Airbnb. According to the authors (p. 406) "P2P transactions of accommodations are enriched with encounters between peer guests and peer hosts who are mutually exposed to the information of other peers through an online platform and are able to communicate with each other online". The authors found that online self-disclosure facilitates reciprocal interactions, rapport building and dyadic trust in subsequent interactions between guest and host, indicating that for Airbnb rapport may develop even before face-to-face interactions take place. The importance of rapport in Airbnb is also evident by research showing the importance of authentic experiences to guests (LIANG *et al.*, 2016). We expect that lower levels of rapport may lead users to behave less pro-socially, reducing anticipation of guilt, and resulting in less positive (less biased) feedbacks than in a situation where the guest interacts more personally and has more intimacy with the host.

Since some collaborative services (such as Airbnb, Uber) have a very interpersonal nature, it is possible that the higher level of rapport commonly present in these interactions lead to more anticipation of guilt and, in turn, a positive feedback bias. However, as opposed to the more 'casual' hosts, nowadays professional hosts also exist in Airbnb. In this case, interactions between host and guest may occur without face-to-face interaction. This may also be true in the future for on-demand transportation services if the projects of self-driving cars are successful. When the interpersonal characteristic of collaborative services is reduced, it may lead to lower levels of rapport and anticipation of guilt, resulting in less biased feedbacks.

Therefore, we propose the following:

P3: Rapport is a boundary condition for the effect of type of service (traditional, collaborative) on feedback, such that a reduction in rapport will lead to less positively biased feedbacks.

## 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As collaborative services expand and gain popularity, so do their economic and theoretical relevance. As more users enter the platforms, the reliability of the reputation mechanisms regulating the services is growing in importance. However, the issue of feedback bias in collaborative services remains and the reason behind it is still unclear. By developing a theoretical framework, we arrived at three main propositions that may allow to better

understand when and why feedback bias occurs in collaborative services. We propose that the interpersonal characteristic of collaborative services leads to higher levels of rapport, which may prompt users to behave in a more prosocial manner, feeling anticipation of guilt for leaving negative feedback. In the case of hospitality services, such as Airbnb, where some hosts (user-provider) are now professionalized, this interpersonal nature may be reduced, in which case feedbacks would be similar to those in equivalent traditional services.

In both traditional and collaborative services, the ever-growing use of technology is changing possibilities of interaction. Technology now allows users to consume services without having any physical contact with another person. This became the case even in some collaborative services, where collaboration and community used to be central aspects. It is true, for example, in the case of more professionalized Airbnb hosts who only need virtual contact with the guests to let them know a code, or where to find a key to enter a property (*WIRTZ et al.*, 2019). The lack of face-to-face interaction with the other user could mean bad -or lack of-rapport (connected and pleasant interaction) (GIEBELHAUSEN *et al.*, 2014), which, in turn, may lead to less biased feedbacks in these situations where no contact with the host occurs. Furthermore, it is possible that the lack of rapport leads to less anticipated guilt, since if the user does not have a pleasant connection with the host, it is possible that the sense of community or even empathy could be lessened.

Anticipation of guilt has been connected to a motivation to "comply with behavioral requests that will help them avoid future feelings of guilt" (LINDSEY, YUN & HILL, 2007, p.468). Therefore, it is possible that due to the nature of collaborative services, which involve more personal interactions and prosocial behavior (especially in the case of Airbnb), users (knowing the power of their feedback to harm others) might feel anticipation of guilt and avoid leaving negative feedbacks (or any feedback at all).

We put forward three propositions that could warrant further empirical investigation to shed light in aspects leading to and affecting feedback bias in collaborative services. The main limitation of this study is not exploring other possible boundary conditions related to feedback bias in collaborative services, such as: personal empathy, number of feedbacks provided and peer score.

This study and its possible further developments may assist managers in being able to target the specific aspects related and leading to feedback bias and create strategies specifically designed to mitigate these issues. Another aspect that seems to be relevant to platform users and managers is how users can enjoy an authentic experience and not let his proximity between them to lead to anticipation of guilt, therefore generating positively biased feedbacks and misreported failures.

Literature points to an ample space for research on how social aspects (e.g. anticipation of guilt and rapport) influence feedbacks in collaborative services and how these feedbacks compare to feedback in equivalent traditional services. According to Guyader (2018), there is a lack of research on how the peers (users and providers) integrate aspects of the market exchange and prosocial norms into their practices and interactions with one another. Similarly, Eckhardt *et al*. (2019) argue that the implication of the 'sharing economy' for marketing thought and practice is still unclear. This research aims to add to existent service marketing literature by proposing a comparison of feedback in collaborative and traditional services, possibly leading to a better understanding of why and when feedback bias occurs in collaborative services. Also, by proposing that social aspects may be connected to feedback bias in this context, we aim to add to the literature on prosocial behavior.

The importance of feedbacks in collaborative services is clear: it is crucial for users to have access to unbiased feedbacks to assert trustworthiness and avoid risks or unpleasant

situations. How to offer authentic experiences without letting the proximity between users to lead to these positively biased feedbacks, and possible underreporting of problems, represents a challenge. We are at a turning point at which it is pivotal to resolve the issue of feedback bias before more changes and new possibilities of interaction are added to the platforms.

**REFERENCES**

Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Anticipation of guilt: an interpersonal approach. *Psychological bulletin*, *115*(2), 243.

Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *39*(4), 881-898.

Belk, R. (2014a). Sharing versus pseudo-sharing in Web 2.0. *The Anthropologist*, *18*(1), 7-23.

_____. (2014b). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(8), 1595-1600.

Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and prosocial behavior. American Economic Review, 96(5), 1652-1678.

Benoit, S., Baker, T. L., Bolton, R. N., Gruber, T., & Kandampully, J. (2017). A triadic framework for collaborative consumption (CC): Motives, activities and resources & capabilities of actors. *Journal of Business Research*, *79*, 219-227.

Bolton, G., Greiner, B., & Ockenfels, A. (2013). Engineering trust: reciprocity in the production of reputation information. *Management science*, *59*(2), 265-285.

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., Fleck, M., & Lutz, C. (2018). Authenticity and the sharing economy. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, *4*(3), 294-313.

Bridges, J., & Vásquez, C. (2018). If nearly all Airbnb reviews are positive, does that make them meaningless?. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *21*(18), 2057-2075.

Chasin, F., von Hoffen, M., Cramer, M., & Matzner, M. (2018). Peer-to-peer sharing and collaborative consumption platforms: a taxonomy and a reproducible analysis. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, *16*(2), 293-325.

Cheng, M., & Jin, X. (2019). What do Airbnb users care about? An analysis of online review comments. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *76*, 58-70.

Cui, T. H., Ghose, A., Halaburda, H., Iyengar, R., Pauwels, K., Sriram, S., Tucker, C., & Venkataraman, S. (2021). Informational Challenges in Omnichannel Marketing: Remedies and Future Research. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(1), 103–120.

Dolnicar, S., & Otter, T. (2003). Which hotel attributes matter? A review of previous and a framework for future research.

Eckhardt, G. M., & Bardhi, F. (2015). The sharing economy isn't about sharing at all. *Harvard business review*, *28*.

_____, G. M., Houston, M. B., Jiang, B., Lamberton, C., Rindfleisch, A., & Zervas, G. (2019). Marketing in the sharing economy. *Journal of Marketing*, *83*(5), 5-27.

Ert, E., Fleischer, A., & Magen, N. (2016). Trust and reputation in the sharing economy: The role of personal photos in Airbnb. *Tourism Management*, *55*, 62-73.

Estrada-Hollenbeck, M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1998). Avoiding and alleviating guilt through prosocial behavior. In *Guilt and children* (pp. 215-231). Academic Press.

Fradkin, A., Grewal, E., Holtz, D., & Pearson, M. (2015). Bias and reciprocity in online reviews: Evidence from field experiments on Airbnb. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation* (pp. 641-641).

Gavilan, D., Avello, M., & Martinez-Navarro, G. (2018). The influence of online ratings and reviews on hotel booking consideration. Tourism Management, 66, 53-61.

Giebelhausen, M., Robinson, S. G., Sirianni, N. J., & Brady, M. K. (2014). Touch versus tech: When technology functions as a barrier or a benefit to service encounters. Journal of Marketing, 78(4), 113-124.

Gratch, J., Wang, N., Gerten, J., Fast, E., & Duffy, R. (2007, September). Creating rapport with virtual agents. In International workshop on intelligent virtual agents (pp. 125-138). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Gremler, D. D., & Gwinner, K. P. (2000). Customer-employee rapport in service relationships. Journal of Service Research, 3(1), 82-104.

Guttentag, D. A., & Smith, S. L. (2017). Assessing Airbnb as a disruptive innovation relative to hotels: Substitution and comparative performance expectations. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 64, 1-10.

_____, D., Smith, S., Potwarka, L., & Havitz, M. (2018). Why tourists choose Airbnb: A motivation-based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel Research*, *57*(3), 342-359.

Guyader, H. (2018). No one rides for free! Three styles of collaborative consumption. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *32*(6), 692-714.

Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *67*(9), 2047-2059.

Huang, L., Morency, L. P., & Gratch, J. (2011, September). Virtual Rapport 2.0. In International Workshop on Intelligent Virtual Agents (pp. 68-79). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Katharina Hellwig, Russell Belk, and Felicitas Morhart (2015),"Shared Moments of Sociality: Embedded Sharing Within PeerTo-Peer Hospitality Platforms", in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 43, eds. Kristin Diehl and Carolyn Yoon.

Kumar, V., Lahiri, A., & Dogan, O. B. (2018). A strategic framework for a profitable business model in the sharing economy. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *69*, 147-160.

Lampinen, A., & Cheshire, C. (2016, May). Hosting via Airbnb: Motivations and financial assurances in monetized network hospitality. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1669-1680). ACM.

Liang, L. J., Choi, H. C., & Joppe, M. (2018). Understanding repurchase intention of Airbnb consumers: perceived authenticity, electronic word-of-mouth, and price sensitivity. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 35(1), 73-89.

Lindsey, L. L. M., Yun, K. A., & Hill, J. B. (2007). Anticipated guilt as motivation to help unknown others: An examination of empathy as a moderator. *Communication Research*, *34*(4), 468-480.

Lindsey, Lisa L. Massi. Anticipated Guilt as Behavioral Motivation: An Examination of Appeals to Help Unknown Others Through Bone Marrow Donation, *Human Communication Research*, Volume 31, Issue 4, October 2005, Pages 453–481

Mody, M. A., Suess, C., & Lehto, X. (2017). The accommodation experiencescape: a comparative assessment of hotels and Airbnb. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29(9), 2377-2404.

Möhlmann, M. (2015). Collaborative consumption: determinants of satisfaction and the likelihood of using a sharing economy option again. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *14*(3), 193-207.

Moon, H., Miao, L., Hanks, L., & Line, N. D. (2019). Peer-to-peer interactions: Perspectives of Airbnb guests and hosts. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *77*, 405-414.

Nowak, B., Allen, T., Rollo, J., Lewis, V., He, L., Chen, A., ... & Savino, M. (2015). Global insight: Who will Airbnb hurt more-hotels or OTAs. Morgan Stanley Research, 232-244.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2000). Guilt and social influence. Annals of the International Communication Association, 23(1), 67-101.

Pan, B., Zhang, L., & Law, R. (2013). The complex matter of online hotel choice. Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 54(1), 74-83.

Park, D. H., Lee, J., & Han, I. (2007). The effect of on-line consumer reviews on consumer purchasing intention: The moderating role of involvement. *International journal of electronic commerce*, *11*(4), 125-148

Seo, S. H., Griffin, K., Young, J. E., Bunt, A., Prentice, S., & Loureiro-Rodríguez, V. (2018). Investigating people's rapport building and hindering behaviors when working with a collaborative robot. International Journal of Social Robotics, 10(1), 147-161.

Shamdasani, P., Mukherjee, A., & Malhotra, N. (2008). Antecedents and consequences of service quality in consumer evaluation of self-service internet technologies. The Service Industries Journal, 28(1), 117-138.

Shuqair, S., Pinto, D. C., & Mattila, A. S. (2019). Benefits of authenticity: post-failure loyalty in the sharing economy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *78*, 102741.

Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2015). Beyond altruism: Sociological foundations of cooperation and prosocial behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*, 43-63.

Swaminathan, V., Sorescu, A., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., O'Guinn, T. C. G., & Schmitt, B. (2020). Branding in a Hyperconnected World: Refocusing Theories and Rethinking Boundaries. *Journal of Marketing*, 84(2), 24–46.

Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The nature of rapport and its nonverbal correlates. Psychological inquiry, 1(4), 285-293.

Willis, G., & Tranos, E. (2021). Using 'Big Data'to understand the impacts of Uber on taxis in New York City. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, *22*, 94-107.

Wirtz, J., So, K. K. F., Mody, M., Liu, S., & Chun, H. (2019). Platforms in the Peer-to-Peer Sharing Economy.

Zervas, G., Proserpio, D., & Byers, J. W. (2021). A first look at online reputation on Airbnb, where every stay is above average. *Marketing Letters*, *32*(1), 1-16.