


# Examining Consumers' Behavioral Intentions Towards Online Home Services Applications

Sumedha Chauhan, O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat, India

Yuvraj Gajpal, Asper School of Business, Canada\*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7105-8926>


Bindu Bhardwaj, The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, India

Poonam Kumar, Indian Institute of Management, Sambalpur, India

Sandeep Goyal, L.M. Thapar School of Management, India

Xiankai Yang, Asper School of Business, Canada

Amit Kumar Bhardwaj, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Derabassi, India

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0713-8016>

## ABSTRACT

On-demand home service application (HSA) is a technological advancement that has brought various day-to-day services to our doorstep with just a few clicks. By using consumer-perceived values (utilitarian, hedonic, and social), trust transfer theory, and commitment-trust theory, the present study aims to investigate the factors influencing sharing intention and repurchase intention of consumers towards using HSAs on their mobile phones. This study involves collecting data from 357 respondents in India and analyzing the same using the SmartPLS 3 software. The results indicate that trust in HSA is influenced by utilitarian value and social value, but not by hedonic value. Trust in HSA results in repurchase intention, commitment, and sharing intention. Interestingly, trust in the user community affects sharing intention but not repurchase intention and commitment. The study integrates the consumer-perceived value, trust transfer theory, and commitment-trust theory to build an integrative framework that explains the consumers' sharing and repurchase intentions towards HSAs.

## KEYWORDS

Commitment Trust Theory, Consumer-Perceived Value, Continuance Intention, Home Services Application, India, Sharing Intention, Trust Transfer Theory

## INTRODUCTION

Mobile application (m-app) platforms act as an aggregator and technology interface between customers and product/service providers, enabling online ordering and offline delivery of on-demand services anytime and anywhere (Jaconi, 2014; Su et al., 2022; Talwar et al., 2021; Yapp et al., 2018). Common

DOI: 10.4018/JGIM.326547

\*Corresponding Author

This article published as an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and production in any medium, provided the author of the original work and original publication source are properly credited.

examples of successful m-app platform-based on-demand services include Uber (on-demand ride-sharing app), Zomato (on-demand food delivery app), and Urban Company (on-demand home service application [HSA]). These on-demand service delivery platforms have grown exponentially in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. For example, the global ride-sharing market is expected to double from US\$85.8 billion in 2021 to more than US\$185.1 billion in 2026 (Markets and Markets, 2022). Regarding the on-demand food delivery market, worldwide revenue is expected to grow from US\$293.6 billion in 2021 to more than US\$466.4 billion in 2026 (Statista, 2021). Another rapidly growing business segment includes m-app platform-based home services, which include on-demand services like home cleaning and equipment repairs, personal grooming, pest control, laundry, and plumbing (Kumar et al., 2022; Technavio, 2019).

HSAs involve the online booking of utility services through an app, followed by an offline delivery of services by the service providers (Kumar et al., 2022). HSA-based service offerings are in sharp contrast to the traditional model where consumers would avail themselves of local home services by contacting the segregated service providers directly. Factors like the growing millennial population and a shift in their buying behavior, increasing penetration of high-speed and affordable internet and communication technologies, and rapidly expanding access to smartphones have led to the shift toward online demand for hyperlocal services (Technavio, 2019).

The global on-demand home services market was valued at US\$280 billion in 2018. It is expected to grow beyond US\$1.133 billion by 2026, which implies an average growth rate of 18.91% (VMR, 2021). Urban Company, a leading HSA in India, expanded its leadership team and raised funding in the amount of US\$255 million in 2021. It also planned to hire more than 100 engineers in 2022 (PTI, 2021). This indicates the growing demand for HSAs in the coming years.

It has been observed that online platforms extract consumer-generated value (social sharing intention and electronic word of mouth [eWOM]) from customers while also creating value (consumer-perceived value or benefits). This, in turn, results in the dual concept of consumer value (Kumar & Reinartz, 2016; Shin & Perdue, 2022). Many studies have evaluated consumer-perceived value and consumer-generated value. However, the dual concept of consumer value where perceived value or benefits lead to generated value has remained underexplored in information systems (IS, Wang et al., 2021).

The continuance intention and satisfaction level of users in the context of m-app platform-based service offerings are influenced by perceived value or benefits, which comprise not only utilitarian but also hedonic benefits (Hsu & Lin, 2020). The existing research studies highlight the relationship between trust-building and customer-generated values like eWOM (Agag & El-Masry, 2016; Alam et al., 2023; Kim & Park, 2013). However, a dearth of studies in IS have investigated the role of customer-perceived value in trust-building. Therefore, it has become important to study the role of customer-perceived value in trust-building. This, in turn, impacts customer-generated value (Agag & El-Masry, 2016; Kim & Park, 2013) and continuance intention (Hsu & Lin, 2020), leading to the authors' first research question:

**RQ1:** How does consumers' perceived values affect consumer trust in HSAs?

The next point pertains to the subsequent role of generated trust in enhancing commitment and continuance or sharing intention among consumers. The commitment-trust theory postulates that trust and commitment are two major factors that influence the behavioral intention of individuals when they are mutually involved in an exchange of information or commercial transaction (Abid et al., 2023; Morgan & Hung, 1994; Wang et al., 2016; Xiao et al., 2019a). Many studies have incorporated the commitment-trust theory in the context of a single trust target like the role of trust in a business-to-consumer (B2C) company website (Li et al., 2006), group buying website (Wang et al., 2016), or social media (Chen et al., 2022). Few studies have looked at the role of multiple trust targets in influencing online consumer behavior (Chen & Shen, 2015; Sollner et al., 2016). Chen

and Shen (2015) applied the commitment-trust theory in the context of social commerce, arguing that trust in members is transferred into the community. This act leads to the user's community commitment. Similarly, Sollner et al. (2016) and Xiao et al. (2019a) highlighted that multiple trust targets (including one or more with trust in the internet, trust in an intermediary platform, trust in supplier, trust in providers, and trust in the user community) should be considered while evaluating consumer behavior in an online business context. The above discussion implies that commitment-trust theory with multiple trust targets can play a significant role in establishing consumer sharing and continuance intention in the context of HSAs.

Another well-known theory is the trust transfer theory. Studies have verified trust transfer between multiple targets or stakeholders in an online setting (Chen et al., 2015; Xiao et al., 2019a). Chen et al. (2015) highlighted that consumer trust in an intermediary online consumer-to-consumer (C2C) platform influences their trust in sellers on the same platform. Xiao et al. (2019a) extended the application of the trust transfer theory by analyzing its role among different trust targets in online-to-offline commerce. However, there have been few studies related to the relationship between trust transfer and commitment, especially in the context of electronic and social commerce (Chen & Shen, 2015; Xiao et al., 2019a, 2019b).

Based on the above discussion, the second and third research questions focus on evaluating the relationship between trust transfer, commitment, and repurchase intention of consumers in the context of HSAs. The second and third research questions are as follows:

**RQ2:** How do different trust targets influence commitment toward HSAs?

**RQ3:** How do different trust targets and commitment influence consumers' sharing and repurchase intentions in the context of HSAs?

The current study applies a structural equation modelling (SEM) approach to assess relationships in the proposed model regarding the continuance intention for using HSAs. The study makes a significant contribution to the academic literature. First, this is one of the first research studies to explore consumer behavior in the context of on-demand home services. Second, the study enhances the understanding of commitment-trust and trust-transfer theory by showing different targets of trust and their distinct impact on customer commitment, repurchase intention, and sharing intention. Third, the study is one of the first to look at perceived value orientation (utilitarian, hedonic, or social) as a precursor or antecedent to the commitment-trust theory while assessing the impact of trust transfer on customer commitment, repurchase intention, and sharing intention.

From the practitioner's point of view, this study points to several interesting areas. First, it highlights how different variants of customer-perceived value impact trust in HSAs. The visibility into this relationship adds value to the HSA companies when designing appropriate features and marketing strategies to enhance the perceived value of the customer. In addition, companies can increase customer trust and commitment, leading to continuance intention and sharing intention. HSA customers for on-demand home services are likely to exhibit different usage behaviors or continuance intention depending on their perceived value orientation. This varies from utilitarian to hedonic to social value. Second, this study offers a detailed understanding of the boundary conditions of trust transfer between the HSA platform, internet technology, and user community. This understanding will enable HSA intermediaries to look beyond the single point of trust and focus on streamlining their trust-building strategies, keeping in mind multiple targets of trust.

The remainder of this study is organized as follows. Section 2 focuses on perceived value, trust transfer, and trust-commitment theories. Section 3 highlights the research model and formulates the hypotheses. Section 4 elaborates on the research methodology. Section 5 provides an analysis of data and results. Section 6 presents the discussion of the findings, theoretical and practical implications, limitations, and future research directions. Section 7 provides the concluding remarks.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### Consumer-Perceived Value

Perceived value is the consumer's evaluation of the trade-off between the product/service benefits and cost of obtaining that product/service (Kumar & Reinartz, 2016; Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000). Consumer-perceived value is the net valuation of the perceived benefits from a product/service that satisfies the needs and wants of the consumer (Wang et al., 2021). Though the perceived value includes tangible and intangible rewards, it is usually linked with tangible rewards like economic gains (Park et al., 2011). Nevertheless, an intangible reward is often expected for invested money within a system. The three main intangible consumer-perceived values are utilitarian value, social value, and hedonic value (Wang et al., 2021; Yoo et al., 2014). When consumers perceive such values, they have a major likelihood of adopting and using the services (Yoo et al., 2014).

Utilitarian value means the consumers perceive the practical and rational benefits of using IS (Vieira et al., 2022). Thus, it indicates the efficiency and effectiveness achieved through IS (Kim and Han, 2011; To et al., 2007). The utilitarian value perceived by a consumer significantly affects the trustworthiness of the information obtained from the system (Yoo et al., 2014), trust in social media brand communities (Wang et al., 2021), and consumer satisfaction (Jones et al., 2006).

Hedonic value also plays a role in evaluating customer behavior in the context of an online platform. Hedonic value is characterized as the perceived enjoyment, fun, or playfulness obtained through IS (To et al., 2007; Van der Heijden, 2004; Vayghan et al., 2022). Thus, hedonic value denotes the pleasure and fun derived from an activity like shopping (Tariyal et al., 2022; Vieira et al., 2022). Literature indicates the significant impact of hedonic value on trustworthiness (Yoo et al., 2014), trust in social media brand communities (Wang et al., 2021), and individual satisfaction with m-apps (Xu et al., 2015).

Additionally, social value is a crucial factor in shaping consumer behavior. Social value is enumerated as the enhancement of a user's social image through IS (Kim & Han, 2011). Social value brings social approval to an individual and enhances their self-image (Vayghan et al., 2022). Thus, social value satisfies an individual's desire to gain social recognition (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Researchers have found that consumer trust is governed by social value (Lin & Huang, 2012; Talwar et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021).

### Trust Transfer Theory

Trust is defined 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. (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 712)*

Trust is considered an effective way to deal with uncertainty (Nguyen et al., 2006). Literature indicates that in an electronic commerce (e-commerce) context, trust plays an important role in enabling consumers to overcome the perception of risk and insecurity related to such environments (McKnight et al., 2002). Hence, it is important to apply strategies that build consumer trust for facilitating successful trades in e-commerce. Wang et al. (2021) contended that the process of trust transfer can facilitate the building of trust in an online environment.

Trust transfer theory presents an efficient mechanism for instituting and improving trust in an online transaction. Trust in the target and trust in the source shape the trust transfer procedure (Koroma et al., 2022). If individuals perceive that the relationship between the source and target is strong, the likelihood of trust transfer is greater. On the other hand, if the relationship between the source and target is weak, individuals may not trust the target (Renner et al., 2022). Thus, trust transfer theory

indicates that the transfer of trust takes place when an unknown entity is perceived to be associated with the source of the transferred trust (Stewart, 2003).

This theory has received significant support due to its capability to explain the process of developing consumer trust. For instance, Lu et al. (2011) discovered that consumer trust in mobile payment services is affected by consumer trust in internet payment services. Wu et al. (2022) contended that interpersonal trust results in community group-buying trust. Similarly, Wang et al. (2021) found that trust in social media brand communities leads to trust in the brand and trust in social media. Thus, the literature indicates that the consumers represent trustors whose trust in a virtual application can be based on their experience of using the internet. Subsequently, their trust can be transferred to things like the brand.

Stewart (2003) argued that the communication process and cognitive process are vital to trust transfer. The communication process takes place when the experiences of others have a direct influence on trustors. For example, when consumers perceive that their friends and colleagues trust a brand's community, they tend to build trust in that community (Wang et al., 2021). On the other hand, the cognitive process takes place when the trustor's familiarity with the association between known and unknown entities leads to trust transfer from a known entity to an unknown entity (Belanche et al., 2014). In this case, the consumer perceives that known and unknown entities are contextually associated (Liu et al., 2018). When consumers have trust in the environment or atmosphere in which they meet the unknown entity, their tendency to trust the unknown entity is generated (Stewart, 2003). For example, if consumers trust the internet, they also trust e-commerce applications on the internet. Further, trust in such applications can generate trust in other entities like user communities of those applications.

### **Commitment-Trust Theory**

Several researchers have explored the determinants of trust and the process through which it establishes the online behavior of consumers (Abid et al., 2023; Hashim & Tan, 2015; Wang et al., 2016). Trust is a multi-faceted concept that promotes a psychological state characterized by a willingness to endure vulnerability about conduct (Jamshidi & Rousta, 2021). The literature conceptualizes commitment as the central element in developing and maintaining a long-term relationship with customers (Guo et al., 2010). Commitment is generated through trust. If consumers are not committed, they tend to shift to alternatives. Morgan and Hunt (1994) established the commitment-trust theory, describing commitment as "an exchange partner believing that an ongoing relationship with another is so important as to warrant maximum efforts at maintaining it" (p. 23). This theory states that trust affects commitment because it reduces the trustor's vulnerability when committed to a relationship (Wang et al., 2016).

The commitment-trust theory assumes that a relationship can only be successful if both trust and commitment are present (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Wei et al., 2019). Previous researchers used this theory to investigate consumer behavior in an online environment. For instance, Wang et al. (2016) combined the IS success model with the commitment-trust theory to study the group-buying behavior of consumers. Mukherjee and Nath (2007) used it in the context of a digitized business environment. Xiao et al. (2019a, 2019b) and Cui et al. (2020) used it to study consumers' behavioral intentions toward online and offline commerce. Several studies, such as Jamshidi and Rousta (2021) and Amin et al. (2021), have empirically validated the importance of trust and commitment in the relational exchange mechanism. Overall, this theory elucidates how the relationship between the trustor and trustee develops, fails, or succeeds (Li et al., 2006; Mukherjee & Nath, 2007).

## **RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

The current study assesses how different consumer-perceived values inculcate trust among consumers and how trust results in commitment, sharing intention, and repurchase intention. It also investigates

an important dimension related to multiple trust targets by investigating the relationship of trust in the internet with trust in HSAs. This is followed by trust in HSAs with trust in user communities. Figure 1 delineates the research model, which is based on consumer-perceived values, trust transfer theory, and commitment-trust theory. Next, the study describes the hypothesized relationships present in the research model.

## Consumer-Perceived Value in HSAs

### Utilitarian Value of HSAs

Utilitarian value is related to the efficiency and effectiveness that result from the use of a service (Kim & Han, 2011; Venkatesh & Brown, 2001). It is defined as an overall assessment of functional benefits gained by the customer from a specific product or service in the form of one or more aspects like price reduction, service, time-saving features, and product selection (Alam et al., 2022; Bae & Jeon, 2022). It is an important determinant for prompting behavioral intention to adopt IS because consumers tend to make a rational and calculated assessment of functional benefits derived from the services (Bae & Jeon, 2022; Kim & Han, 2011). Consumers can acquire information related to the service from various posts by sellers and other consumers. This enables the consumer to generate trust in the service (Lavuri et al., 2022).


Scholars have noted that utilitarian value significantly influences the consumer’s psychological perceptions in various contexts. Utilitarian value is positively related to brand trust in the smartphone industry (Fathina & Rachmawati, 2022), the trustworthiness of shared information on Twitter (Yoo et al., 2014), and trust in the social media brand community (Wang et al., 2021). Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1:** Utilitarian value positively affects consumer trust in HSAs.

### Hedonic Value of HSAs

Hedonic value is associated with emotional benefits like enjoyment, pleasure, fantasies, feelings, and fun (Van der Heijden, 2004; Vayghan et al., 2022). The consumer will perceive hedonic value in an m-app if it is interesting to use and makes the user happy (Kim & Han, 2009; Vayghan et al., 2022). Scholars found that hedonic value can positively influence user satisfaction via m-apps (Xu

Figure 1. Proposed research model



et al., 2015). Fathina and Rachmawati (2022) found a direct and positive effect of hedonic value on brand trust.

In IS research, hedonic value has been foregrounded as fun or pleasure drawn from the use of technology. The research has received significant attention from scholars (Brown & Venkatesh, 2005; Lavuri et al., 2022; Van der Heijden, 2004). Consumers may also enjoy searching for options, commenting on products or services, and sharing their experiences with others. Consumer pleasure may also arise from accurate and more informed decisions. This, in turn, can generate trust in services (Wang et al., 2021). In the context of HSAs, consumers' affective response to usage will generate trust toward a service when consumers perceive a higher hedonic value while searching, selecting, and ordering home services. Therefore, the authors propose:

**H2:** Hedonic value positively affects consumer trust in HSAs.

### *Social Value of HSAs*

Social value arises from social relationships (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Rintamäki et al. (2006) found that consumers can enhance their self-esteem and social relationships by using the brand's community in social media. Social value is associated with the image that consumers want to project in their social groups through their choice of behavior (Elliot et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2022). Scholars have examined social value through a positive relationship with customer intention and satisfaction in booking online hotels. This, in turn, boosts consumer self-esteem (Lin & Huang, 2012; Talwar et al., 2020).

Researchers found that social media brand community and social value are positively related (Wang et al., 2021). In addition, studies found positive relationships between consumer trust and recommendation behavior (Talwar et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2016; Yang, 2019).

Consumer trust in a brand while online shopping can be generated through perceptions about online elements like social networks, service request functions, and pictures of people (Bauman & Bachmann, 2017; Talwar et al., 2020). Thus, social value represents prestige and self-image that consumers derive in social group settings within HSAs. Social value can build trust in the brand by making a positive impression and deriving prestige. Hence, the authors propose:

**H3:** Social value positively affects consumer trust in HSAs.

### **Trust in the Internet**

Many consumers consider the internet an indispensable part of their life. This digital medium facilitates transactions on HSAs. Still, it can be regarded as a distant, insecure, ambiguous, and impersonal, vulnerable, and uncertain channel (Faqih, 2022). The lack of face-to-face interaction on the internet results in the absence of trust (Huang et al., 2022; Pavlou, 2003; Wu & Chen, 2005). McKnight et al. (2002) described trust in the internet as "the belief that needed structural conditions are present to enhance the probability of achieving success" (p. 339).

In an online business, structural conditions refer to the promises, guarantees, and regulations of the environment that support its success (McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Xiao et al., 2019a). Trust in the internet is highly relevant for consumers in the online business context because of the risk and uncertainty of its transactions (Pizzutti & Fernandes, 2010; Soleimani, 2022). Trust is also highly relevant in HSAs because payment for the transaction can be made online or offline (there is always a trust factor associated with the internet's regulatory or legal protection for consumers). The presence of such protection influences trust in a certain entity within the environment of the internet (Tan & Sutherland, 2004; Wang et al., 2021). Thus, the authors hypothesize:

**H4:** Trust in the internet positively affects trust in HSAs.

## Trust in HSAs

Trust in an intermediary online platform refers to the consumer's perception and belief in intermediary platform providers and their ability to satisfy the consumer's needs (Kumar et al., 2022; McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Xiao et al., 2019a). McKnight and Chervany (2001) argued that trust in an intermediary platform is driven by the consumer's beliefs about the integrity, benevolence, and competence of that platform. Therefore, trust in an intermediary platform influences the trust of the consumers in other trust targets like the user community and suppliers (Chen et al., 2015; Xu, 2017).

IS literature has demonstrated the relationship between trust in the intermediary platform and the online behavioral intention of the users (Belanche et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2015; Dew et al., 2017). Moreover, Chen and Shen (2015) extended the significance of trust in an intermediary platform by stating the argument that an individual's trust in the intermediary platform drives his/her trust in the user community and other stakeholders on that platform. Similarly, Xiao et al. (2019a) stated that consumers' trust in an intermediary online platform makes him/her believe in the user community on that platform. In this way, consumers pay attention to the views, feedback, and suggestions made by the user community on the trusted online platform. Hence, the authors hypothesize:

**H5:** Trust in an intermediary platform for home services positively affects trust in the user community.

Through the HSA platform, the consumer can obtain information, get services, make transactions, and give feedback on the services. The platform's benevolence can inculcate trust in the consumer's mindset and, thus, facilitate his/her potential opportunistic behavior toward the platform (Chen & Shen, 2015). Also, the relationship between consumer loyalty and trust in the intermediary platform has been depicted in the literature (e.g., Chen & Shen, 2015; Belanche et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2015). Consumer trust in the intermediary platform can affect the sharing intention of the community. This implies that if a person has a high level of trust toward a particular online platform, he/she will also have a high inclination toward the product/service offerings on that platform and will be highly loyal. As a result, a consumer will tend to share his/her experiences of consumption on the HSA platform.

Researchers have found the positive influence of trust on commitment (Abid et al., 2023; Li et al., 2006; Mukherjee & Nath, 2007; Wang et al., 2016). A study on commitment toward a certain website revealed that the consumer's trust in the group buying website can impact his/her commitment to it (Wang et al., 2016). Therefore, the authors hypothesize:

**H6:** Trust in HSAs positively affects repurchase intention.

**H7:** Trust in HSAs positively affects commitment.

**H8:** Trust in HSAs positively affects sharing intention.

## Trust in the User Community

Trust in the user community implies that the consumer is willing to count on the decisions, actions, and reviews of other users on the platform (Chen & Shen, 2015). Researchers have found that there is a significant influence of trust in the user community on online behavior like sharing information and efficacious support (Abid et al., 2023; Chen & Shen, 2015; Xiao et al., 2019a). Hence, if the user community shares effective and valuable information for the specific value offering, the consumer will tend to purchase it frequently (Xiao et al., 2019a). It is also evident from various research arguments that the user's community offers valuable and effective information only when an online platform provides effective support to its consumers (Koroma et al., 2022; Sollner et al., 2016; Xiao et al., 2019a). Thus, the consumer will be more likely to attach to the community and share his/her experiences when the users in the community have trustworthy attributes. The consumer will start trusting an HSA as per the rules and engagements associated with the concerned platform (Tan &



Sutherland, 2004; Xiao et al., 2019a). These rules and engagements help the consumer in reviewing the services, experiencing the platform, and sharing activities with other users in the community.

Scholars have integrated the IS success model with the commitment-trust theory to study the group behavior of consumers (Wang et al., 2016). Literature also articulates that online communities are resistant to continue their use of an online platform if they believe that others are being opportunistic and are unable to maintain their promises (Yen, 2009). Consumers will be more attracted to and loyal to the community if the community demonstrates trustworthy attributes (Wu et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2019a, 2019b). Thus, the authors hypothesize that:

**H9:** Trust in the user community positively affects repurchase intention for HSAs.

**H10:** Trust in the user community positively affects commitment to HSAs.

**H11:** Trust in the user community positively affects sharing intention for HSAs.

### **Commitment**

Commitment is an enduring desire to continue the relationship with a brand (Suh & Han, 2003). Chen and Shen (2015) discovered that consumers are psychologically connected to a website if they have a higher commitment to it. This is attained by maintaining relationships. In banking services, it is observed that there is a positive relationship between commitment and repurchase intention (Verhoef, 2003). In the banking context, studies have also discovered a positive relationship between commitment and the sharing of collective interests of consumers and sellers (Herjanto & Amin, 2020). The positive effect of commitment on consumer retention and sharing intention is well-studied in the literature (Chen & Shen, 2015; Hashim & Tan, 2015; Wang et al., 2016). Xiao et al. (2019a) also found that commitment has a significantly positive relationship with both sharing intention and repurchase intention. This implies that if a consumer has a high level of commitment toward a particular HSA service brand, he/she will maintain a long-term relationship with it and continue the usage of its services and share his/her experiences. Thus, based on the above arguments, the authors hypothesize that:

**H12:** Commitment positively affects repurchase intention for HSAs.

**H13:** Commitment positively affects sharing intention for HSAs.

### **Control Variables**

Studies have investigated the influence of demographic variables on consumer behavior (Talwar et al., 2021). Literature also discusses the influence of demographic variables on related consumer behavior. For example, Talwar et al. (2021) suggested that age, gender, and educational background directly influence the drivers of adoption. It has been observed generally and examined specifically in research studies that younger generations are more likely to adopt new technologies (Hwang et al., 2019; Talwar et al., 2021). Thus, these generations are more likely to use HSAs compared to older consumers. Considering the evidence, the research model for the present study controlled for the confounding influence of three variables (age, gender, and education) on two criterion variables (sharing intention and repurchase intention).

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Questionnaire Development**

The survey data and demographic details of participants were gathered through a self-administered questionnaire from April 2021 through June 2021. The survey questionnaire for the present study was

designed based on the existing literature (see Table 1). These questions were modified based on the HSA context and made available in English. A committee was formed with six academicians from four business schools in India. The committee had an overall experience of 42 years in academia. The committee performed the content validation of all questions corresponding to each construct.

**Table 1. Constructs and measurement items**

Construct	Items	Description	Sources
Utilitarian Value	UV1	Compared to the effort I need to put in, I benefit from the user of home service apps.	Kim and Han (2009)
	UV2	Compared to the time I spend on it, I find it worthwhile to use home service apps.	
	UV3	Overall, I find good value in the use of home service apps.	
Hedonic Value	HV1	I enjoy using home service apps.	Kim and Han (2009)
	HV2	I feel relaxed by using home service apps.	
	HV3	Home service apps make me feel good.	
	HV4	Home service apps make me use them.	
Social Value	SV1	Home service apps help me gain social approval.	Lin and Huang (2012); Talwar et al. (2020)
	SV2	Home service apps help me make a positive impression on other people.	
	SV3	Home service apps changed the way I am perceived by others.	
	SV4	Home service apps help me stand out among my peers.	
Trust in Internet	TI1	I trust the internet.	Belanche et al. (2014); Sollner et al. (2016)
	TI2	The internet is a reliable means to carry out transactions.	
	TI3	When making transactions, the internet is trustworthy.	
	TI4	It is not a problem to pay in advance for purchased products/services over the internet.	
Trust in HSAs	THSA1	I use trustworthy home service apps.	Chen et al. (2015); Pavlou and Gefen (2004); Sollner et al. (2016)
	THSA2	The home service apps that I use are in my best interest.	
	THSA3	The home service apps that I use are competent and effective in providing advice on services.	
	THSA4	The home service apps that I use are truthful in their dealings with me.	
Trust in User Community	TUC1	I value the information provided by other users on home service apps.	Sollner et al. (2016)
	TUC2	Information provided by other users on home service apps is true and reliable.	
	TUC3	In general, I can count on the information other users provide on home service apps.	
Commitment	CM1	I want the home service apps that I use to be available for a long time.	Li et al. (2006); Wang et al. (2016)
	CM2	My relationship with home service apps is worth my maximum effort.	
	CM3	I would be very upset if the home service apps that I use disappear in the future.	
	CM4	I feel a sense of belonging to the home service apps that I use.	
	CM5	I feel attached to the home service apps that I use.	
Repurchase Intention	RI1	I intend to continue using home service apps rather than discontinue their use.	Qureshi et al. (2009)
	RI2	I intend to continue using home service apps rather than use alternative means.	
	RI3	I look forward to revisiting home service apps in the future.	
Sharing Intention	SI1	I am willing to provide my experience on home service apps.	Yang (2019); Cheung and Lee (2012); Chen et al. (2015); Bock et al. (2005)
	SI2	I am willing to recommend home service apps.	
	SI3	I am willing to share my own consumption experience with members on home service apps.	

Content validity evaluates whether the measurement items of the constructs properly depict the full domain of the construct (Straub et al., 2004).

A preliminary test on 10 business students was conducted. The students made use of HSAs at least four times in the past and, hence, were aware of such applications. The students were asked about the lack of clarity and confusion in the questions of the survey. Based on their suggestions, minor modifications were made to the questionnaire.

Subsequently, a pilot study was performed to gauge the pertinence of the survey questionnaire. All the questions except the questions related to the control variable employed a seven-point Likert scale, which ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The pilot survey was filled out by a total of 95 participants through convenience sampling. The purpose of the present research was elucidated to the participants while sending the link to the online survey. Additionally, the participants were assured that their responses would remain anonymous.

The authors conducted the factor analysis and reliability test of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  on the data, which was collected for the pilot study. The factor analysis was performed using SPSS software. While doing factor analysis, the loading of every item on its respective construct was found to be greater than 0.5. Hence, none of the items were deleted (Hair et al., 2010). Also, the value of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for all the constructs was found to be between 0.7 and 0.95, which is an acceptable range for Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value in applied research (Nunnally, 1978). Thus, the authors could confirm the survey instrument for this research. The questions for each construct and their sources are listed in Table 1.

### Sampling and Data Collection

The link to the finalized survey was floated among the students and staff members of four universities in India. The link to the survey was made available to a total of 2,310 potential participants. On the first page of the survey, a participant was asked whether he/she had used HSA at least four times in the past. If the participant responded "yes," he/she was directed to the main survey page or to the end of the survey. This was done to ensure that the survey participants were well-experienced with HSAs. Out of 2,310 participants, a total of 689 attempted to fill out the survey. Thus, the response rate was 29.82%. However, out of 689 participants, only 357 participants had used HSAs at least four times. Thus, the sample consisted of 357 usable responses.

A statistical power analysis was conducted to ascertain the minimum sample size needed to assess the proposed research model using the G\*Power tool (Faul et al., 2009; Memon et al., 2020). The input values used for effect size,  $\alpha$ , and power were 0.15, 0.05, and 0.95. It can be observed from the proposed research model that four arrows point to "trust in home services app," one arrow to "trust in user community," three arrows to "repurchase intention," three arrows to "sharing intention," and two arrows to "commitment." Following the rule of the highest number of arrows pointing toward one variable in the model, the value "4" was used as the number of predictors in the input parameters. The G\*Power tool showed that the minimum sample size required for the model was 129. Thus, the sample size of 357 reveals sufficient statistical power. The demographic details of the participants are presented in Table 2.

### DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The current study employed the SEM approach to evaluate the proposed hypotheses. SEM can be applied via covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM) and partial least squares SEM (PLS-SEM, Hair et al., 2011). PLS-SEM is recommended for exploratory studies; CB-SEM is preferred for performing confirmatory studies (Ong & Puteh, 2017). Therefore, the authors used PLS-SEM for this study.

PLS-SEM can handle complex models and achieve high statistical power with a small sample size. Its algorithm is built on ordinary least squares regression for distinct sub-parts of the structural model (Hair et al., 2017). The current study attempts to validate an exploratory model comprising

Table 2. Demographics of the participants

Category	Sample (N = 357)
<b>Age</b>	
Under 18	9.24%
18-30	16.25%
31-40	26.61%
41-50	23.53%
51-60	15.41%
61-70	6.44%
Above 70	2.52%
<b>Gender</b>	
Male	37.54%
Female	62.46%
<b>Education</b>	
High School	5.88%
College/University	10.64%
Post Graduate Study	54.06%
Other	29.41%

multiple constructs with complex relationships. It does not intend to test a proposed theory. Thus, PLS-SEM was a suitable statistical approach (Chin & Newsted, 1999).

A similar approach has been undertaken by researchers in the past (Chauhan et al., 2021). The present study used the SmartPLS 3 software to evaluate the measurement and structural models. Reliability and validity were assessed through the measurement model. The structural model was used to evaluate the hypotheses.

### Measurement Model

The adequacy of the measurement model was assessed based on the criteria for reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. First, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  and composite reliability were evaluated to verify the reliability of the measurement model. Table 3 indicates that the values of Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , as well as composite reliability for all the constructs, were greater than 0.7. Thus, the reliability of all the constructs was ascertained (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Second, convergent validity was confirmed as the average variance extracted (AVE) values were greater than 0.5. Convergent validity was further tested through the standard loadings of the measurement items. Every loading was greater than 0.6 (see Table 4, Hair et al., 2010). Third, as shown in Table 5, the discriminant validity was confirmed because the square root value of AVE of all the constructs was greater than the correlation between that construct and other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Additionally, the discriminant validity of all the constructs was further confirmed as the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratios were discovered to be smaller than 0.9 (Henseler et al., 2015). See Table 5.

Thereafter, the multicollinearity of all the constructs was checked using the variance inflation factor (VIF) values. The VIF values should be less than 10 for multicollinearity to not be a problem. In this research, all the VIF values were below the threshold of 10 (O'Brien, 2007). Thus, multicollinearity does not appear to be an issue.

Table 3. Reliability and convergent validity of constructs

Construct	Reliability		Convergent Validity
	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Utilitarian Value	0.751	0.856	0.665
Hedonic Value	0.957	0.952	0.832
Social Value	0.801	0.870	0.625
Trust in internet	0.788	0.861	0.608
Trust in HSAs	0.858	0.904	0.701
Trust in UC	0.810	0.888	0.725
Commitment	0.870	0.906	0.657
Repurchase Intention	0.861	0.915	0.782
Sharing Intention	0.878	0.925	0.803

Additionally, common method bias (CMB) was evaluated using procedural and statistical approaches (Podsakoff et al., 2003). When following the procedural approach, participants were informed they could remain candid while completing the survey because no response was right or wrong. They were also assured that anonymity would be maintained. Two statistical approaches, namely Harman's single factor test and the full collinearity assessment approach, were used to identify CMB. The outcome of Harman's single factor test indicated that only 16.68% of the variance was explained by the most significant factor. Hence, CMB does not appear to be a concern according to Harman's single factor test.

Furthermore, Kock (2015) suggested that the full collinearity assessment approach is successful for the identification of CMB in the context of partial least squares (PLS) SEM. Kock (2015) indicated that the VIF should not be greater than 3.3 for the model to be free from CMB (see Table 6). The authors undertook the full collinearity assessment approach, observing that the VIF values for all the constructs in this study were less than 3.3. Hence, the model is free from CMB as per the specifications set by Kock (2015).

### Structural Model

The model fit was assessed considering the data gathered through the survey questionnaire for the present study. In a research model, the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) value should not be greater than 0.08 (Henseler et al., 2016). SRMR value strongly verifies the approximate model fit criteria for a PLS structural model. For the proposed research model of the present study, the SRMR value was noted as 0.043.

The structural model was utilized to assess the hypothesized relationships. To evaluate the structural model, the path coefficients and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) values were calculated (Chin & Newsted, 1999). The statistical significance of hypothesized relationships was assessed using path coefficients, while the ability of the research model to elucidate the variation in the dependent variables was denoted by  $R^2$  values. The results of the structural model are depicted in Figure 2. Trust in HSA is significantly influenced by utilitarian value ( $\beta = 0.354$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and social value ( $\beta = 0.398$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), but not by hedonic value ( $\beta = 0.035$ ,  $p = 0.360$ ). Thus, the authors found support for H1 and H3, but not H2. Trust in the internet influences trust in HSA ( $\beta = 0.297$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), which further influences trust in the user community ( $\beta = 0.391$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Thus, H4 and H5 were supported. Trust in HSA has a significant effect on repurchase intention ( $\beta = 0.157$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), commitment ( $\beta = 0.343$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and sharing intention ( $\beta = 0.089$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), supporting H6, H7, and H8. Trust in the user community significantly impacts sharing intention ( $\beta = 0.468$ ,  $p <$

Table 4. Item loadings

Construct	Items	Loading	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Utilitarian Value	UV1	0.861	0.021	41.759
	UV2	0.820	0.025	32.712
	UV3	0.760	0.035	21.769
Hedonic Value	HV1	0.880	0.168	5.546
	HV2	0.869	0.159	5.337
	HV3	0.861	0.172	5.102
	HV4	0.879	0.201	4.897
Social Value	SV1	0.761	0.032	23.987
	SV2	0.797	0.026	30.907
	SV3	0.799	0.026	30.616
	SV4	0.798	0.026	30.599
Trust in Internet	TI1	0.758	0.037	20.690
	TI2	0.751	0.039	19.485
	TI3	0.758	0.037	20.560
	TI4	0.840	0.027	31.098
Trust in HSA	THSA1	0.844	0.014	59.710
	THSA2	0.840	0.015	57.017
	THSA3	0.834	0.016	52.545
	THSA4	0.830	0.015	54.709
Trust in User Community	TUC1	0.853	0.016	53.720
	TUC2	0.854	0.014	60.711
	TUC3	0.846	0.017	49.462
Commitment	CMM1	0.811	0.019	42.504
	CMM2	0.801	0.018	45.016
	CMM3	0.800	0.018	43.408
	CMM4	0.829	0.016	53.488
	CMM5	0.812	0.020	40.415
Repurchase Intention	RI1	0.878	0.011	81.029
	RI2	0.879	0.012	73.089
	RI3	0.894	0.010	90.665
Sharing Intention	SI1	0.892	0.010	86.211
	SI2	0.902	0.010	91.976
	SI3	0.894	0.010	86.713

0.001), but not repurchase intention ( $\beta = -0.063$ ,  $p = 0.188$ ) or commitment ( $\beta = -0.054$ ,  $p = 0.324$ ). Thus, the authors found support for H11, but not H9 and H10.

The model was also controlled for the confounding impact of three demographic variables (age, gender, and education) on sharing intention and repurchase intention. Gender and education were not

Table 5. Discriminant validity of constructs

	CMM	RI	HV	AGE	GD	EDU	SI	SV	THSA	TI	TUC	UV
<b>CMM</b>	<b>0.81</b>	0.59	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.05	0.47	0.08	0.37	0.04	0.10	0.06
<b>RI</b>	0.51	<b>0.88</b>	0.03	0.43	0.02	0.02	0.11	0.04	0.37	0.07	0.09	0.07
<b>HV</b>	0.12	0.02	<b>0.91</b>	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03
<b>AGE</b>	0.10	0.40	-0.01	<b>1.00</b>	0.10	0.02	0.12	0.05	0.14	0.05	0.12	0.05
<b>GD</b>	0.12	0.01	0.04	0.10	<b>1.00</b>	0.11	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.04	0.06
<b>EDU</b>	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.02	-0.11	<b>1.00</b>	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.02
<b>SI</b>	0.41	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.07	0.04	<b>0.90</b>	0.04	0.44	0.05	0.63	0.06
<b>SV</b>	-0.05	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	<b>0.79</b>	0.41	0.18	0.06	0.09
<b>THSA</b>	0.32	0.32	0.05	0.13	-0.04	0.04	0.38	0.34	<b>0.84</b>	0.31	0.47	0.44
<b>TI</b>	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.10	-0.09	-0.02	-0.14	0.26	<b>0.78</b>	0.07	0.12
<b>TUC</b>	0.08	0.07	0.03	0.11	-0.02	0.00	0.53	0.02	0.39	0.04	<b>0.85</b>	0.08
<b>UV</b>	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.02	-0.06	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.36	0.06	-0.03	<b>0.82</b>

Note 1: CMM = Commitment; RI = Repurchase Intention; HV = Hedonic Value; AGE = Age; GD = Gender; EDU = Education; SI = Sharing Intention; SV = Social Value; THSA = Trust in HSAs; TI = Trust in internet; TUC = Trust in User Community; UV = Utilitarian Value

Note 2: Diagonal, bold-faced, and italicized values are the square roots of the AVE. HTMT values are present above the diagonal values. Inter-construct correlation values are present below the diagonal values.

Table 6. VIF values


Construct	VIF
Utilitarian Value	1.336
Hedonic Value	1.019
Social Value	1.443
Trust in Internet	1.247
Trust in HSA	2.608
Trust in User Community	1.679
Commitment	1.819
Repurchase Intention	1.518
Sharing Intention	1.856

found to significantly affect sharing intention and repurchase intention. Age was found to influence repurchase intention, but not sharing intention. Furthermore, the model explained 10%, 39%, 42%, 34%, and 15% variations in commitment, repurchase intention, sharing intention, trust in HSAs, and trust in the user community, respectively.

## DISCUSSION

The current study sought to investigate three research questions. First, it aimed to explore how consumer-perceived value affects consumer trust in HSAs. The results indicate that utilitarian value and social value can enhance consumers' trust in HSAs, while hedonic value is insignificantly related to trust in HSAs. The results related to the utilitarian value and social value are consistent with the

Figure 2. Structural model results



Note: —→ Significant Path  
 ---→ Insignificant Path  
 \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001; n.s. = non-significant

prevailing literature that reveals the significant effect of these values on consumer trust (Wang et al., 2021). Some studies revealed a stronger influence of hedonic value on the outcome variable than the utilitarian value (Jones et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2021). This is in sharp contrast to the present study that discovered the insignificant influence of hedonic value on the outcome variable.

Second, the study explored the process of trust transfer among distinct trust targets and how different trust targets affect commitment toward HSAs. The results showed a significant relationship between trust in the internet and trust in HSAs. This finding is in line with claims made by McKnight et al. (2002) and Tan and Sutherland (2004). They argued that institution-based trust (i.e., the perceptions regarding the internet environment) significantly impact trust in a particular e-commerce entity. Trust in HSAs was further found to significantly affect trust in the user community. Thus, this study extends the previous studies on the online platform by taking into consideration a more integrative list of trust targets that clarifies the process of trust transfer among known and unknown entities. The results further indicated that commitment is significantly affected by trust in HSAs, but not by trust in the user community. These results are partially consistent with the literature that revealed that trust in intermediary platforms and trust in the user community enhance commitment (Xiao et al., 2019a).

Third, the study examined how different trust targets and commitment affect consumers' sharing intention and repurchase intention for HSAs. The study found that commitment significantly affects the sharing intention and repurchase intention. These findings are consistent with the prior literature that demonstrated the importance of commitment toward sharing intention (Chen & Shen, 2015; Xiao et al., 2019a) and repurchase intention (Xiao et al., 2019a). The study also discovered that trust in HSAs (intermediary platforms) significantly affects sharing intention and repurchase intention. These significant relationships are consistent with the existing literature on online group buying and social commerce contexts (Chen & Shen, 2015; Wang et al., 2016). On the other hand, trust in the user community significantly influences sharing intention, but not repurchase intention. These results are partially consistent with the literature that discovered a significant relationship of trust in the user community with sharing, as well as repurchase intention (Xiao et al., 2019a).

Overall, the findings of the present study enrich the literature by examining the influence of consumer-perceived values on trust in HSAs. It also indicates the significance of multiple trust targets, including trust in the internet, trust in HSAs, and trust in the user community. The study shows how different trust targets influence commitment, sharing intention, and repurchase intention. The study



also provides support for the commitment-trust theory in the context of HSAs and investigates how commitment leads to sharing intention and repurchase intention. Next, the implications for theory and practice are discussed.

### **Theoretical Implications**

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to four areas: (1) HSA literature; (2) consumer-perceived values; (3) commitment-trust theory; and (4) trust-transfer theory. It is one of the first studies exploring the role of consumer-perceived value, trust transfer, and commitment in the sharing and repurchase intentions towards HSAs. This study can be considered a starting point for future research aimed at understanding the significant factors driving the continuance and sharing intentions among people in the context of HSAs. This study depicts how customer-perceived value can help in developing trust in HSAs.

Based on previous literature, the authors argued that there are three types of values that consumers can acquire by accessing HSAs, namely utilitarian, hedonic, and social values (Wang et al., 2021). The study found the varying impact of these values on trust in HSAs. Social value and utilitarian value are found to be associated with trust in HSAs. However, hedonic value is not related to trust in HSAs. Therefore, this study shows that consumer-perceived values resulting from information technology-enabled service innovation can be used by companies to develop consumer trust. This provides an upright practice into how an existing concept of consumer value or theory on trust can be utilized in the new research context of HSAs (Hong et al., 2013). Also, with respect to consumer value and engagement, this study strengthens the consumer engagement research (Kumar & Reinartz, 2016) from the perspective of exploring the significance of consumer-perceived values in building trust toward HSAs.

The current study broadens the scope of trust with respect to the commitment-trust theory. In relation to the commitment-trust theory, this study extends the scope of trust and its impact on commitment by focusing on multiple trust entities and their subsequent impact on consumer commitment and behavior. This study complements Sollner et al. (2016) and Chen and Shen (2015), who call for research on multiple trust targets and their effects on consumer commitment and behavior. Hence, in relation to the trust transfer theory, this study extends its application in the context of HSAs. There is a dearth of research on the trust transfer mechanism in HSAs; therefore, the current study permeates this gap and strengthens the trust transfer theory. Thus, the current study has focused on the exploration of the relationship between trust and commitment in the context of HSAs.

Finally, the current study examines the application of trust transfer theory in the HSA context and contributes to envisioning consumer behavior in a technology-enabled business context like HSAs. This also fulfills the future research calls by Evanschitzky et al. (2007) and Reimer and Benkenstein (2016) in the context of investigating user behavior when multiple entities are involved. To the best of the authors' knowledge, the current study is one of the first to examine consumer value dimensions as antecedents to trust-building, followed by the role of trust transfer among multiple trust targets in affecting the consumer's commitment and behavior toward HSAs.

### **Practical Implications**

From the practitioner's point of view, this study has implications for intermediary platform operators engaged in providing on-demand home services to users. First, this study highlights how different consumer-perceived value dimensions impact trust-building among consumers. As highlighted by the results, focusing on enhancing social and utilitarian values as compared to hedonic value will result in greater trust-building toward HSAs among consumers. HSA providers should design their operational model and marketing strategies so that they enhance the social and utilitarian values of their offerings. For utilitarian value, HSAs must continually improve the on-demand home service offerings, quality of services, value-based pricing, and regular updates regarding service offerings. HSA platforms can let consumers rate their experiences online after availing themselves of their service

offerings. HSA providers need to ensure that their app is well-designed in terms of user navigation, as well as filter, search, select, and order options. Regarding social value, HSA providers need to properly equip consumers so they can easily share their experiences online. They should also enable users to gain social appreciation and approval by availing themselves of on-demand home services.

Second, this study indicates the pivotal role of trust in HSAs. This is one of a few studies that present a detailed understanding of the boundary conditions of trust transfer among HSA providers, internet technology, and the user community. This understanding will enable platform intermediaries to look beyond the single point of trust and focus on fine-tuning trust-building strategies, keeping in mind their multiple trust targets. For example, as consumers gain trust in HSA providers, they are likely to develop more trust in the user communities linked to those HSA platforms. This trust-transfer relationship will result in an enhanced level of sharing intention among consumers.

Third, the current study found that commitment holds a central point in driving consumer sharing and repurchase intentions on HSA platforms. HSA providers should focus on enhancing the trustworthiness of their platforms (user-friendly interface, reliable information, security features, privacy, and quick customer service), which in turn will strengthen the trust of the consumers in user communities and will drive their commitment toward these platforms for repurchasing and sharing intentions. Unexpectedly, this study found that trust in the user community does not lead to overall commitment and repurchase intention among consumers. However, trust in the user community influences the sharing intention of the consumers. This implies that HSA providers must stay focused on enhancing the trustworthiness of their core service offerings and technology platform interface rather than relying on their user-community network in driving the commitment and repurchase intention of consumers. Focusing on the user-community network rather than core service offerings and platform interface may help HSA providers in gaining recognition among the public. However, it may not be sufficient in attracting repurchase intention.

### **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

Despite its significant contributions, the current study has a few limitations. First, it focuses on HSA consumers from India; thus, the findings may not be relevant to other cultural contexts or application-based services. Hence, research can be conducted in other geographical regions. Nevertheless, the study offers a robust conceptual model that can be tested in other cultural contexts to conduct a cross-cultural analysis. Second, the study explores consumer sharing and repurchase intentions from a relational perspective of factors like trust and commitment. However, research may incorporate other variables (e.g., perceived effectiveness of dispute resolution, reputation, etc.) in the model to investigate their influence on consumer behavior. Third, this study measured commitment as a unidimensional concept. However, it can also be theorized as a multidimensional concept comprising affective, normative, and calculative dimensions (Li et al., 2006; Xiao et al., 2019a). Thus, research could investigate the relationship of different dimensions of commitment with trust targets and behavioral intention in HSAs. Fourth, the study makes use of a cross-sectional design for the gathering of data. Thus, the social desirability bias can affect the study, despite taking all procedural precautions to lessen its effect. Hence, future research can use a longitudinal study design to offer further insights into the context of HSAs. Fifth, a similar research model can be analyzed in the context of newly emerging or popular apps in other niche areas (e.g., Upwork, WeChat, Meesho, and Zoom). Finally, the study considered age, gender, and education as the control variables. Future researchers can use other demographic variables like income and household size along with non-demographic variables.

### **CONCLUSION**

Though there has been a growing popularity of HSAs among consumers, there is a lack of research in this area. Hence, the current study aimed to investigate how different consumer-perceived values inculcate trust among consumers and how trust results in commitment, sharing intention, and

repurchase intention. It built and tested a research model that integrated the consumer-perceived value, trust transfer theory, and commitment-trust theory to investigate the sharing and repurchase intentions of consumers of HSAs. The model controlled for age, gender, and education. Thus, the study enriches the literature by providing insights into which factors play a key role in governing sharing and repurchase intentions for HSAs. The survey data was collected from 357 respondents in India to test the hypotheses. The study found support for most of the hypotheses and discusses the important implications drawn from them.

## REFERENCES

- Abid, M. F., Siddique, J., Gulzar, A., Shamim, A., Bashir, I., & Zafar, A. (2023). Integrating the commitment-trust theory to gauge customers loyalty in riding services. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 29(3), 305–337. doi:10.1080/10496491.2022.2143987
- Agag, G., & El-Masry, A. A. (2016). Understanding consumer intention to participate in online travel community and effects on consumer intention to purchase travel online and WOM: An integration of innovation diffusion theory and TAM with trust. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 60, 97–111. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.02.038
- Alam, S. S., Masukujjaman, M., Ahmad, M., & Jaffor, R. (2022). Acceptance of online distance learning (ODL) among students: Mediating role of utilitarian and hedonic value. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–34. doi:10.1007/s10639-022-11533-3 PMID:36589518
- Alam, S. S., Masukujjaman, M., Mohamed Makhbul, Z. K., Helmi Ali, M., Ahmad, I., & Al Mamun, A. (2023). Experience, trust, eWOM engagement and usage intention of AI enabled services in hospitality and tourism industry: Moderating mediating analysis. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 1–29. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/1528008X.2023.2167762
- Amin, M., Ryu, K., Cobanoglu, C., & Nizam, A. (2021). Determinants of online hotel booking intentions: Website quality, social presence, affective commitment, and e-trust. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 30(7), 845–870. doi:10.1080/19368623.2021.1899095
- Bae, J. H., & Jeon, H. M. (2022). Exploring the relationships among brand experience, perceived product quality, hedonic value, utilitarian value, and brand loyalty in unmanned coffee shops during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability (Basel)*, 14(18), 11713. doi:10.3390/su141811713
- Bauman, A., & Bachmann, R. (2017). Online consumer trust: Trends in research. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 12(2), 68–79. doi:10.4067/S0718-27242017000200008
- Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., Flavián, C., & Schepers, J. (2014). Trust transfer in the continued usage of public e-services. *Information & Management*, 51(6), 627–640. doi:10.1016/j.im.2014.05.016
- Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., & Lee, J. N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 29(1), 87–111. doi:10.2307/25148669
- Brown, S. A., & Venkatesh, V. (2005). Model of adoption of technology in households: A baseline model test and extension incorporating household life cycle. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 29(3), 399–426. doi:10.2307/25148690
- Chauhan, S., Goyal, S., Bhardwaj, A. K., & Sergi, B. S. (2021). Examining continuance intention in business schools with digital classroom methods during COVID-19: A comparative study of India and Italy. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/0144929X.2021.1892191
- Chen, J., & Shen, X. L. (2015). Consumers' decisions in social commerce context: An empirical investigation. *Decision Support Systems*, 79, 55–64. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2015.07.012
- Chen, X., Huang, Q., Davison, R. M., & Hua, Z. (2015). What drives trust transfer? The moderating roles of seller-specific and general institutional mechanisms. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 20(2), 261–289. doi:10.1080/10864415.2016.1087828
- Chen, Y., Tingchi Liu, M., Liu, Y., Chang, A. W., & Yen, J. (2022). The influence of trust and relationship commitment to vloggers on viewers' purchase intention. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 34(2), 249–267. doi:10.1108/APJML-08-2020-0626
- Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, M. K. O. (2012). What drives consumers to spread electronic word of mouth in online consumer-opinion platforms. *Decision Support Systems*, 53(1), 218–225. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2012.01.015
- Chin, W. W., & Newsted, P. R. (1999). Structural equation modeling analysis with small samples using partial least squares. *Statistical Strategies for Small Sample Research*, 1(1), 307–341.

- Cho, M., Bonn, M. A., & Li, J. J. (2019). Differences in perceptions about food delivery apps between single-person and multi-person households. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 108–116. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.06.019
- Cui, Y., Mou, J., Cohen, J., Liu, Y., & Kurcz, K. (2020). Understanding consumer intentions toward cross-border m-commerce usage: A psychological distance and commitment-trust perspective. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 39, 100920. doi:10.1016/j.elerap.2019.100920
- Dew, M. A. A., Hidayanto, A. N., Shihab, M. R., & Zhu, Y. Q. (2017). Trust transfer and its effects on the continuance usage of mobile service in B2C e-marketplaces. *Proceedings of the 21st Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems (PACIS)*.
- Elliot, S., Papadopoulos, N., & Kim, S. S. (2011). An integrative model of place image: Exploring relationships between destination, product, and country images. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(5), 520–534. doi:10.1177/0047287510379161
- Evanschitzky, H., Baumgarth, C., Hubbard, R., & Armstrong, J. S. (2007). Replication research's disturbing trend. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(4), 411–415. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.12.003
- Faqih, K. M. (2022). Internet shopping in the Covid-19 era: Investigating the role of perceived risk, anxiety, gender, culture, and trust in the consumers' purchasing behavior from a developing country context. *Technology in Society*, 70, 101992. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101992
- Fathina, A. A., & Rachmawati, I. (2022). The effect of hedonic and utilitarian value on brand trust and brand affect as intervening variable on iPhone. *Res Militaris*, 12(6), 1468–1476.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149 PMID:19897823
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. doi:10.1177/002224378101800104
- Guo, X., Duff, A., & Hair, M. (2010). The antecedents and consequences of commitment in bank-corporate relationships: Evidence from the Chinese banking market. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 16(3), 395–416. doi:10.1080/13602380903080357
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modelling PLS-SEM* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152. doi:10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202
- Hashim, K. F., & Tan, F. B. (2015). The mediating role of trust and commitment on members' continuous knowledge sharing intention: A commitment-trust theory perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(2), 145–151. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.11.001
- Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(1), 2–20. doi:10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. doi:10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8
- Herjanto, H., & Amin, M. (2020). Repurchase intention: The effect of similarity and client knowledge. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 38(6), 1351–1371. doi:10.1108/IJBM-03-2020-0108
- Hong, W., Chan, F. K., Thong, J. Y., Chasalow, L. C., & Dhillon, G. (2014). A framework and guidelines for context-specific theorizing in information systems research. *Information Systems Research*, 25(1), 111–136. doi:10.1287/isre.2013.0501

- Hsu, C. L., & Lin, J. C. C. (2020). Understanding continuance intention to use online to offline (O2O) apps. *Electronic Markets*, 30(4), 883–897. doi:10.1007/s12525-019-00354-x
- Huang, Z., Zhu, Y., Hao, A., & Deng, J. (2022). How social presence influences consumer purchase intention in live video commerce: The mediating role of immersive experience and the moderating role of positive emotions. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 1–17. doi:10.1108/JRIM-01-2022-0009
- Hwang, J., Lee, J. S., & Kim, H. (2019). Perceived innovativeness of drone food delivery services and its impacts on attitude and behavioral intentions: The moderating role of gender and age. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 81, 94–103. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.03.002
- Jaconi, M. (2014). The on-demand economy is revolutionizing consumer behavior – Here’s how. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/the-on-demand-economy-2014-7/?IR=T>
- Jamshidi, D., & Rousta, A. (2021). Brand commitment role in the relationship between brand loyalty and brand satisfaction: Phone industry in Malaysia. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 27(1), 151–176. doi:10.1080/10496491.2020.1809596
- Jones, M. A., Reynolds, K. E., & Arnold, M. J. (2006). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping value: Investigating differential effects on retail outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(9), 974–981. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.03.006
- Kim, B., & Han, I. (2009). What drives the adoption of mobile data services & quest: An approach from a value perspective. *Journal of Information Technology*, 24(1), 35–45. doi:10.1057/jit.2008.28
- Kim, S., & Park, H. (2013). Effects of various characteristics of social commerce (s-commerce) on consumers’ trust and trust performance. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(2), 318–332. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.11.006
- Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 11(4), 1–10. doi:10.4018/ijec.2015100101
- Koroma, J., Rongting, Z., Muhideen, S., Akintunde, T. Y., Amosun, T. S., Dauda, S. J., & Sawaneh, I. A. (2022). Assessing citizens’ behavior towards blockchain cryptocurrency adoption in the Mano River Union States: Mediation, moderation role of trust and ethical issues. *Technology in Society*, 68, 101885. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101885
- Kumar, P., Chauhan, S., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2022). An innovation resistance theory perspective on home service applications: The moderating role of country context. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(6), 2300–2317. doi:10.1111/ijcs.12787
- Kumar, V., & Reinartz, W. (2016). Creating enduring customer value. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 36–68. doi:10.1509/jm.15.0414
- Lavuri, R., Jindal, A., & Akram, U. (2022). How perceived utilitarian and hedonic value influence online impulse shopping in India? Moderating role of perceived trust and perceived risk. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 14(4), 615–634. doi:10.1108/IJQSS-11-2021-0169
- Li, D., Browne, G. J., & Wetherbe, J. C. (2006). Why do internet users stick with a specific web site? A relationship perspective. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 10(4), 105–141. doi:10.2753/JEC1086-4415100404
- Lin, P. C., & Huang, Y. H. (2012). The influence factors on choice behavior regarding green products based on the theory of consumption values. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 22(1), 11–18. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.10.002
- Liu, L., Lee, M. K., Liu, R., & Chen, J. (2018). Trust transfer in social media brand communities: The role of consumer engagement. *International Journal of Information Management*, 41, 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.02.006
- Lu, Y., Yang, S., Chau, P. Y., & Cao, Y. (2011). Dynamics between the trust transfer process and intention to use mobile payment services: A cross-environment perspective. *Information & Management*, 48(8), 393–403. doi:10.1016/j.im.2011.09.006
- Markets and Markets. (2022). *Ride sharing market*. <https://www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/mobility-on-demand-market-198699113.html>

- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. doi:10.2307/258792
- McKnight, D. H., & Chervany, N. L. (2001). What trust means in ecommerce customer relationships: An interdisciplinary conceptual typology. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 6(2), 35–59. doi:10.1080/10864415.2001.11044235
- McKnight, D. H., Choudhary, V., & Kacmar, C. (2002). Developing and validating trust measures for e-commerce: An integrative typology. *Information Systems Research*, 13(3), 334–359. doi:10.1287/isre.13.3.334.81
- Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Cheah, J. H., Thurasamy, R., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2020). Sample size for survey research: Review and recommendations. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 4(2), 1–20. doi:10.47263/JASEM.4(2)01
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20–39. doi:10.1177/002224299405800302
- Mukherjee, A., & Nath, P. (2007). Role of electronic trust in online retailing: A re-examination of the commitment-trust theory. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9/10), 1173–1202. doi:10.1108/03090560710773390
- Nguyen, T. V., Le Ngoc, T. B., & Freeman, N. J. (2006). Trust and uncertainty: A study of bank lending to private SMEs in Vietnam. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 12(4), 547–568. doi:10.1080/13602380600571260
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673–690. doi:10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6
- Ong, M. H. A., & Puteh, F. (2017). Quantitative data analysis: Choosing between SPSS, PLS, and AMOS in social science research. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Scientific Research*, 3(1), 14–25.
- Parasuraman, A., & Grewal, D. (2000). The impact of technology on the quality-value-loyalty chain: A research agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 168–174. doi:10.1177/0092070300281015
- Park, J., Chung, H., & Rutherford, B. (2011). Social perspectives of e-contact center for loyalty building. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(1), 34–38. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.09.017
- Pavlou, P. A. (2003). Consumer acceptance of electronic commerce: Integrating trust and risk with the technology acceptance model. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 7(3), 101–134. doi:10.1080/10864415.2003.11044275
- Pizzutti, C., & Fernandes, D. (2010). Effect of recovery efforts on consumer trust and loyalty in e-tail: A contingency model. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 14(4), 127–160. doi:10.2753/JEC1086-4415140405
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879 PMID:14516251
- PTI. (2021, June 8). *Urban Company to hire over 100 engineers in 2022*. <https://www.livemint.com/companies/news/urban-company-to-hire-over-100-engineers-in-fy2022-11623155034104.html>
- Qureshi, I., Fang, Y., Ramsey, E., McCole, P., Ibbotson, P., & Compeau, D. (2009). Understanding online customer repurchasing intention and the mediating role of trust – An empirical investigation in two developed countries. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 18(3), 205–222. doi:10.1057/ejis.2009.15
- Reimer, T., & Benkenstein, M. (2016). When good WOM hurts and bad WOM gains: The effect of untrustworthy online reviews. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5993–6001. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.05.014
- Renner, M., Lins, S., Söllner, M., Thiebes, S., & Sunyaev, A. (2022). Understanding the necessary conditions of multi-source trust transfer in artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 55th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS2022)* (pp. 1–10). <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/80057>

- Rintamäki, T., Kanto, A., Kuusela, H., & Spence, M. T. (2006). Decomposing the value of department store shopping into utilitarian, hedonic and social dimensions: Evidence from Finland. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 34(1), 6–24. doi:10.1108/09590550610642792
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68 PMID:11392867
- Shin, H., & Perdue, R. R. (2022). Customer nontransactional value cocreation in an online hotel brand community: Driving motivation, engagement behavior, and value beneficiary. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(5), 1088–1104. doi:10.1177/00472875211024752
- Soleimani, M. (2022). Buyers' trust and mistrust in e-commerce platforms: A synthesizing literature review. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, 20(1), 57–78. doi:10.1007/s10257-021-00545-0
- Sollner, M., Hoffmann, A., & Leimeister, J. M. (2016). Why different trust relationships matter for information system users. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 25(3), 274–287. doi:10.1057/ejis.2015.17
- Statista. (2021). *Most popular food delivery applications across India as of August 2021*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1149293/india-popular-food-delivery-apps/>
- Stewart, K. J. (2003). Trust transfer on the world wide web. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 5–17. doi:10.1287/orsc.14.1.5.12810
- Straub, D., Boudreau, M.-C., & Gefen, D. (2004). Validation guidelines for IS positivist research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(1), 24.
- Su, D. N., Nguyen-Phuoc, D. Q., Duong, T. H., Dinh, M. T. T., Luu, T. T., & Johnson, L. (2022). How does quality of mobile food delivery services influence customer loyalty? Gronroos's service quality perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 34(11), 4178–4205. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-08-2021-1039
- Suh, B., & Han, I. (2003). The impact of customer trust and perception of security on the acceptance of electronic commerce. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 7(3), 135–161. doi:10.1080/10864415.2003.11044270
- Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Kaur, P., & Mäntymäki, M. (2020). Why do people purchase from online travel agencies (OTAs)? A consumption values perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 88, 102534. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102534
- Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Scuotto, V., & Kaur, P. (2021). Barriers and paradoxical recommendation behaviour in online to offline (O2O) services. A convergent mixed-method study. *Journal of Business Research*, 131, 25–39. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.03.049
- Tan, F. B., & Sutherland, P. (2004). Online consumer trust: A multidimensional model. *Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations*, 2(3), 40–58. doi:10.4018/jeco.2004070103
- Tariyal, A., Bisht, S., Rana, V., Roy, S., & Pratap, S. (2022). Utilitarian and hedonic values of eWOM media and online booking decisions for tourist destinations in India. *Journal of Open Innovation*, 8(3), 137. doi:10.3390/joitmc8030137
- Technavio. (2019). *Online on-demand home services market worth USD 869.95 billion, at 52% CAGR during 2018-2022*. <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20190627005590/en/Online-On-demand-Home-Services-Market-Worth-USD>
- To, P. L., Liao, C., & Lin, T. H. (2007). Shopping motivations on Internet: A study based on utilitarian and hedonic value. *Technovation*, 27(12), 774–787. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2007.01.001
- Van der Heijden, H. (2004). User acceptance of hedonic information systems. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 28(4), 695–704. doi:10.2307/25148660
- Vayghan, S., Baloglu, D., & Baloglu, S. (2022). The impact of utilitarian, social and hedonic values on hotel booking mobile app engagement and loyalty: A comparison of generational cohorts. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*. 10.1108/JHTI-06-2022-0229



- Venkatesh, V., & Brown, S. A. (2001). A longitudinal investigation of personal computers in homes: Adoption determinants and emerging challenges. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 25(1), 71–102. doi:10.2307/3250959
- Verhoef, P. C. (2003). Understanding the effect of customer relationship management efforts on customer retention and customer share development. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 30–45. doi:10.1509/jmkg.67.4.30.18685
- Vieira, V. A., Rafael, D. N., & Agnihotri, R. (2022). Augmented reality generalizations: A meta-analytical review on consumer-related outcomes and the mediating role of hedonic and utilitarian values. *Journal of Business Research*, 151, 170–184. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.06.030
- VMR. (2021). *Global home services market by deployment, by repairs & maintenance, by home improvement type, by geographic scope and forecast*. <https://www.verifiedmarketresearch.com/product/global-home-service-market-size-and-forecast-to-2025/>
- Wang, W. T., Wang, Y. S., & Liu, E. R. (2016). The stickiness intention of group-buying websites: The integration of the commitment-trust theory and e-commerce success model. *Information & Management*, 53(5), 625–642. doi:10.1016/j.im.2016.01.006
- Wang, X., Wang, Y., Lin, X., & Abdullat, A. (2021). The dual concept of consumer value in social media brand community: A trust transfer perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102319. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102319
- Wei, K., Li, Y., Zha, Y., & Ma, J. (2019). Trust, risk and transaction intention in consumer-to-consumer e-marketplaces: An empirical comparison between buyers' and sellers' perspectives. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 119(2), 331–350. doi:10.1108/IMDS-10-2017-0489
- Wong, K. K. K. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using SmartPLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24(1), 1–32.
- Wu, J., Chen, Y., Pan, H., & Xu, A. (2022). Influence of multi-role interactions in community group-buying on consumers' lock-in purchasing intention from a fixed leader based on role theory and trust transfer theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 903221. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.903221 PMID:35783755
- Wu, L., & Chen, J. L. (2005). An extension of trust and TAM model with TPB in the initial adoption of on-line tax: An empirical study. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 62(6), 784–808. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2005.03.003
- Xiao, L., Mi, C., Zhang, Y., & Ma, J. (2019a). Examining consumers' behavioral intention in O2O commerce from a relational perspective: An exploratory study. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 21(5), 1045–1068. doi:10.1007/s10796-017-9815-6
- Xiao, L., Zhang, Y., & Fu, B. (2019b). Exploring the moderators and causal process of trust transfer in online-to-offline commerce. *Journal of Business Research*, 98, 214–226. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.069
- Xu, C., Peak, D., & Prybutok, V. (2015). A customer value, satisfaction, and loyalty perspective of mobile application recommendations. *Decision Support Systems*, 79, 171–183. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2015.08.008
- Xu, T. (2017). Development analysis of O2O model based on mobile electronic business. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Forum on Decision Sciences*. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2920-2\_43
- Yang, X. (2019). How perceived social distance and trust influence reciprocity expectations and eWOM sharing intention in social commerce? *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 119(4), 867–880. doi:10.1108/IMDS-04-2018-0139
- Yapp, E. H., Balakrishna, C., Yeap, J. A., & Ganesan, Y. (2018). Male and female technology users' acceptance of on-demand services. *Global Business and Management Research*, 10(1), 105–126.
- Yen, Y. R. (2009). An empirical analysis of relationship commitment and trust in virtual programmer community. *International Journal of Computers*, 31(1), 171–180.
- Yoo, J., Choi, S., Choi, M., & Rho, J. (2014). Why people use Twitter: Social conformity and social value perspectives. *Online Information Review*, 38(2), 265–283. doi:10.1108/OIR-11-2012-0210

*Sumedha Chauhan is a professor in the area of Information Systems and Analytics at Jindal Global Business School, O.P. Jindal Global University. Her research interests include e-commerce and online retailing. She has published several research papers in reputed journals such as Journal of Business Research, European Journal of Information Systems, International Journal of Information Management, and Information Systems Frontiers, etc.*

*Yuvraj Gajpal is an Assistant Professor of Supply Chain Management at Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba Winnipeg, Canada. He holds a PhD in Management Science from DeGroot School of Business at McMaster University Hamilton, Canada and Master in Industrial Management from Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Madras, India. Prior to joining University of Manitoba, he worked as an assistant professor at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM), Saudi Arabia. He also taught courses at McMaster University as a sessional lecture. He has worked as a postdoctoral fellow at Interuniversity Research Center on Enterprise Networks, Logistics and Transportation (CIRRELT), University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT) and McMaster University. He is a member of Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences (INFORMS) and Canadian Operational Research Society (CORS). His research interests mainly lie on application of heuristics and meta-heuristics on transportation and logistics management.*

*Bindu Bhardwaj is a practicing chartered accountant. She is PhD from Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology Patiala in the domain of operation management. Her area of research interest is optimization and technology adoption at the level of organisations and individuals.*

*Poonam Kumar is chair Research/MDP & Consultancy, Area Chair Marketing & faculty member in Marketing area at Indian Institute of Management (IIM) Sambalpur. With more than twenty years of experience, Dr. Kumar is a blend of industry, academics, research, training, and consulting with mix experience of working under different Indian and International University systems. Dr. Kumar has served and shouldered many administrative responsibilities like Multiple Chairs, Program Director, Course Leader-MBA, PG & Executive Program etc., at Indian Universities and Under Nottingham Trent University system. Dr. Poonam has been actively involved in training and she has conducted various training programs for middle, senior and top-level executives in Maharatna and Navratna PSUs like NHPC, BHEL, GAIL, IOC etc. Prof Kumar has numerous publications in refereed International and National Journals and in the proceedings of them refereed International and National Conference in her credit. She has also presented research papers in various refereed National & International Conferences. Dr. Poonam has on her credit book on Research Methodology and Brand Management. She has also chaired sessions in many international and national conferences.*

*Sandeep Goyal is a techno-management consultant, researcher, academician and Information Technology practitioner having more than 24 years of experience in the corporate and academia. He did Fellow Programme (EFPM) and PGPM from MDI, Gurgaon besides doing B.E (Computer Science and Engineering) from PEC, Chandigarh. He worked as a Research Scholar with Martin Prosperity Institute (Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto, Canada) during Apr-Jun 2013. He is currently associated with Institute for Competitiveness (India) as a Research Fellow and working with Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology as an Area Chair (Information Systems) and Faculty. Regarding research, he has published more than 30 research papers and teaching cases in the globally recognized international management journals. He published his latest book titled "Towards a Theory of Smart Social Infrastructures at Base of the Pyramid" with Cambridge University Press. The research interests involve themes related to Business Models in Emerging Markets, E-commerce, Social Entrepreneurship, Shared Value, Circular Economy and Sustainable Development. He takes courses in the areas of E-Commerce, Managing Information Systems, Analytics Programming, Business Applications of Cloud Computing, Strategic Management, Managing International Business, Business Models, and Social Entrepreneurship. Regarding consulting work, he has been involved with the corporates and government institutions in diverse assignments related to sustainability, inclusive business models, shared value, and e-governance.*

*Xiankai Yang is a master student in supply chain department at Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba. His research lies on healthcare operations and supply chain management. He has published paper in Computers and Industrial Engineering. He has presented his research work in many reputed national and international conferences such as CORS, ASAC, POMS, IWSPE, DSI and IEOM.*

*Amit Kumar Bhardwaj is having experience of 21 years as an academician, presently he is teaching at L. M. Thapar School of Management (LMTSM), Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Patiala, Punjab, India. He is a doctorate in the field of Information system from Computer Science & Engineering Department, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology. He has done Masters in Software Engineering from Computer Science & Engineering Department, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, India and MBA from Kurukshetra University, India. He had conducted 21 skill development workshops in the domain of Information Technology at the National level to enhance the technology and employability skills of the youth in India.*