

Qualitative research methods

Student name: Nabila Jrida

Student ID : 1704968

DR Allison

Qualitative research methods	1
The perception of ride-sharing in Denmark	3
Full citation:	3
Brief introduction:	3
Research methodology:	4
Data collection methods:	5
Research philosophy:	6
Critical analysis of literature review:	7
conclusion:	9
References:	10
The ambivalence of ride-sharing in London	12
abstract:	12
Introduction:	13
Literature review:	13
Research questions:	15
Research aim:	15
Research philosophy:	16
Research methods:	16
Data collection methods:	17
Description of context and participation:	17
Data collection steps:	17
Data analysis:	18
Preliminary findings:	18
Discussion:	21
Conclusion:	24
Appendix:	25
Interviews questions:	25
Ethic form:	25
References:	40
Reflective writing	44
Introduction:	44
Description:	44
Feelings:	45
Evaluation and Analysis:	46
Conclusion:	46
Action plan:	47
References:	48

The perception of ride-sharing in Denmark

Full citation:

Nielsen, J., Hovmøller, H., Blyth, P. and Sovacool, B. (2015). Of “white crows” and “cash savers:” A qualitative study of travel behaviour and perceptions of ride-sharing in Denmark. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol.78, pp.113-123. Available Online at: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0965856415001196> [Accessed 8 Aug. 2018].

Brief introduction:

In their 2015 research, Nielsen et al aim to investigate the way commuters in Denmark regard ride-sharing that has been put into three categories: ad hoc, acquaintance-based, organisation-based. The authors also in their research explore the factors that drive Danish commuters to both either choose or reject to use the carpooling. The fifty participants were all danish residents which were demographically diverse although this sample of participants did not depict all danish drivers as well as commuters, moreover, the sample conclude danish residents that possess a car and the one who do not.

The researchers also determine market segments and suggest some business models that may help to prevail over current issues facing this industry. The research split the views on ride-sharing into two categories : Positive views discussed by interviewees that conclude saving money comparing to the other means of transport, better flexibility in terms of origins, destinations and schedule, and also the facility of interacting with people whom they share the rides with.

In the other hand, negative views on ride-sharing that were mentioned by the interviewees concluded shortage of rides, fear of ride-sharing as it can be dangerous, anticipation of social discomfort in the company of strangers as they were describes by respondents.

After recognising the different perceptions of ride-sharing mentioned above, The article comes to conclusion that a further research in ride-sharing behaviour is needed and that drivers and commuters seem to be divided on the subject.

The outcome of this research additionally advocate that neither climate change nor environmental sustainability are likely to be of a substance in the ride-sharing industry in Denmark although this latter is well-known for its green initiatives and efforts around the world. Although the authors have some good points, In this paper, the writer will critically review the research methodology employed by Nielson et al (2015) in their study. The writer will investigate the way this methodology was employed, and the likelihood of other method approaches to effectively be working in order to strengthen the findings of this study.

Research methodology:

According to the authors, Using a qualitative research approach through interviews and focus groups, allow interaction and deep investigation of the topic. As far as I am concerned, the qualitative research approach is well suited for this study. in-depth interviews include the asking of open-ended questions and follow-up investigations planned to build a deep comprehension of interviewees' experiences, perceptions, opinions, feelings, and knowledge(Patton, 2002) contrary to quantitative methods, qualitative approach can provide an understanding of the reasons behind people participating in specific actions or behaviours.(Rosenthal, 2016)

The authors qualitatively split the factors that influence the use as well as the no-use of ride-sharing into two categories which are positive and negative views. The subcategories of each element was also qualitatively analysed which make no difference between them in term of the significance of each element separately. The author could have used a mix methods approach in order to quantify the factors based on the importance of each of them. Mixed methods can assist with featuring the similarities and dissimilarities between specific attributes of an experience. (Bernardi, Keim and Von Der Lippe, 2007). Instead the researcher measured the significance of each attribute based on the number of times were mentioned in the interviews.

The findings in this study could be reinforced by a considerably bigger sample of participants in order to provide an undeniable support and proof about what business

strategies or models that are more likely to work in Denmark. A more detailed descriptive research design could also take in consideration to include how many often the participants use ride-sharing per week and when was the last time they used this service in order to split the participants that had a ride-sharing experience into two categories present users and non-practising users.

Data collection methods:

For the purpose of their study, The authors rely on primary data as well as secondary data. The primary data was derived from semi structured interviews as well as five separate focus groups including fifty participants. The interviews and focus group took place in 5 different cities (one of whom is rural) in Denmark. As far as I am concerned, in-depth interviews combined with focus groups are appropriate for qualitatively analysing the views of the participants on ride-sharing. Rakow (2011) states that researchers who use interviews as well as focus groups are taken part in an elaborate and demanding task that can offer further understanding of individuals as well as groups. Therefore, these two combined methods can reply to the research questions asked by Nielson et al (2015).

Nielson et al (2015) employ 50 participants for the interviews as well as focus groups, in my point of view, the findings of the research could be reinforced by a considerably greater sample in order to provide some definite facts about what business strategies are more likely to succeed for each category. the problem is not the number of participants in the research but in the contrary the degree to which access to the cultural theories is obtained to build an understanding of how this cultural group interprets the world. (McCracken, 1988). In other words, what matters is not the numbers of participants rather than the findings the researcher is seeking.

Based on the techniques recommended by Creswell (2008), the authors start the interviews by generally questioning the participants about their age, where they are based, how many often they participate in ride-sharing and which other means of transport they were utilising and their views on them. Notes were taken after each interview were fast coded, However, recording interviews can be

From a personal prescriptive, the authors could also adopt a more sensible sample that include ride-sharing users against non- users in order to deeply investigate the factors that influence each group, the authors could also scrutinise if positive as well as negative views on ride-sharing improve, the participation in ride-sharing will also be affected.

Research philosophy:

For the purpose of their study, Nielson et al adopt an interpretivism research paradigm. As far as I am concerned, the use of the interpretivism paradigm is appropriate for this study. The main notion of interpretivism is to deal with these subjective interpretations already existing in the social world; i.e. to be aware of their circumstances, to restore them, to comprehend them, to evade misrepresent them, to employ them in order to help establish new theories. (Goldkuhl, 2012). Lukka (2014) states that Explaining motivational and causative clarification in details in interpretive study, is likely to provide the evidence established with explicitness and strong points. In other words, interpretivism research paradigm helps to strengthen and make the arguments the researcher introduced through his study explicit. basically, the general drive of the interpretivism research paradigm is to reveal the meaning of individuals' words. (Young, 2009), all the arguments above enhance the choice of the authors, interpretivism research paradigm explain the views on ride-sharing in details while providing the factors developed with clarity and strength. However, Even though the qualitative research is usually coupled with interpretivism, alternatives still exist.

Pragmatic research paradigm can be combined with interpretivism thinking and methods, the fundamental essence of pragmatic knowledge is valuable and productive, while in interpretivism, knowledge is only about comprehending. (Goldkuhl, 2012). From my point of view, Nielson et al only seek to understand the Danes perceptions of ride-sharing as well as the factors behind this phenomenon, Hence, the adoption of interpretive research alone was a sensible choice. A developed research design could also take in consideration if those with ride-sharing experience were current or non-practising ride-sharers.

Critical analysis of literature review:

Giving that ride-sharing is a popular topic in the transportation research journal, the authors Give a brief literature review on ride-sharing and travel behaviour. Throughout this academic literature, Nielson et al (2015) only seek to triangulate data as the researchers are not willing to Be directly associated with any specified theory. However, the brief literature does conclude mainly travel behaviour associated with cars rather than ride-sharing. Although the authors have employed variety of academic journal articles, Half of the literature review focuses in private cars and the positive perception about it. The authors should have given more attention to travel behaviour associated specifically with ride-sharing.

The authors state in that the aim of the study is to investigate the Danes views on ride-sharing, And to reveal the way Danes think about ride-sharing and what factors influence their choices. However, throughout the findings and discussion section, it has been observed that in Denmark, drivers as well as commuters perceive ride-sharing either positively or negatively, people who arbitrate between both radical views still exist although this group has not been included in the study. This shows that a binate approach “for” or “against” ride-sharing may not be effective however a more reasonable, and pragmatic approach may work better.

The Authors could have split the ride sharing into two categories -household and non household, instead of investigating different typologies of carpooling which are acquaintance-based, organisation- based, ad hoc. the most substantial rational behind the unpopularity of ride-sharing are the inconvenience, lack of trust, and incentives. Among these three factors, trust is a major factor that people consider while refusing or accepting a ride.(Vanoutrive et al., 2012). Therefore, as far as I am concerned, non household or ad hoc should be given more attention in the future transportation researches.

In 2017, in Denmark, a share of 40.3% of users is 25-34 years old and 20.4% of them is 35-44 (Statistica,2018), this suggests that the authors could have only focused on the young people perceptions in order to introduce a well studied business strategy to enhance the ride-sharing among young people who are aged between 25-44 and which

are represent the greatest share among ride-sharing users in Denmark. As far as I am concerned, the authors could have compared the findings of the research with people perceptions of ride-sharing in other countries such as united kingdom or united stated, in order to reveal wether the findings of that research can internationally apply.

The authors investigate the perception of ride-sharing as well as the factors that influence Danish drivers and commuters to participate in this kind of trip or not in both urban as well as rural areas.

As far as I am concerned, this study could have focused in rural areas where traditional transport service does not provide as good quality services as urban areas. In rural regions, ride-sharing could also provide people with substitutes for private cars and that will in turn will have a positive affect in environment. Niels and Jørgen (2015) states that a research conducted in two rural regions in Denmark reveal that a significant number of locals are fascinating by the intelligent ride-sharing, although also the awareness of their ride partners as well as scheduling the ride-sharing in advance (2-24 hours before) are of a substance for them. Hence, the authors could have investigated what are the views on ride-sharing in danish rural areas and what are the most important ones so they could have pointed out the model or the business strategy that could enhance the ride-sharing in the rural areas.

As far as I am concerned, the authors could have advocated various marketing as well as business strategies that would suit each segment as the advantages of ride-sharing differ From an individual to another. In my opinion, ensuring those developed business strategies and models could support boosting the environmental initiatives and enhancing the potential of ride-sharing in Denmark.

conclusion:

This paper critically review and analyse the methodology as well as the literature review employed in the journal article of Nielson et al (2015). The reviewed journal article has examined the Danes views on ride-sharing as well as the elements that influence danish people either to take part in ride sharing experience or not. The methods as well as the philosophy was adopted by the authors were appropriate for the topic of ride-sharing as the aim of study was to understand what people think about ride-sharing and what factors influence their choice. The literature review used for Nielson et al (2015) study was critically reviewed in the last section giving some opinions about what the authors could have don to strengthen the study.

References:

Bernardi, L., Keim, S. and Von Der Lippe, H. (2007). Social Influences on Fertility: A Comparative Mixed Methods Study in Eastern and Western Germany. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), pp.23-23.

Lukka, K. (2014). Exploring the possibilities for causal explanation in interpretive research. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, [online] 39(7), pp.559-566. Available at: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0361368214000567>.

Mccracken, G. (1988). *the long interview*. 1st ed. [ebook] Ontario: Sage publications, p.17. Available at: <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=3N01cl2gtoMC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false> [Accessed 29 Aug. 2018].

Niels, A. and Jørgen, M. (2015). Intelligent Carpooling in Rural Areas – Opportunities and Barriers. *national academy of sciences*. [online] Available at: <https://proceedings.itsworldcongress.com/bestpapers> [Accessed 31 Aug. 2018].

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: sage publishing.

Rakow, L. (2011). Commentary: Interviews and Focus Groups as Critical and Cultural Methods. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 88(2), pp.416-428.

Rosenthal, M. (2016). Qualitative research methods: Why, when, and how to conduct interviews and focus groups in pharmacy research. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and*

Learning, [online] 8(4), pp.509-516. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S1877129715301970>.

Statista. (2018). *Ride Sharing - Denmark | Statista Market Forecast*. [online] Available at: <https://www.statista.com/outlook/368/133/ride-sharing/denmark#market-users>

Vanoutrive, T., Van De Vijver, E., Van Malderen, L., Jourquin, B., Thomas, I., Verhetsel, A. and Witlox, F. (2012). What determines carpooling to workplaces in Belgium: location, organisation, or promotion?. *Journal of Transport Geography*, [online] 22, pp.77-86. Available at: https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/S0966692311002055/1-s2.0-S0966692311002055-main.pdf?_tid=3164c0c5-0e52-4f8b-9686-7171e12a9584&acdnat=1534713348_7df6ce8b21abdd5b2c5edd9ffc8927d3

Young, D. (2009). Interpretivism and Education Law Research: A Natural Fit. *Education Law Journal*, [online] 18(3), p.203. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/212959444?accountid=130472> [Accessed 30 Aug. 2018].

The ambivalence of ride-sharing in London

abstract:

Based on data gathered through in depth interviews that took place in London, this research investigates Londoners views on ride-sharing. Adopting a qualitative research method, this study explores the factors that influence London commuters to participate in ride-sharing or not.

The research findings have revealed London both male and female commuters seem to be divided regarding this phenomenon. Views on ride-sharing were split into categories: positive perceptions which conclude cost savings (comparing to public transport) ,Speed, comfort, socialisation. And negative perceptions which mostly were reported by female participants conclude lack of availability of rides in some parts of London, safety and social awkwardness towards strangers.

The research also reveals that environmental initiatives were of no importance in influencing the adoption of ride-sharing in London.

Introduction:

The advanced technology of GPS with smart phones associated with Current developments in information and communication technology have currently enabled the appearance and rapid increase of newly discovered types of business models based on sharing.

Ride-sharing becomes one of those business models that have changed urban mobility by introducing a new timely and costly convenient mean of transportation anywhere, anytime and for everybody. Paid ride-sharing applications like Uber and Lyft have seen a fast expansion as this kind of systems generate opportunities in order to benefit from the unoccupied space in travelling vehicles.

A national travel survey stated that 61% of UK trips and 78% of miles per person were by car either as a driver or passenger.(Corvaglia et al., 2017). That might explain the ease that has been given by those services to commuters in order to choose between being a driver or a passenger.

Unlike the conventional carpool services, the new form of ride-sharing enables travellers as well as drivers to be paired in real time rather than a scheduled way.(Ma and Zhang, 2017). The subject of this paper is ride-sharing, and the ambivalence associated with it.

Literature review:

It is beneficial to examine the academic literature on ride-sharing and travel behaviour in order to investigate the findings of this research. For the purposes of this research, the word ride-sharing have the same meaning as carpooling. Basically, those two words can be described as the usage of a private, individually possessed vehicle to give ride to various travellers. (Amey, 2010).

Posen (2015) describes Ride-sharing as the connecting and concurrent trip where a minimum of one driver and one rider share a vehicle with allocated individuals with an alike travel plan. Another definition of ride-sharing by Morency (2007) who states that

ride-sharing occurs when two or more trips are carried out in the same vehicle in the same time, its principal expected effect is to rise car occupancy which will lead to a decrease in the amount of cars in urban areas. Similarly, carpooling was defined as a settlement where two or more people, living in a different household, share a single vehicle in order to decrease the amount of Single Occupancy Vehicle needed per trip. (Neoh, Chipulu and Marshall, 2017).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher prefer to use the term ride-sharing as it emphasis the formation of sharing and it is also more popular in the UK. Ride-sharing is in all respects a common subject of debate in the tick of transport authority workers . It is considered as a practical alternative to traditional means of transport, It has been also encouraged by transit suppliers and transport planners. (Morency, 2007). Ride-sharing has a substantial ability to enhance carpooling and decrease the traffic problems in urban roads, and that will only happen if the commuters feel at ease among the people they are sharing the ride with and do not feel the risk that can be associated with the adoption of ride-sharing(Zhou et al., 2017)

Ride-sharing is perceived as a crucial way to lessen congestion, fuel costs and to encourage the green actions which focus on ameliorating the environment.(Hosni, Naoum-Sawaya and Artail, 2014). However, in spite of the environmental and economic advantages, the adoption of ride-sharing still represents a small quantity (Amey, 2010). Ride-sharing can be negatively perceived when the government provide an excellent public transport as traffic and parking shortage can restrict car travelling back and forth to city centres.(Vanoutrive et al., 2012)

Some research has stated that there are a minimum of three characteristics that will have an affect on a person's views on ride-sharing. And those characteristics are price and convenience- decreasing transportation fees and the waiting time to get a ride are one of the direct advantages of ride-sharing (Santos and Xavier, 2015), safety - Privacy and safety problems is another characteristic of ride-sharing therefore restrict the potential of the latter, even-though a few users appreciates the sociable side that ride-sharing can provide. Ride-sharing can be negatively perceived when the government provide an excellent public transport as traffic and parking shortage can restrict car travelling back and forth to city centres.(Vanoutrive et al., 2012). Nielson et al (2015) states that apart from price, convenience and safety there are other factors that influence the use as well as the no use for ride-sharing like comfort and social attributes.

Amey (2010) has given three attributes of ride-sharing which enables the classification of mostly all the modes of transport than can be shared. Those attributes are:

- Absence of profit stimulus
- The journey is controlled by the driver's needs
- Smaller automobile capacities.

Mobility systems established by companies like Uber and Lyft are in a position to supply well grounded mean of transportation to individuals who utilise those applications. This mode of transport enhances entrance to mobility to people who are unqualified to drive a private automobile, decreasing the waiting time and strain resulted from travel. (Alonso-Mora et al., 2017)

Travel time savings are generally the most important single element of the monetised advantages of transport infrastructure activities and strategies. Moreover, time-related advantages like reliability and mitigation of overcrowding on public transport are traditionally highly regarded to be enhancing the 'value of time'. (Batley et al., 2017).

Privacy and safety problems is another characteristic of ride-sharing therefore restrict the potential of the latter, even-though a few users appreciates the sociable side that ride-sharing can provide.

Research questions:

- What do London commuters think about ride-sharing?
- What are the key factors influencing Londoners decision to be a part of a ride-sharing trip?

Research aim:

The aim of this study is to investigate travel behaviour and how people perceive the ride-sharing in the UK. The researcher through this study will have an understanding of the main factors that affect the British commuters decision to participate in a ride-sharing trip in order to provide some policy recommendations that can be followed to boost ride-sharing participation.

Research philosophy:

The interpretive paradigm consist of comprehending the subjective meanings of people in research fields. The main notion of interpretivism is to deal with these subjective interpretations already existing in the social world; i.e. to be aware of their circumstances, to restore them, to comprehend them, to evade misrepresent them, to employ them in order to help establish new theories. (Goldkuhl, 2012). Interpretivism is based on a life-world ontology that argues all observation is both theory- and value-laden and investigation of the social world is not, and cannot be, the pursuit of a detached objective truth (Leitch, Hill, & Harrison, 2010)

Therefore, the interpretive research paradigm will be used in this study because it is characterised by a need to understand How Londoners perceive the ride-sharing as it is from a subjective point of view and seeks an explanation within the frame of reference of the participants rather than the objective observer of the action.

Research methods:

For the purposes of this study, qualitative research methods will be adopted. Saldana (2011) stated that qualitative research is a general word for an extensive sorts of procedure and techniques that are adopted for natural social studies where the collection of data and analysis of findings are quality based rather than quantity.

Furthermore, Qualitative research methods are employed in case the purpose of the study is a good comprehension of a specific subject from the participants points of view to develop a research in order to employ a bigger sample. (Rosenthal, 2016). By way of explanation, qualitative research is a method that can be used in order to interpret the way people thing about a specific topic.

This paper will adopt a qualitative research method in order to explore How Londoners perceive ride-sharing and to gain an understanding of underlying motivations and reasons behind what factors influence their decisions of London commuters to be a part of a ride-sharing trip. Based on qualitative research, the researcher will raise a knowledge of how London commuters perceive ride-sharing and explain the positive as well as negative attributes of this phenomenon.

Data collection methods:

In order to gather data in a qualitative study, a variety of methodologies such as observations, in-depth interviews, and focus groups that can be employed.(Rosenthal, 2016). This study will be employing primary as well as secondary data. The Primary data will be based on in depth interviews that will include open ended questions in a semi structured form.

in-depth interviews include the asking of open-ended questions and follow-up investigations planned to build a deep comprehension of interviewees' experiences, perceptions, opinions, feelings, and knowledge(Patton, 2002)

Description of context and participation:

For the purpose of this study, the interview conducted include asking open ended questions focusing in gaining insight into perceptions towards ride-sharing in London as well as the factors that influence either its adoption or no-adoption. We carried out six semi structured interviews with postgraduate students who live in different parts of London (none of them own a car). The participants do not represent all commuters in London.

The postgraduate students that participate in this study were all from University of Wales Trinity saint David. Besides being students, the participants were part-time employees, aged between 26

And 32 years old, with different nationalities but all living in different part of London.

Data collection steps:

The study in hands has been based on primary as well as secondary data through articles and works that have been done in the same area of the study conducted. Semi structured interviews was chosen as a primary research methods. The interviews have been mainly conducted through face to face meetings. Every meeting took around 10 to 20 minutes and was recorded, however, due to the Author's Guide to Institutional Review Board, we submit the outcomes of the

interviews anonymously. Due to the timeframe as well as word limit of this study, a sample of six people has been employed.

According Qu and Dumay (2011), There is no single correct method of interviewing, no design is relevant for all interviews, and no one method of wording questions that will permanently succeed. Thus, no guidelines of the process of interviews was adopted.

While carrying out the interviews, the interviewer allow the participant to take sufficient time to reply to the questions and provide their views on the phenomenon. The interviewer also observed the way interviewees respond to some questions and their attitudes while answering the questions as it is interpretative for the researcher to read between the lines and beware of concealed words or ambivalence.(Qu and Dumay, 2011)

Data analysis:

For the purpose of this study, the data has been collected through face to face interviews. The semi structured interviews was conducted on six participants over a period of fifteen days. All the interviews were recorded after obtaining the participants permission. After finishing all the interviews, the data analysis was divided into three steps. The first step started by listening carefully to each response for each question in the interviews. The following step started by taking notes carefully of each reply to each question in the interviews and making some comments. The third step was based on dividing the responses to two elements: the positive views on ride-sharing and the negative views on ride-sharing. Then the researcher started to scrutinise the characteristics that influence the decision of both adoption or no adoption of ride-sharing in this section in order to address the research questions mentioned above.

The researcher critically examined the findings of the study in hand through comparing and contrasting them with the secondary data in order to gain a good comprehension of London commuters perception of ride-sharing.

Preliminary findings:

The findings of this study was divided into two sections. Table 1: the researcher included the most important characteristics of ride-sharing that influence the decision of its

adoption, the researcher also gave a brief description of each element and illustrated this later With a response of one of London commuters. In the other hand, Table 2 represented the characteristics that influence the no adoption of ride-sharing.

Table 1:

Category	Description	Example from participants
Cost saving	Ride-sharing is much cheaper than other modes of transport.	ride-sharing is one of the cheaper and convenient way to get home after a long night out.
Speed	Comparing to other modes of public transport, it has fewer stops.	When I am late, I just order an Uber pool. It is the quickest and cheapest way to get to where you want in London.
Comfort	More comfortable than the public transport	As you know, weather is not guaranteed in this country, I find ride-sharing very comfortable and especially when it rains. I hate it when my hair is ruined.
Socialisation	Ride-sharing provide users with the opportunity to socialise with new people	Thanks to ride-sharing for setting me up with my girlfriend :-)

Table 2

Category	Description	Example from participants
Availability	Ride-sharing is not much available in some parts of London in real time.	Where I live, It is very hard to find a ride-sharing in real time, Hence, I prefer to use the overground at least you can always check the schedule.

Safety	Rides sharing is about trust the driver as well as the persons whom you are commuting with.	As a girl, I can not trust being with a stranger in the same vehicle, that can be very risky. That's why I prefer to order an Uber X as it is much safer
Social Awkwardness	Ride-sharing is about being with a stranger in the same car.	Having to talk with a stranger all the way would be a little bit exhausting, I prefer to make the most of that time replying to my emails.

Discussion:

Through the qualitative research in hand, the researcher examine the London commuters perception of ride-sharing, under this heading, the researcher will critically analyse the findings in line with previous studies that have been conducted in the same area.

Question 1: What do London commuters think about ride-sharing?

The findings of the study in hand reveal that the participants have a good understanding of ride-sharing. 66% of the participants aged between (26-32) use ride-sharing at least once a week. In line with a research conducted by Statistica (2018), a portion of 55.7% of people who use ride-sharing in the UK are aged between 25-34 years old.

In contrast with Hosni, Naoum-Sawaya and Artail (2014) that stated that Ride-sharing is perceived as a crucial way to lessen congestion, fuel costs and to encourage the green actions which focus on ameliorating the environment. Our findings shows that none of the participants perceive ride-sharing as a way to support environmental initiatives or to minimise overcrowding. These findings goes in line with Nielson et al (2015) who states that it looks like none of the respondents think that their personal transportation adoption can have a big influence on environmental matters.

Following the literature review of this study that we found to be partially right, Our findings follow the line developed by Nielson et al (2015), who states that there are more factors than price, safety and convenience that influence people decisions to be part in the rides haring or not.

Question 2: What are the key factors influencing Londoners decision to be a part of a ride-sharing trip?

The findings of this study in hands shows that 66% of the participants have positive views on ride-sharing while only 33% of the participants have negative views towards this phenomenon. This section will be discussed through two parts: positive and negative views on ride-sharing.

Positive views on ride-sharing:

Unsurprisingly and given the age range of the sample, 66% of the participants had a strong positive perception towards ride-sharing. Two reasons came up almost equally on the top of the replies given by the participants were the cost saving as well as speed.

The factors of price and speed, and the discussion that the ride-sharing can be cheaper still be cheaper than public transport and in the same time faster as it concludes fewer stops comparing to other means of public transport. As one interviewee illustrated this by saying: “ comparing to public transport, It is the cheapest and fastest way to get where you want if you are really in hurry”. Regarding this two factors, (Nielson et al, 2015) study demonstrates that price was number one on the list of factors that influence the use of ride-sharing while speed was classified the fourth after flexibility and comfort which might explain that the discounts that students get for their public transport use in London make them only pick the ride-sharing option if the speed factor is found necessary.

In line with Nielson et al (2015), our findings also states that comfort was an important factor than influence London commuters decision to be part in the ride-sharing. Weather and public transport overcrowding was mentioned various times by the participants. For the quote (see table 1 above) and this factor was followed by socialisation, some of the participants were happy to meet new people in their trips while the other were neutral about it, one of the participants said: “ Honestly, it depends, sometimes after a great night out, I would be really happy to talk to somebody on my way home, but sometimes, when I am on my way back from my part time job I just wanna sit and relax”

Negative views on ride-sharing:

One of the vital obstacles was availability, ride-sharing is not real time available in some parts of London. Participants said that they need to schedule their trips much in advance when they are based in the outskirts of London, one participant said:” where I live, it is very hard to find a ride-sharing in a real time, hence, I prefer use the overground at least you can check the schedule”. Nielson et al (2015) study states in term of flexibility and as well as availability, ride-sharing provides its users on popular routes better services than less popular ones.

Safety was another barrier to ride-sharing, all the participants that included safety in their interviews were female. one participant said:”in a city like London, ride-sharing can be very risky.” The last factor that deprive the participants of using the ride-sharing was the social awkwardness that they can feel while being with stranger in the same car. only one of the respondents mentioned that in the interview (see table 2). Which make it the least influenceable factor.

Conclusion:

Stastica (2018) reports that 14.5% of people in the UK participate in ride-sharing and it is expected to rise to 18% which is 12.2m users by 2022. Hence, In order to support and incentivise ride-sharing adoption, researchers and practitioners in the transportation field need to comprehend what drive people to adopt the ride-sharing and what also discourage them from it.

Besides the fact that the sample can not represent all commuters in London as the number of people interviewed was small, due to timeframe as well as word limit, Future work could adopt a larger sample in order to strengthen the findings.

Only 33% of the respondents reported that they have never been a part of a ride-sharing experience and that they found it undependable, risky and socially awkward. While, the others have positive views on ride-sharing like cost savings, speed, comfort and socialising.

The factor of environment and climate change was not mentioned in the interviews, which might explain that the financial and social factors are the most substantial.

Appendix:

Interviews questions:

1. Do you drive in London? Why?
2. What do you think about the public transport in London?
3. What do you think about Ride-sharing? Is there anything that can be changed or improved to get better ride-sharing experience?
4. What do you think about sharing a car with a stranger?

Ethic form:

APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL

In order for research to result in benefit and minimise risk of harm, it must be conducted ethically. A researcher may not be covered by the University's insurance if ethical approval has not been obtained prior to commencement.

The University follows the OECD Frascati manual definition of **research activity**: “creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications”. As such this covers activities undertaken by members of staff, postgraduate research students, and both taught postgraduate and undergraduate students working on dissertations/projects.

The individual undertaking the research activity is known as the “principal researcher”.

Ethical approval is not required for routine audits, performance reviews, quality assurance studies, testing within normal educational requirements, and literary or artistic criticism.

Please read the notes for guidance before completing ALL sections of the form.

This form must be completed and approved prior to undertaking any research activity. Please see Checklist for details of process for different categories of application.

SECTION A: About You (Principal Researcher)

Full Name:	Nabila jrida		
Tick all boxes which apply:			
Member of staff:	☐	Student:	☐
Honorary research fellow:	☐		

Faculty/School/Centre:	University of Wales Trinity Saint David
Campus:	London
E-mail address:	jridanabila@gmail.com
Contact Telephone Number:	7500700006

For students:

Student Number:	1704968	Undergraduate	☐
Programme of Study:	DBA	Taught Postgraduate	☐
Director of Studies/Supervisor:	Dr Allison Wylde	Research	☐

SECTION B: Approval for Research Activity

Has the research activity received approval in principle? (please check the Guidance Notes as to the appropriate approval process for different levels of research by different categories of individual)	YES	☒	NO	☐
				Date
If Yes, please indicate source of approval (and date where known):	Research Degrees Committee	☐		
	Faculty Research Committee	☐		
	Dr Allison Wylde	☐		

Approval in principle **must** be obtained from the relevant source prior to seeking ethical approval.

SECTION C: External Ethical Guidance Materials

Please list the core ethical guidance documents that have been referred to during the completion of this form (including any discipline-specific codes of research ethics, and also any specific ethical guidance relating to the proposed methodology). Please tick to confirm that your research proposal adheres to these codes and guidelines.	
	☐
	☐
	☐

SECTION D: External Collaborative Research Activity

Does the research activity involve collaborators outside of the University?	YES	☐	NO	☒
If Yes, please provide the name of the external organisation and name and contact details for the main contact person:				

Institution	
Contact person name	
Contact person e-mail address	

Where research activity is carried out in collaboration with an external organisation

Does this organisation have its own ethics approval system?	YES	☐	NO	
If Yes, please attach a copy of any final approval (or interim approval) from the organisation				

SECTION E: Details of Research Activity

Indicative title:	the ambivalence of ride-sharing in London		
Proposed start date:	1-8-2018	Proposed end date:	4-9-2018
Purpose of research activity (including aims and objectives) Outline the purpose, aims and objectives of the research activity, including key research questions. Show briefly how existing research has informed the proposed activity and explain what the research activity will add and how it addresses an area of importance. (Maximum 300 words) The aim of the study is to investigate travel behaviour and how people perceive the ride-sharing in the UK. The researcher through this study will have an understanding of the main factors that affect the British commuters decision to participate in a ride-sharing trip in order to provide some policy recommendations that can be followed to boost ride-sharing participation.			
Proposed methods Provide a brief summary of all the methods that may be used in the research activity, making it clear what specific techniques may be used. If methods other than those listed in this section are deemed appropriate later, additional ethical approval for those methods will be needed. (Maximum 600 words) This paper will adopt a qualitative research method in order to explore How Londoners perceive ride-sharing and to gain an understanding of underlying motivations and reasons behind what factors influence their decisions of London commuters to be a part of a ride-sharing trip. Based on qualitative research, the researcher will raise a knowledge of how London commuters perceive ride-sharing and explain the positive as well as negative attributes of this phenomenon. the interpretive research paradigm will be used in this study because it is characterised by a need to understand How Londoners perceive the ride-sharing as it is from a subjective point of view and seeks an explanation within the frame of reference of the participants rather than the objective observer of the action.			

Location of research activity Identify all locations where research activity will take place.
University of Wales Trinity Saint David
Research activity outside of the UK If research activity will take place overseas, you are responsible for ensuring that local ethical considerations are complied with and that the relevant permissions are sought. Specify any local guidelines (e.g. from local professional associations/learned societies/universities) that exist and whether these involve any ethical stipulations beyond those usual in the UK (provide details of any licenses or permissions required). Also specify whether there are any specific ethical issues raised by the local context in which the research activity is taking place, for example, particular cultural sensitivities or vulnerabilities of participants.
(this box should expand as you type)

SECTION F: Scope of Research Activity

Will the research activity include:	YES	NO
Use of a questionnaire or similar research instrument?	☐	
Use of interviews?		☐
Use of diaries?	☐	
Participant observation with their knowledge?		☐
Participant observation without their knowledge?	☐	
Use of video or audio recording?		☐
Access to personal or confidential information without the participants' specific consent?	☐	
Administration of any questions, test stimuli, presentation that may be experienced as physically, mentally or emotionally harmful / offensive?	☐	
Performance of any acts which may cause embarrassment or affect self-esteem?	☐	
Investigation of participants involved in illegal activities?	☐	
Use of procedures that involve deception?	☐	
Administration of any substance, agent or placebo?	☐	
Working with live vertebrate animals?	☐	
Other primary data collection methods, please explain in this box	☐	

If NO to every question, then the research activity is (ethically) low risk and **may** be exempt from **some** of the following sections (please refer to Guidance Notes).

If YES to any question, then no research activity should be undertaken until full ethical approval has been obtained.

SECTION G: Intended Participants

Who are the intended participants:	YES	NO
Students or staff at the University?		☐
Adults (over the age of 18 and competent to give consent)?		☐
Vulnerable adults?	☐	
Children under 18?	☐	
Prisoners?	☐	
Young offenders?	☐	
Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the investigator or a gatekeeper?	☐	
People engaged in illegal activities?	☐	
Others (please identify):	☐	☐

Participant numbers and source

Provide an estimate of the expected number of participants. How will you identify participants and how will they be recruited?

6 participants: postgraduate students

Information for participants:	YES	NO	N/A
Will you describe the main research procedures to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?		☐	☐
Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?		☐	☐
Will you obtain written consent for participation?	☐		☐
Will you explain to participants that refusal to participate in the research will not affect their treatment or education (if relevant)?		☐	☐
If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their consent to being observed?		☐	☐
Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?	☐		☐
With questionnaires, will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?		☐	☐
Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?		☐	☐
Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation, in a way appropriate to the type of research undertaken?		☐	☐
If NO to any of above questions, please give an explanation			

(this box should expand as you type)

Information for participants:	YES	NO	N/A
Will participants be paid?	☐		☐
Is specialist electrical or other equipment to be used with participants?	☐		☐
Are there any financial or other interests to the investigator or University arising from this study?	☐		☐
Will the research activity involve deliberately misleading participants in any way, or the partial or full concealment of the specific study aims?	☐		☐
If YES to any question, please provide full details			
(this box should expand as you type)			

SECTION H: Anticipated Risks

Outline any anticipated risks that may adversely affect any of the participants, the researchers and/or the University, and the steps that will be taken to address them. If you have completed a full risk assessment (for example as required by a laboratory, or external research collaborator) you may append that to this form.			
Full risk assessment completed and appended? Yes ☐ No ☐			
Risks to participants For example: emotional distress, financial disclosure, physical harm, transfer of personal data, sensitive organisational information			
None			
If research activity may include sensitive, embarrassing or upsetting topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use) or issues likely to disclose information requiring further action (e.g. criminal activity), give details of the procedures to deal with these issues, including any support/advice (e.g. helpline numbers) to be offered to participants. Note that where applicable, consent procedures should make it clear that if something potentially or actually illegal is discovered in the course of a project, it may need to be disclosed to the proper authorities			
None			
Risks to investigator For example: personal safety, physical harm, emotional distress, risk of accusation of harm/impropriety, conflict of interest			
None			
University/institutional risks For example: adverse publicity, financial loss, data protection			
None			
Adverse outcomes List measures put in place to limit any adverse effects or outcomes of research activity where appropriate. Include any emergency protocols.			
None			

Disclosure and Barring Service			
If the research activity involves children or vulnerable adults, a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate must be obtained before any contact with such participants.			
	YES	NO	N/A
Has a DBS certificate been obtained?	☐	☐	☐

SECTION I: Feedback, Consent and Confidentiality

Feedback

What feedback will be provided to participants, how will this be done and when?

(this box should expand as you type)

Informed consent

Describe the arrangements to inform potential participants, before providing consent, of what is involved in participating. Describe the arrangements for participants to provide full consent before data collection begins. If gaining consent in this way is inappropriate, explain how consent will be obtained and recorded.

(this box should expand as you type)

Confidentiality / Anonymity

Set out how anonymity of participants and confidentiality will be ensured in any outputs. If anonymity is not being offered, explain why this is the case.

(this box should expand as you type)

SECTION J: Data Protection and Storage

In completing this section refer to the University's Research Data Management Policy and the extensive resources on the University's Research Data Management web pages (<http://uwttsd.ac.uk/library/research-data-management/>).

	YES	NO
Does the research activity involve personal data (as defined by the Data Protection Act)? "personal data" means data which relate to a living individual who can be identified— (a) from those data, or (b) from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller, and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any other person in respect of the individual.		☐
If YES, provide a description of the data and explain why this data needs to be collected: in order to investigate the perception of ride-sharing.		
Does it involve sensitive personal data (as defined by the Data Protection Act)? "Sensitive personal data" means personal data consisting of information as to – (a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject, (b) his political opinions, (c) his religious beliefs or other beliefs of a similar nature, (d) whether he is a member of a trade union (within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992), (e) his physical or mental health or condition, (f) his sexual life, (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence, or (h) any proceedings for any offence committed or alleged to have been committed by him, the disposal of such proceedings or the sentence of any court in such proceedings.	☐	
If YES, provide a description of the data and explain why this data needs to be collected: (this box should expand as you type)		
Will the research activity involve storing personal data on one of the following:	YES	NO
Manual files (i.e. in paper form)?	☐	☐
University computers?	☐	☐
Private company computers?	☐	☐
Home or other personal computers?	☐	☐
Laptop computers/ CDs/ Portable disk-drives/ memory sticks?	☐	☐
"Cloud" storage or websites?		☐
Other – specify:	☐	☐
For all stored data, explain the measures in place to ensure data confidentiality, including details of password protection, encryption and anonymisation:		

(this box should expand as you type)		
Will the research activity involve any of the following activities:	YES	NO
Electronic transfer of data in any form?	☐	
Sharing of data with others at the University?	☐	
Sharing of data with other organisations?	☐	
Export of data outside the European Union or importing of data from outside the UK?	☐	
Use of personal addresses, postcodes, faxes, emails or telephone numbers?	☐	
Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals?	☐	
Use of data management system?	☐	
Data archiving?	☐	
If YES to any question, please provide full details, explaining how this will be conducted in accordance with the Data Protection Act (and/or any international equivalent):		
(this box should expand as you type)		

List all who will have access to the data generated by the research activity:
Only me
List who will have control of, and act as custodian(s) for, data generated by the research activity:
Only me
Give details of data storage arrangements, including where data will be stored, how long for, and in what form. Will data be archived – if so how and if not why not.
Data will be stored in my personal laptop for till I generate findings and then it will be erased from the device

SECTION K: Declaration

The information which I have provided is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge. I have attempted to identify any risks and issues related to the research activity and acknowledge my obligations and the rights of the participants.

In submitting this application I hereby confirm that I undertake to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's [Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice](#)

Signature of applicant: Nab	Date: 3-9-2018
------------------------------------	-----------------------

For students:

Director of Studies/Supervisor:	Dr Allison Wylde
Signature:	
Date:	

For staff:

Head of School/Assistant Dean:	
Signature:	
Date:	

Checklist: Please complete the checklist below to ensure that you have completed the form according to the guidelines and attached any required documentation:

☐	I have read the guidance notes supplied before completing the form.
☐	I have completed ALL RELEVANT sections of the form in full.
☐	I confirm that the research activity has received approval in principle
☐	I have attached a copy of final/interim approval from external organisation (where appropriate)
☐	I have attached a full risk assessment (and have NOT completed Section H of this form) (where appropriate)
☐	I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice.
☐	I understand that before commencing data collection all documents aimed at respondents (including information sheets, consent forms, questionnaires, interview schedules etc.) must be confirmed by the DoS/Supervisor, module tutor or Head of School.

RESEARCH STUDENTS AND STAFF ONLY

All communications relating to this application during its processing must be in writing and emailed to pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk, with the title 'Ethical Approval' followed by your name. You will be informed of the outcome of your claim by email; therefore it is important that you check your University and personal email accounts regularly.

STUDENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE OR TAUGHT MASTERS PROGRAMMES should submit this form (and receive the outcome) via systems explained to you by the supervisor/module leader.

This form is available electronically from the Academic Office web pages: <http://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/academic-office/>

Application Process

All staff research projects and all research students must submit the Ethical Approval Form to the **University Ethics Committee** via the Academic Office (pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk). Staff research directly in relation to personal study for taught undergraduate or Masters programmes should be submitted via the Faculty procedures explained below.

Taught masters and taught undergraduate research Ethical Approval Forms are considered **within Faculties**. Faculties will provide details of the specific processes for this. Where the Ethical issues within any single ethical application are of particular concern the Faculty will refer these to the University Ethics Committee. Any student activity that involves the collection of primary data needs to undergo Ethical approval, this includes assignment work as well as dissertations.

Notes for guidance in completion of this form

Section A: About You

Please complete all relevant sections

Section B: Approval for research activity

Research proposals must be approved in principle before applying for Ethical Approval. The proposal approval only becomes final when the ethical approval is received.

The process for proposal approval varies according to the individual and programme of study:

- Research students, by application on form PG1 to the Research Degrees Committee
- Taught students by review of research proposal within Faculties (Faculties provide specific details of these processes)
- Staff, by agreement by the Head of School/Assistant Dean

Section C: External Ethical Guidance materials

Many discipline areas are required to operate with the discipline specific codes of research ethics (for example health, psychology, education etc.), any such codes must be listed and you must tick to confirm that you have consulted with these.

Section D: External Collaborative Research Activity

Provide details of the external collaborative partners, where appropriate you might want to submit a copy of the external collaboration agreement with the Ethical Approval Form. If the partner requires the research to be subject to its own internal Ethical approval process then please provide details of that process and a copy of any final (or interim) approvals received from the organisation.

Section E: Details of Research Activity

Remember that the individuals reviewing this Ethical Approval Form may not have seen your research proposal, and also may not be experts in the specific area of your research. The information provided should therefore be jargon free and clearly stated.

Indicative Title: please use the same title as used on the research proposal.

Purpose: the Ethical approval process will want to ensure that the methods you propose are adequate and appropriate to address the research aims and objectives. Excessive additional data collection can be seen as unethical.

Proposed Methods: the Ethical approval process seeks to ensure that you understand the methods that are intended, and that the implementation of those methods will be appropriate and without unnecessary impact on respondents. Please be specific.

Location: this needs to mention geographical location and also local situation (for example, within Local Authority Offices in Cardiff, using a private room but close to other individuals). If you are collecting data within an organisational setting then you need to explain the permissions that you have obtained to do this.

Research Activity outside of the UK: please complete this section in detail, and note any guidance you have received. Also describe your own familiarity (or not) with the location that you will be utilising.

Section F: Scope of Research Activity

Please tick ALL of the research activities that might be undertaken. If any additional types of activity are intended then please add an extra box and describe these.

If you have answered no to all questions in F then sections G and J do not need to be completed. Section H should be considered, and may be completed. Signatures are still required in section K.

Section G: Intended Participants

Please tick all categories that might apply.

Numbers & Source: if you are using a series of different methods or research activities please list numbers for each stage/phase. Be clear about how you will find respondents. Will you use intermediaries, and if so how? How will you ensure compliance with your sampling strategy?

Information for participants: all participants should be appropriately informed about the research, what is expected of them and what will happen to the information that they provide. The Ethical review process does not ask to see this documentation, but requires this to be reviewed and approved by the Director of Studies in the case of research students, the supervisor/module tutor in relation to students on taught programmes and the Head of School/Assistant Dean in relation to staff research.

Section H: Anticipate Risks

All research carries some level of risk. The answers you provide to questions in this section will be reviewed to ensure that you have an appropriate understanding of the type of risks involved and how you can mitigate against these risks. If you have completed a full risk assessment, as required for example for laboratory work, field work, clinical tests, diving operations, or by a collaborative partner, you may append that to this form. In that case, please tick the box indicating this has been provided. You will not then be required to complete Section H.

Risk to participants Think very carefully about how your actions/questions/discussions might affect the people you are involving as participants. You might identify the risk as small but it would still be a risk. Many types of question have the potential to make respondents less content with their life / job; you need to recognise and try to ameliorate any such effects

If these are business owners, time with you may reduce profit.

In some locations physical risk is very real to both participants and yourself, please consider this.

Risk to you, the researcher Think about where you will meet people, if there are any dangers involved in the location. If you are meeting people as individuals think about using a public place. In general do not visit people in their own homes or remote locations. If you are talking to individuals about certain issues think about how their responses might affect you emotionally. What about the risk of collecting insufficient data?

Risk to the University When undertaking your research, you are acting as a member of the University (student or staff). Professionalism is important, so it is important to be well organised and well prepared. Punctuality, clarity etc. are all part of this. What will you do to ensure this? You must ensure you do not harm the good name of the University in any way and do nothing to undermine the reputation of the research it conducts and sponsors. Upholding high standards of conduct and integrity are vital in this regard. You must also conduct the research in such a way to minimise the potential for claims of negligence made against the University, its researchers and any collaborating individual or organisation. In this respect you should always comply with ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards as required by statutory and regulatory authorities, as well as the university's Research Integrity and Ethics Code of Practice. Research misconduct in this respect can take many forms, including:

- fabrication: making up results or other outputs (eg, artefacts) and presenting them as if they were real
- falsification: manipulating research processes or changing or omitting data without good cause
- plagiarism: using other people's material without giving proper credit
- failure to meet ethical, legal and professional obligations: for example failure to declare competing interests; misrepresentation of involvement or authorship; misrepresentation of interests; breach of confidentiality; lack of informed consent; misuse of personal data; and abuse of research subjects or material
- improper dealing with allegations of misconduct: failing to address possible infringements such as attempts to cover up misconduct and reprisals against whistle-blowers

Adverse Outcomes. Think carefully about the possibilities, and cover here

Section I: Feedback, Consent and Confidentiality

Feedback to participants: outline your approach. Will interview transcripts be shared with respondents to check accuracy? Will summaries of questionnaire analysis be made available to respondents in some way? Will an overview report be provided? How and when?

Informed consent: Draft letter / e-mail / or heading (or footer) section of questionnaire must be approved by DoS/supervisor (if research student), supervisor/module tutor if taught student, or Head of School / Assistant Dean if a member of staff.

Confidentiality/Anonymity. Explain clearly how you will ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

Section J: Data Protection and Storage

Before completing this section it is necessary to read the University's Research Data Management information. The questions that follow are designed to ensure compliance with the Data Protection Act as well as established research protocols.

Many research activities will involve electronic transfer of data and use of data management systems in the summarisation and analysis of data. You will need to explain these in relation to compliance with the Data Protection Act.

Think carefully about who will have access to your data, this will include supervisors and examiners. Also that a thesis will be made available via the University library and the British Library system. If you are seeking an access bar for a period of time after completion then mention it here. If you will provide a copy of your findings, or intend to give a presentation, to a facilitating/ supporting/accessing organisation then explain that in this section. But also think about the general principle of data sharing, as explained in the Research Data Management information.

In terms of storage of data please ensure security, and also mitigate against loss of data.

Section K: Declaration

Ensure the appropriate countersignatures have been provided

Look carefully at the checklist and ensure that you comply with and tick all that are relevant to your research.

References:

- Alonso-Mora, J., Samaranayake, S., Wallar, A., Frazzoli, E. and Rus, D. (2017). On-demand high-capacity ride-sharing via dynamic trip-vehicle assignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, [online] 114(3), pp.462-467. Available at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/114/3/462>.
- Amey, A. (2010). Real-Time Ridesharing. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2217(1), pp.103-110.
- Batley, R., Bates, J., Bliemer, M., Börjesson, M., Bourdon, J., Cabral, M., Chintakayala, P., Choudhury, C., Daly, A., Dekker, T., Drivyla, E., Fowkes, T., Hess, S., Heywood, C., Johnson, D., Laird, J., Mackie, P., Parkin, J., Sanders, S., Sheldon, R., Wardman, M. and Worsley, T. (2017). New appraisal values of travel time saving and reliability in Great Britain. *Transportation*. [online] Available at: <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/120587/1/10.1007%252Fs11116-017-9798-7.pdf>.
- Corvaglia, F., Evans, A., Cummings, J. and Slocombe, M. (2017). *National Travel Survey: England 2017*. [online] Assets.publishing.service.gov.uk. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/729521/national-travel-survey-2017.pdf [Accessed 20 Aug. 2018].
- Goldkuhl, G. (2012). Pragmatism vs interpretivism in qualitative information systems research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, [online] 21(2), pp.135-146. Available at: <http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:515141/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Hosni, H., Naoum-Sawaya, J. and Artail, H. (2014). The shared-taxi problem: Formulation and solution methods. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, [online] 70, pp. 303-318. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0191261514001659>.
- Jain, J. and Lyons, G. (2008). The gift of travel time. *Journal of Transport Geography*, [online] 16(2), pp.81-89. Available at: https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/S0966692307000531/1-s2.0-S0966692307000531-main.pdf?_tid=18a447f7-d528-4e69-a27a-53f73d3da545&acdnat=1534711835_bccd16567cbf17cb3e058103d3f8794e.

KETOKIVI, M. and MANTERE, S. (2010). TWO STRATEGIES FOR INDUCTIVE REASONING IN ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH. *Academy of Management Review*, [online] 35(2), pp.315-333. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261949419_Two_Strategies_for_Inductive_Reasoning_in_Org

Leitch, C., Hill, F. and Harrison, R. (2010). The Philosophy and Practice of Interpretivist Research in Entrepreneurship. *Organizational Research Methods*, [online] 13(1), pp.67-84. Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.908.6312&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

Ma, R. and Zhang, H. (2017). The morning commute problem with ridesharing and dynamic parking charges. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, [online] 106, pp.345-374. Available at: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0191261516307202>.

Morency, C. (2007). The ambivalence of ridesharing. *Transportation*, [online] 34(2), pp. 239-253. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/212429769?accountid=130472>.

Neoh, J., Chipulu, M. and Marshall, A. (2017). What encourages people to carpool? An evaluation of factors with meta-analysis. *Transportation*, [online] 44(2), pp.423-447. Available at: https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/docview/1867933041?accountid=130472&rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo.

Nielsen, J., Hovmøller, H., Blyth, P. and Sovacool, B. (2015). Of “white crows” and “cash savers:” A qualitative study of travel behavior and perceptions of ridesharing in Denmark. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, [online] 78, pp.113-123. Available at: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0965856415001196>.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: sage publishing.

Posen, H. (2015). Ridesharing in the Sharing Economy: Should Regulators Impose Über Regulations on Uber?. *Iowa Law Review*, [online] 101(1), pp.405-433. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1770930427?accountid=130472> [Accessed 19 Aug. 2018].

Qu, S. and Dumay, J. (2011). The qualitative research interview. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, [online] 8(3), pp.238-264. Available at: <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/docview/888254482/fulltextPDF/FF017AA9B60A492CPQ/1?accountid=130472>.

Rosenthal, M. (2016). Qualitative research methods: Why, when, and how to conduct interviews and focus groups in pharmacy research. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, [online] 8(4), pp.509-516. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S1877129715301970>.

Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Santos, D. and Xavier, E. (2015). Taxi and Ride Sharing: A Dynamic Dial-a-Ride Problem with Money as an Incentive. *Expert Systems with Applications*, [online] 42(19), pp. 6728-6737. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/science/article/pii/S0957417415003024>.

Saunders, M., Louis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009). *Understanding research philosophies and approaches*. 4th ed. [ebook] pp.106-135. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309102603_Understanding_research_philosophies_and_approaches [Accessed 24 Aug. 2018].

Statista. (2018). *Ride Sharing - United Kingdom | Statista Market Forecast*. [online] Available at: <https://www.statista.com/outlook/368/156/ride-sharing/united-kingdom> [Accessed 25 Aug. 2018].

Vanoutrive, T., Van De Vijver, E., Van Malderen, L., Jourquin, B., Thomas, I., Verhetsel, A. and Witlox, F. (2012). What determines carpooling to workplaces in Belgium: location, organisation, or promotion?. *Journal of Transport Geography*, [online] 22, pp.77-86. Available at: https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/S0966692311002055/1-s2.0-S0966692311002055-main.pdf?_tid=3164c0c5-0e52-4f8b-9686-7171e12a9584&acdnat=1534713348_7df6ce8b21abdd5b2c5edd9ffc8927d3.

Zhou, Y., Huang, Y., McGlynn, J. and Han, A. (2017). Who Will You Share a Ride With: Factors that Influence Trust of Potential Ride-share Partners. *UrbComp'17*.

Reflective writing

Introduction:

Reflective writing has come to be determined as a fundamental element of reflective practice, and primary to the fact of learning from experience (Jasper, 2005). For researchers as well as students, reflective writing has become an important approach that employ their own experience in order to obtain some knowledge. Reflective capacity is defined as a critical appraisal of knowledge and experience in order to attain an extending interpretation and comprehension. (Mann, Gordon and MacLeod, 2009). According to Jasper (2005), reflective writing build the establishment of critical appraisal and critical analysis competency important to satisfactory qualitative research, and offers an evident and specific review series of the researcher's procedure.

During the reflective writing, the researcher participates in reflecting on their own action and contribution in an proceeding in order to attain their aims. It should be embodied into any research as a data origin and to be contemplated as primary to verifying the integrity of the qualitative research. (Jasper, 2005). As the researcher is new to reflection, the Gibbs model (1988) of reflection was chosen because this model offers an explicitly explained steps. In Gibbs' model the first three components are based on what occurred while the last three parts are based on understanding the experience and how the researcher can enhance the problem by writing an action plan.

Description:

The qualitative research I am based on in my reflective writing is about the ambivalence of ride-sharing. As a part of the qualitative research methods module, we were allocated to accomplish two parts, however, we will only be reflecting on part two which represent the developed qualitative research. This module aim to teach the doctorate students pick the

right data collection methods, the appropriate research philosophy, research design and how to discuss the findings.

As far as I am concerned, my topic is about ride-sharing and the way people perceive it. I picked this topic because I have always been intrigued about the history of ride-sharing and the different factors that influence individuals either to participate in it or not. After being informed of some previous researches in the factors that influence the use and non-use of ride-sharing, I have discovered that researchers only focused on price, convenience and safety as characteristics of Ride-sharing. My aim was to reveal whether there are more characteristics of ride-sharing by finding out how London commuters perceive ride-sharing and what makes them participate in it or not.

Feelings:

In the beginning of the semester, I had to choose a topic within 2 weeks time, hence, I spent reading articles about the topics that interested me, after that I had a meeting with Dr Allyson

That helped me to finally choose the topic of ride-sharing. Although, I was not sure about the topic in the beginning, the more I read journal articles about ride-sharing the more I became more fascinated about the way individuals perceive that phenomenon, in spite of that, the procedure of this part was more difficult than I expected it to be.

The timeframe was an issue as I had to conduct six in-depth interviews and analyse carefully the findings, moreover, arranging the meetings with participants was the most difficult part as they were all students that work part time and had also to work on their assignments. After finishing the literature reviews, I started getting anxious as time went by and couldn't get hold of any of the participants, I felt that I need to conduct meetings in the lunch time when we have class on Tuesday and Friday, therefore, it took me 3 weeks to accomplish the interviews. After finishing them, I really felt relieved and finally started interpreting the outcome and analysing the findings so I started working on the presentation which went very well, I also benefited from Dr Allison's comments on the

analysis part so I made some slight change, actually I feel that my study has become clearer and more developed after the comments of Dr Allison.

Evaluation and Analysis:

Based on the journal articles I have read about few topics that I was interested in, I finally chose the subject of my research. As far as I am concerned, the part 1 which was about a critical analysis of an article about the same topic chosen for part 2 has helped me a lot with my qualitative research as I learned how the authors employ the methods in their qualitative research and also I have revealed some gaps that I have avoided in my qualitative research (part2). Hence, I was able to save time that could have been wasted in looking for some irrelevant information about the topic, this article also helped me to understand the characteristics of ride-sharing that have been mentioned in previous researches thorough through its literature review.

In the other hand, the most difficult part that I passed through was the interviews as I struggled to get hold of the participants, some of them kept scheduling the meetings, as time passed by I started feeling anxious so I had to find some new participants in order to accomplish my research in due time. Other than this, I think my knowledge of qualitative research methods have been strengthened a lot because of this module which will in turn help me with my doctorate thesis.

Conclusion:

From this experience, I learnt to be more aware of the significance of time and the importance of developing a back up plan if I face similar issues in my future researches. The knowledge I have obtained from this study has helped me to become much more sensible of the consequences of not having a back up plan and the significance of acting in the right time if anything goes wrong. I have also learnt that a lot of reading has to be done before you choose the topic so you would be able to reveal the research gap in order to base your work on.

Generally, I am content with what I have learned. I will apply this knowledge to my qualitative researches in the future in order to improve the quality of my doctorate dissertation, therefore, I have developed an action plan (see table below).

Action plan:

What will I do?	What would I do to be better prepared in the future?
Back up planning	I can manage to obtain an extra number of approvals from the participants in case I would not be able to reach some of them.
Organisation	I can manage to organise my time effectively in order to finish before due time so I will have more time in case something delayed me.

References:

Gibbs, G. (1988) *Learning by Doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods*. Further Education Unit. Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic.

Jasper, M. (2005). Using reflective writing within research. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10(3), pp.247-260.

Mann K, Gordon J, MacLeod A. Reflection and reflective practice in health professions education: A systematic review. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*. 2009;14:595–621.