To cite: Kuhzady, S., Seyfi, S., & Béal, L. (2020). Peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation in the sharing economy: a review. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1786505>

**Peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation in the sharing economy:
A review**

^a Salar Kuhzady, ^b Siamak Seyfi, ^c Luc Béal*

^a Department of Tourism, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran (s.kuhzadi@gmail.com)

^b Geography Research Unit, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland (siamak.seifi@yahoo.com)

^c La Rochelle Business School - CRIIM Laboratory, La Rochelle, France (beall@excelia-group.com)

***Corresponding author:**

Siamak Seyfi

Email: siamak.seifi@yahoo.com

**Peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation in the sharing economy:
A review**

Abstract

Accommodation has been viewed as the largest and most important sector in the tourism industry. This paper provides a systematic review of 371 papers identified in SCOPUS and WOS databases between 2000 and 2019 on P2P accommodation in the sharing economy. Research on P2P accommodation is experiencing high growth, with Airbnb a major focus for tourism scholars. The provision of authentic experiences, environmental concerns, and socialization are important themes in P2P accommodation research, with trust and negative attitudes of established businesses and government regarded as the main barriers of P2P development. Common strategies to respond P2P accommodation platforms are also identified.

Keywords: P2P accommodation; sharing economy; Airbnb; collaborative consumption; systematic review

1. Introduction

Accommodation has long been viewed as the largest and most ubiquitous sub-sector within the tourism economy (Sharpley, 2000). The qualitative and quantitative attributes of accommodation have a direct influence on the success of tourism industry and destinations (Sharpley, 2000). Spending on accommodation represents the most significant element of total tourist expenditure (Guttentag, 2015). For example, according to Eurostat (2018), accommodation took up 37% of tourism expenditure for tourism trip of Europeans, making it a substantial portion of travel expenditures.

The rapid growth and diversity of lodging available has added complexity to tourist decision-making and intensified the competition in the accommodation sector (Tsai, Song, & Wong, 2009). Traditionally competition was between conventional forms of lodging, such as star-rated hotels. However, in addition to traditional lodging competition now comes from alternative forms of accommodation that emerged from the sharing economy and online marketplaces, such as Airbnb (Guttentag, 2015; Mody, Suess, & Lehto, 2017; Zerves et al., 2017; Sigala, 2017; Phua, 2019). Airbnb as one of the exemplar companies of the sharing economy, with over seven million listings of homes, apartments, guest rooms, even houseboats and tree houses, in more than 100,000 cities in over 190 countries (Airbnb, 2019) and is bigger than many more established international hotel chains (Phua, 2019; Adamiak, 2019). Airbnb's growth has also led to the transformation of housing market demand in urban areas (Rodríguez-Pérez de Arenaza et al., 2019; Wyman, Mothorpe, & McLeod, 2020), with an increase in temporary lettings in major urban tourist areas (Amore, de Bernardi, & Arvanitis, 2020). For instance, Rodríguez-Pérez de Arenaza et al. (2019) reported that sun-and-beach Airbnb listings account for 13.69% of the price of residential rental prices in the coastal area of Andalusia, Spain. Accordingly, peer to peer accommodation (P2P) mediated by sharing economy platforms is expected to challenge forms of traditional accommodation and revolutionize the tourism and hospitality industry (Fang et al., 2016; Sigala, 2017). In 2018, P2P accommodation made up about 7% of accommodation globally, or roughly eight million beds. The projected annual growth rate for global P2P accommodation is estimated at 31% between 2013 and 2025, six times the growth rate of traditional bed-and-breakfasts and hostels (World Bank Group,

2018). However, these growth figures are now likely to be substantially challenged by the impacts of COVID-19 on tourism (Hall, Scott, & Gössling, 2020).

Various drivers for the growth of the sharing economy and P2P accommodation have been identified by scholars. These include economic crisis and increasing demand for low-budget lodging (Caudron & Peteghem, 2014); technology developments and emerging web 2.0 (Rosen et al., 2011; Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014); social media and peer-to-peer technology (Caudron & Peteghem, 2014; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018); and environmental awareness of travelers and sustainability (Palgan, Zvolska, & Mont, 2017; Sung, Kim, & Lee, 2018). Sigala (2017) emphasized the attractiveness of P2P lodging in contrast with traditional accommodation and argued that contemporary tourists are mainly looking for authenticity, socialization and experience co-creation.

The growing numbers of studies on P2P accommodation highlights the need for a systematic review of research to outline what is known about P2P accommodation. A number of systematic reviews on the sharing economy have been conducted (Cheng, 2016; Prayag & Ozanne, 2018; Narasimhan et al., 2018; Sutherland & Jarrahi, 2018, Guttentag, 2019), however a systematic review on P2P accommodation is still lacking. The only available systematic review on P2P is one of 71 articles published during 2010-2016 (Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). To fill this gap and to “make sense of what has already been done, capture key lessons learned from the past, and identify directions for the future” (Kilubi, 2016, p. 3), this paper is structured around two main objectives: first, to summarize the content of P2P research in terms of research themes and favorite P2P platforms. Second, to discuss the main motivations to participate in peer-to-peer accommodation, main barriers of P2P and coping reactions of stakeholders along with the strategies suggested to tackle the challenges of P2P accommodation and identify future avenues for research in P2P accommodation.

2. Literature review

2.1. Sharing economy

Sharing itself is not a new phenomenon, however the sharing of products and services between strangers (Belk, 2010) and emerging global for-profit types of sharing economy startups have shifted the nature of sharing. The sharing economy (SE) is a disruptive business model that

originated in the development of the Internet and especially Web 2.0 (Hall & Williams, 2020). The sharing economy is growing at an impressive rate across the globe (Hou, 2018) while there are some ambiguities with respect to its definition (Cockayne, 2016; Gössling & Hall, 2019) which have led into different terms (i.e. collaborative consumption, collaborative economy, gig economy, P2P sharing). Richardson (2015) gives a broad definition and explains that: “the sharing economy refers to forms of exchange facilitated through online platforms, encompassing a diversity of for-profit and non-profit activities that all broadly aim to open access to under-utilized resources through what is termed ‘sharing’” (2015, p. 1). He argues that given the nature of sharing economy and it’s simultaneously ‘neoliberalism on steroids’ (Morozov, 2013 cited in Richardson, 2015) and a remedy for a hyper-consumerist culture has been framed both as part of the capitalist economy and as an alternative which has led into an apparent paradox (Gössling & Hall, 2019).

Generally, notions of the sharing economy in tourism can be divided in four groups; namely: transportation (e.g. Uber), dining (e.g. Eatwith), tour guide services (e.g. Vayable), and accommodation (e.g. Airbnb, Couchsurfing, Homeaway) (Ert et al., 2016). Botsman and Rogers (2011) suggest that participation in the sharing economy can be boosted by economic, practical, social and idealistic factors. Reputation among peers (Tussyadiah, 2016), enjoyment and sustainability (Palgan et al., 2017; Sung et al., 2018) and curiosity (Tussyadiah, 2016) are also among other incentives that have also been suggested for participation in SE. While the three main characteristics of the sharing economy including (1) an online platform (2) two-sided features (3) open access to under-utilized resources are accepted, the most debatable dimension of the SE is whether the SE should be carried out for profit (Hou, 2018; Gössling & Hall, 2019). Geissinger et al. (2019) argued that SE currently is in “a state of conflict and tension between market and non-market logics”. However, the SE has proved that it is not a short-term trend and is here for the foreseeable future.

2.2. Peer to peer accommodation

Accommodation, as the largest and most ubiquitous sub-sector within the tourism economy (Sharpley, 2000), has been shaken up by P2P accommodation. Peer to peer accommodation platforms are extended version of commercial (Hall, 2009; Adamiak, 2019) and second homes (Müller & Hall, 2018) and homestays that are “characterized by being a private lodging, with permanent residents, offering guests accommodation and breakfast before their departure” (Marques & Gondim Matos, 2019, p. 2). A homestay is a stay by a tourist, traveler or student

at a house, which is hosted by a local family in a local vicinity” (Rizal et al., 2018, p. 94). Homestay provide travelers a sense of feeling at home, interact with the host family, first-hand relationship with locals, experience the local culture, and low-cost accommodation (Kulshreshtha & Kulshrestha, 2019). By understanding this trend, startups such as Airbnb, Vrbo, HomeAway, FlipKey, Roomorama, and Couchsurfing have created online opportunities for individuals to rent out their entire home or bedrooms to travelers seeking alternatives to traditional accommodation (Tussyadiah & Zach, 2017). For instance, Couchsurfing has reached 12 million members in more than 200 thousand destinations (Luo & Zhang, 2016; Couchsurfing, 2019). According to Palgan et al. (2017), based on interaction between the platforms’ users, P2P accommodation is divided into three groups: non-profit (Couchsurfing & Be Welcome) for profit (Airbnb), and reciprocal (home exchange) (fig 1)

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

It has been argued that the sharing economy can increase the re-use of already produced but underutilized goods and extends products’ life span through facilitating their distribution among people. For Prothero et al. (2011) the intrinsic values of collaborative consumption shapes the nature of consumption: “by shifting the paradigm away from individual ownership to collectivity and sharing, less demand for consumer goods may give way to a new economy that could help take on problems such as pollution and excessive energy usage” (2011, p. 36). Nevertheless, the actual contribution of commercial sharing economy models to the sustainability of tourism has been substantially criticized (Gössling & Hall, 2019).

Attitude toward P2P accommodation is divided into two groups. The first group saw P2P as a threat to tourism. Generally, accommodation sectors and governments support this thought and criticized P2P accommodation for providing unfair competition, reduces job security, avoids taxes and poses a threat to safety (Juul, 2015). While startups and travelers mainly have a generally positive view towards P2P accommodation and advocate this platform, its abilities for creating employment opportunities, low price accommodation and extend tourists' length of stay (Dolnicar, 2018). Moreover, while these new types of businesses provide opportunities to individuals by offering new conveniences and insights of services as well as to tourists, many describe it as a disruptive element for traditional lodging sector (Guttentag, 2015; Dredge & Gyimóthy, 2015; Guttentag & Smith, 2017; Gutiérrez et al., 2017; Hall & Williams, 2020). Tussyadiah (2016) argued that the model of businesses in a sharing economy environment

potentially affects travel patterns of tourists and bring challenge for accommodation sector. However, Swig (2014) stated that the remarkable growth of P2P accommodation could be related to the millennial travelers that are looking for destination authenticity and cheap accommodation or gives individuals the opportunity to become businesspeople on a part-time, temporary and flexible level. P2P accommodation may provide an environment for travelers to co-create their experience through interpersonal relationships (dialogue, physical contact, observation) may facilitate the process of socialization (Coelho et al., 2018). P2P platforms such as Couchsurfing may help travelers to have ‘living like a local’ experiences and Airbnb (via Airbnb experiences) can help travelers to obtain deep and local knowledge of a destination (Marques & Gondim Matos, 2019). Nevertheless, simultaneously there are substantial concerns as to the impacts of such developments on rental housing and destination communities because of the replacement of locals by visitors (Gössling & Hall, 2019). Against this backdrop, this paper aims to systemically review the progress of P2P accommodation in sharing economy and the challenges it faces and the future directions.

3. Method

3.1. The systematic review

Systematic reviews are an increasingly common review method in the social sciences, including in tourism research (e.g. Kim et al., 2018; Seyfi, Hall, & Kuhzady, 2018; Spasojevic et al., 2018; Gómez et al., 2019; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2020). Previous reviews on the sharing economy (e.g., Cheng, 2016; Narasimhan et al., 2018; Sutherland & Jarrahi, 2018) used methods such as co-citation analysis and online ethnography to identify articles, which are useful but do not critically appraise the methodological rigor of the included studies (Prayag & Ozanne, 2018).

3.2. The systematic review process

Pahlevan-Sharif et al. (2019) suggested a four stages process for undertaking a systematic review (identification, screening, eligibility, including). Uman (2015) acknowledged that to conduct a systematic review following eight steps is needed (question, inclusion and exclusion criteria, select studies, extract data, assess study quality, analyze and interpret results, and disseminate findings). By merging these two procedures, a five-step process was adopted (fig 2).

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

The first stage involves defining the review questions. The following questions were defined:

1. What are the publications in the field of P2P accommodation?
2. What themes could be retrieved from topic analysis?
3. What are the main motivations to participate in P2P accommodation?
4. How have the focal areas of papers changed since 2010?
5. What response strategies have there been to P2P accommodation?

Following formulation of the questions, eligible articles were sought. SCOPUS and Web of Science (WOS) were selected as the main data bases. The search was performed in late October 2019 in SCOPUS and WOS using the following search terms: ‘p2p accommodation’, ‘peer to peer accommodation’, ‘Airbnb’, ‘sharing economy accommodation’, ‘Couchsurfing’, ‘short term rentals and sharing economy’, ‘collaborative economy/consumption’, and ‘alternative accommodation’. This was then followed by a further iterative search for papers, including in Google Scholar, of cited papers that were not otherwise identified in the original search because, for example, they did not contain an abstract or keywords. This was especially important for identifying older papers (Seyfi et al., 2018). In the next step to make an initial screening and select eligible article, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Inclusion criteria included: (1) the study must be a peer-reviewed publication, (2) the study must be in English, (3) the study must be related to the defined keywords (4) no time span was applied. Exclusion criteria included: (1) study that do not meet the inclusion criteria, (2) book chapter, proceeding, editorials, and editorial material.

The initial search resulted in 512 publications (SCOPUS 282; WOS 230). After removal of overlaps 384 articles are identified (fig 2). Data of selected articles including, title, keywords, abstract, source, organization, country, and year were extracted in tab-delimited Win (UTF-8) format. To ensure the accuracy of the extracted articles and minimize the probability of bias, articles were cross-checked. After ensuring the eligibility of articles, analysis was conducted on 371 articles.

4. Findings

4.1. Overview of the published articles

Overall, 371 studies were retrieved after using the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The findings revealed that in contrast with other topics in tourism and hospitality, P2P accommodation has a very short history. The first studies on P2P accommodation began in 2000 (fig 3). Of the 371 studies almost ninety-nine percent (N=327) have been published since 2016. As shown in figure 3, the growing numbers of published articles during 2017-2019 indicating an increasingly attention to such an emerging topic that still in its infant stage. In total, 109 journals were contributed in publishing articles on P2P accommodation and 491 authors and 260 universities from 48 countries have been contributed in the knowledge development on P2P accommodation.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

To identify the most researched P2P accommodation types, topics, keywords, and abstract of all samples were analyzed. Food, transportation, accommodation, and local guide are the four main sharing economy business models in the tourism and hospitality. Accommodation is the most studied form of sharing economy. Normally, accommodations in collaborative economy are three types, namely; free (e.g. Couchsurfing), for profit (e.g. Airbnb), and reciprocal (e.g. home exchange). The results indicated that Airbnb and Couchsurfing were the most studied P2P accommodation platforms. Of the 371 articles 74.39% (N=276) articles were related to Airbnb and 12.66% (N=47) were related to Couchsurfing.

4.2. Topical review

To classify topics on P2P accommodation, a review of the article topics was conducted. The results of topic review indicated that topics could be divided into six categories, namely: conceptual development, drivers and motivation, barrier, regulation, and literature review (table 1). Most of the studies were devoted to different variables (e.g., trust, authenticity, memorable experience, risk, value co-creation, satisfaction, loyalty, intention, repurchase).

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

4.3. Evolution of studies

Keywords are useful in representing the major research aims, focus, methods, theory, and research themes of the publication. Cheng et al. (2018, p. 641) defined keywords as the

significant, binding words in certain research topics and the “significant, indicative words in certain forms of thought”. To achieve these aims, keyword extraction and analysis based on keyword frequency are suggested (Bratt, 2018). Keywords were extracted automatically from Scopus and WOS. Keywords representing the same concepts are grouped (e.g., motives and motivation). General words (i.e. tourism, travel, sharing, P2P accommodation) are removed. Based on these strategies, 1,425 keywords were identified.

To examine the progression of P2P research over time, the results were divided into two sub-periods: 2000-2015, 2016-2019 given the substantial publication in the aftermath of 2016 as noted above. The retrieved keywords were Visualized by VOSviewer that is an open access software developed by Van Eck and Waltman (2014) for constructing, visualizing, and bibliometric analysis. Visualization is based on the frequency of occurrence of a particular term in which the most frequently used keywords are highlighted by red circles. As figure 4 shows, between 2000-2015 ‘Homestay’, ‘Couchsurfing’, and flowingly ‘trust’, are the most common keywords. The main trends between 2000-2015 were related to assessing homestay and the non-profit form of P2P accommodation (Couchsurfing), important factors in trust building among strangers, social dimensions of P2P platforms, and introducing P2P as an alternative tourism accommodation type (figure 4).

[INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]

The success of Airbnb changed the attention of tourism scholars. Post 2015 there was a major focus on Airbnb while other new topics emerged, such as economic dimension of P2P platforms, service quality, satisfaction, experience, pricing, and applying different methodologies (e.g., text mining) to analysis P2P accommodation (fig 5).

[INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE]

4.4. Drivers and motivations to participate in P2P accommodation

Motivation explores the reasons “why people do what they do” (Reeve, 2014, p. 7). Generally, there are two types of motivation: internal and external motivation. Internal motivation is driven by interest or enjoyment in the task itself and exist in the individuals while external motivation refers to external factors that inspire one person to do something. Self-determination

theory (SDT) is generally used by scholars to answer what motivate individuals to participate in the P2P accommodation (Tussyadiah, 2016; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018). Based on the SDT individuals' behavior is influenced by both internal (for example enjoyment) and external motivation to obtain a reward or to avoid a punishment. In addition to SDT, some scholars have applied social exchange theory (SET) to explore behavioral intention to use P2P accommodation. Behavioral intentions are shaped when individuals perceive the benefits from using P2P (Kim et al., 2018).

For each paper the introduction and literature were reviewed and motivations were identified. Young et al. (2017) identified authentic local experiences through deep interactions and first hand experiences with the host as the main motivation for using P2P accommodation. Pung, Del Chiappa, & Sini (2019) also highlighted the importance of authenticity, social interaction, location, and trust as factors influencing the use of sharing economy tourism services, beyond accommodations. Priporas et al., (2017) suggested technological advancements and easy use as the important motivations. Curiosity and novelty seeking (Lalicic & Weismayer, 2018) and enjoy of a more home-like experience (Olya et al., 2018) are among other suggested motivations for the rising attractiveness of P2P accommodation. The results indicated that economic benefit is the main motivation for the travelers. Generally, P2P accommodations are cheaper for travelers than other types of accommodation. Authentic experience, environmental concerns, and socialization are the other important factors that have led to an increase in the use of P2P accommodation. In addition to these general drivers, based on the three types of P2P lodging, the following motivations could be suggested for different types of P2P accommodation:

Free P2P accommodation: A Spanish study by Pietilä (2011), found that sociocultural reasons (e.g. making friendships, cultural exchange and learning something from the interaction with the guest) are the main motivators of locals for hosting tourists. In addition, altruism and prosocial behavior can be other motivators, which can be added. Prosocial behavior is defined as actions which 'intend to help others without expectation of rewards' (Puckett & Diffily, 2004, p. 313).

Reciprocal P2P accommodation: Home exchangers use their home as an 'asset to be capitalized', to provide opportunities to travel to destinations which otherwise are hard to reach (Tonner, Hamilton, & Hewer, 2016, p. 29). Looking for experiencing authentic cultural

experiences, travelling more and saving money are other main motivations for reciprocal P2P accommodation (Zvolska, 2015).

Rental P2P accommodation: The main motivation for this type is economic benefits for both guests and hosts but, according to Tussyadiah and Pesonen (2018), social connections and sustainability are also significant.

4.5. Barriers of P2P accommodation

While P2P accommodation benefits have been identified there are also some barriers for acceptance in the market. The development of web 2.0, particularly the social media boom, has changed the circulation of information about individuals (Rosen et al., 2011) and decreased the effects of traditional factors (e.g., blood and geographical relationships) on trust building (Luo & Zhang, 2016). However, trust is still one of the main factors in the success of collaborative consumption and is crucial to the future of P2P consumption (Ert et al., 2016; Luo & Zhang, 2016; Ter Huurne et al., 2017).

4.6. Strategies to respond to peer-to-peer accommodations

P2P platforms, and the growth of Airbnb and Couchsurfing, has been disruptive to destination-marketing organization (DMOs) and traditional commercial accommodation providers. Accordingly, DMOs and established businesses are looking to find effective ways to respond to P2P accommodation. The most common recommendations are summarized in table 2.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

5. Discussion and Conclusions

During the last decade, P2P accommodation has attracted remarkable research attention, similar to that of online travel agencies (OTA), such as Booking.com, have done. Accordingly, P2P is widely attracting the attention of scholars. The findings show that P2P accommodation research has a short history. The first attempts to study P2P accommodation began in 2010 with a study on Couchsurfing. However, of the 146 studies approximately 92% (N=134) were

published between 2016-2019. In the early phases (2010-2013) when the number of studies were limited, the non-profit form of P2P accommodation (Couchsurfing), trust building among strangers, and the introduction of P2P as an alternative tourism and type of accommodation were the main trends. With the success of Airbnb, the focus of scholars shifted to profit-forms of P2P accommodation. During 2014-2018, the number of studies have seen a remarkable growth, with the economic dimensions of P2P platforms, service quality, and satisfaction being highlighted. Trust and motivation were also common interests among scholars.

Given the growth of social media, trust building is still viewed as a critical factor in collaborative consumption success (Ert et al., 2016; Ter Huurne et al., 2017), and is playing a vital role in shaping the future of P2P consumption. Harper (2014) sees trust as the ‘Achilles Heel’ of P2P networks (Harper, 2014, p. 54), with trust recognized as a key factor for the sharing economy and P2P platforms (Geiger, Horbel, & Germelmann, 2018; Gibbs et al., 2018). Thus, P2P platforms introduced mechanisms that facilitating trust building. Dependent on the type of platforms, different mechanisms have been offered. For example, Airbnb used the mutual review system, photos, social connection (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn), government ID, and phone number. Ert et al. (2016) showed that the provision of the host’s photo has a positive impact on trust building in Airbnb. Additionally, the positive effect of reviews on trust building have also been identified (Bridges & Vásquez, 2016; Oskam & Boswijk, 2016). Couchsurfing use other trust builder mechanisms (e.g. self-disclosure information, verified membership, number of friends). More recently, they add mutual friend(s) and mutual interest(s) to their platform. Liu, Nie, and Li (2016) acknowledged that along with homogeneity and reciprocity, Couchsurfing’s trust systems were successful in building mutual trust. Decrop et al. (2018) found that value homophily is also effective in reducing uncertainty and increasing trust between strangers on Couchsurfing.

Böcker and Meelen (2017) acknowledged that motivations for involvement in the sharing economy are not uniform. Profit (economic benefits) are recognized as the main motivation for involvement in for profit P2P accommodation (Guttentag, 2015). However, some scholars suggest that environmental drivers also underlie sharing economy involvement (Piscicelli et al., 2015; Palgan et al., 2017; Sung et al., 2018). Tussyadiah (2016) also claim that social motivations (e.g., interact with local host) are of great value as well. However, for the non-monetary P2P platforms (e.g., Couchsurfing) the motivations are less obvious. Indeed, travelers who just look for free accommodation are not very welcomed by members (Karmann, 2012).

Accordingly, surfers are more interested in making interactions with the local hosts (Jung et al., 2016), and the destination (Liu et al, 2016).

It is suggested that travelers should no longer be seen only as a buyer but “rather they are co-producers who actively generate their own experiences.” New tourists" are more care about environment, local culture, and “looking to experience and learn rather than merely stand back and gaze” (Cecilia, Elisabeta, & Magdalena, 2011, p.245). Therefore, scholars suggest the need of shift from traditional service-centered marketing to experience-based marketing (Dolnicar, 2018; Guttenberg, 2019b). In the other words, ‘satisfaction and quality’ are not enough to provide experiences that contemporary travelers are looking for (Kim, Ritchie & McCormick, 2012).

While there are three types of P2P accommodation; free (e.g. Couchsurfing), for profit (e.g. Airbnb), and reciprocal (e.g. home exchange), studies so far have mainly focused on Airbnb and studies on the other two types and especially reciprocal and comparative studies are lacking. Additionally, while the economic dimensions of P2P accommodation (e.g., effect on hotel revenue and employment) are widely studied, research on social-cultural, environmental issues, destination effects (e.g. destination image, destination familiarity, and revisit intention) and sustainability are limited (Gössling & Hall, 2019).

The novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has had a significant impact on tourism industry due to the widespread introduction of travel restrictions by states as well as massive and unprecedented slump in demand among travelers (Gössling, Scott, & Hall, 2020; Hall, Scott, & Gössling, 2020). Tourism is considered as one of the hardest hits by the COVID-19 outbreak, with millions of jobs at risk in this labour-intensive sector of the economy (UNWTO, 2020). According to the UNWTO’s forecasts, international tourists would be decreased by 60 % to 80 % in 2020 which may affect 100 to 120 million direct tourism jobs at risk (UNWTO, 2020). The COVID-19 crisis and the ensuing social distancing has significantly disrupted the tourism industry and wider economy including the sharing economy services. While, P2P accommodations and more particularly Airbnb were at a constant growth prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, this pandemic has shaken up the whole sector (Watson, 2020), and demand for short-term rentals has witnessed significant setbacks (DuBois, 2020). For instance, Airbnb’s revenue is expected to be less than half of what it was in 2019.

While, the flexibility of amenities that Airbnb offers (e.g. room space, pet-friendly, family-friendly, and various entertainment amenities) and its provision of home-based amenities, was

a challenge to common practices in the traditional hotel accommodation sector (Yu et al., 2020), in the current COVID-19 travel environment, it is argued that potential travellers' consumption patterns will be affected (Wen et al., 2020), less travelers would use P2P accommodations services and travelers are less likely to choose Airbnb listings (Wood, 2020). However, Dolnicar and Zare (2020) claim that by the proper control of this pandemic, demand for P2P accommodation would keep growing quickly. More recently, P2P accommodations have developed cleaning protocols for hosts (e.g., 24-hour vacancies between bookings in Airbnb) in an effort to address the ongoing challenges and pressure created by the virus and to limit possible coronavirus transmissions (Wood, 2020). This highlights the importance of cleanliness and hygiene as significant factors in P2P rental sector' attraction in COVID-19 times (Naumov, Varadzhakova, & Naydenov, 2020; Wen et al., 2020; Chadwick, 2020).

Given the inherent uncertainties surrounding COVID-19 and its impact on the booking behavior of travelers, the future of the global short-term rental market is hard to predict (Gössling et al., 2020). For instance, recent global survey series conducted by McKinsey & Company (2020) across 42 countries on the consumer sentiment and behaviour during the COVID-19 crisis show that consumer sentiment is evolving in coronavirus crisis and there is a greater emphasis on enhanced cleaning practices and sanitation measures (McKinsey & Company, 2020). For instance, empirical study of Naumov et al. (2020) shows that Bulgarian tourists do not generally trust the cleanliness and sanitation protocols at P2P accommodations and prefer family-owned apartments and second homes for the best hygiene and sanitation comfort. As the lockdown restrictions in several countries are eased, consumers' demand for higher level of cleaning standards and sanitation is particularly significant for P2P rental sector which requires restoring customer trust (Naumov et al., 2020; Chadwick, 2020; Gössling et al., 2020).

Despite the contributions made and the comprehensive approach adopted, the findings of this study should still be viewed in the light of a number of limitations that also provide opportunities for further research. First, results reported were not comprehensive in reflecting the evaluation and progress of peer-to-peer accommodation, areas such as the substantial literature on second home rentals was not reviewed (Hall & Müller, 2018; Müller & Hall, 2018). This study examines only peer-reviewed journal articles. Future research including books, book chapters, and grey literature and perhaps a further comparative approach between industry and academic sources would offer additional insights into the P2P accommodation phenomenon.

References

- Adamiak, C. (2019). Current state and development of Airbnb accommodation offer in 167 countries. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1696758>
- Airbnb. (2019). Fast facts. Retrieved from <https://news.airbnb.com/fast-facts/>.
- Amore, A., de Bernardi, C., & Arvanitis, P. (2020). The impacts of Airbnb in Athens, Lisbon and Milan: a rent gap theory perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1742674>
- Belk, R. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 715–734.
- Bernardi, M. (2018). Millennials, sharing economy and tourism: the case of Seoul. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 4(1), 43-56.
- Böcker, L., & Meelen, T. (2017). Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for intended sharing economy participation. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 28-39.
- Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2011). *What's mine is yours: how collaborative consumption is changing the way we live*. New York, HarperBusiness.
- Bratt, S. (2018). Digital library keyword analysis for visualization education research. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 10(4), 595–611.
- Brauckmann, S. (2017). City tourism and the sharing economy—potential effects of online peer-to-peer marketplaces on urban property markets. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3(2), 114-126.
- Bridges, J., & Vásquez, C. (2018). If nearly all Airbnb reviews are positive, does that make them meaningless?. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(18), 2057-2075.
- Caudron, J. & Peteghem, D. Van. (2014). *Digital transformation: A model to master digital disruption*. BookBaby.
- Cecilia, S. G., Elisabeta, M., & Magdalena, B. (2011). Tourism's Changing Face: New Age Tourism versus Old Tourism. *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series*.
- Chadwick, L. (2020). Coronavirus: Hotels and Airbnb plan 'fundamental shift' after COVID-19 lockdowns. *Euronews*. Retrieved from <https://www.euronews.com/2020/05/08/coronavirus-hotels-and-airbnb-plan-fundamental-shift-after-covid-19-lockdowns>.
- Cheng, F. F., Huang, Y. W., Yu, H. C., & Wu, C. S. (2018). Mapping knowledge structure by keyword co-occurrence and social network analysis. *Library Hi Tech*, 36(4), 636-650.
- Cheng, M. (2016). Sharing economy: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 57, 60-70.
- Cockayne, D.G. (2016). Sharing and neoliberal discourse: The economic function of sharing

in the digital on-demand economy. *Geoforum*, 77, 73–82.

Coelho, M. de F., Gosling, M. de S. & Almeida, A.S.A. de. (2018). Tourism experiences: Core processes of memorable trips. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 37, 11–22.

Cohen, B. & Kietzmann, J. (2014). Ride On! mobility business models for the sharing economy. *Organization & Environment*, 27(3): 279–296.

Contu, G., Conversano, C., Frigau, L., & Mola, F. (2019). The impact of Airbnb on hidden and sustainable tourism: the case of Italy. *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 9(2), 99–130.

Couchsurfing. (2019). *About Couchsurfing*. Retrieved from <https://www.couchsurfing.com/about/about-us/>.

Dann, D., Teubner, T., & Weinhardt, C. (2019). Poster child and guinea pig—insights from a structured literature review on Airbnb. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 427–473.

Decrop, A., Del Chiappa, G., Mallargé, J., & Zidda, P. (2018). “Couchsurfing has made me a better person and the world a better place”: the transformative power of collaborative tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 57–72.

Dolnicar, S. (2018). Unique features of peer-to-peer accommodation networks. In Dolnicar, S. (Ed.) *Peer-to-peer accommodation networks: Pushing the boundaries* (pp. 1–14), Goodfellow Publishers.

Dolnicar, S. (2019). A review of research into paid online peer-to-peer accommodation: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research curated collection on peer-to-peer accommodation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 248–264.

Dolnicar, S., & Zare, S. (2020). COVID19 and Airbnb – Disrupting the disruptor. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 102961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102961>

Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015). The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(3), 286–302.

DuBois, D. (2020). *Impact of the coronavirus on global short-term rental markets*. Retrieved from <https://www.airdna.co/blog/coronavirus-impact-on-global-short-term-rental-markets>

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

Eurostat. (2018). *Tourism statistics – expenditure*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Tourism_statistics_-_expenditure&oldid=448787#Accommodation_took_up_the_largest_share_of_the_tourism_budget_of_EU_residents.

Fang, B., Ye, Q. & Law, R. (2016). Effect of sharing economy on tourism industry

employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57, 264–267.

Geiger, A., Horbel, C., & Germelmann, C. C. (2018). “Give and take”: how notions of sharing and context determine free peer-to-peer accommodation decisions. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 5-15.

Geissinger, A., Laurell, C., Sandström, C., Eriksson, K., & Nykvist, R. (2019). Digital entrepreneurship and field conditions for institutional change—Investigating the enabling role of cities. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 146, 877-886.

Gibbs, C., Guttentag, D., Gretzel, U., Morton, J., & Goodwill, A. (2018). Pricing in the sharing economy: a hedonic pricing model applied to Airbnb listings. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 46-56.

Gómez, M., Pratt, M. A., & Molina, A. (2019). Wine tourism research: A systematic review of 20 vintages from 1995 to 2014. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(18), 2211-2249.

Gössling, S., & Hall, C.M. (2019). Sharing versus collaborative economy: how to align ICT developments and the SDGs in tourism?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(1), 74-96.

Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-20.
10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708.

Grimmer, L., Vorobjovas-Pinta, O., & Massey, M. (2019). Regulating, then deregulating Airbnb-The unique case of Tasmania (Australia). *Annals of Tourism Research*. 75, 304–307.

Gunter, U., & Önder, I. (2018). Determinants of Airbnb demand in Vienna and their implications for the traditional accommodation industry. *Tourism Economics*, 24(3), 270-293.

Gurran, N., Searle, G., & Phibbs, P. (2018). Urban planning in the age of Airbnb: Coase, property rights, and spatial regulation. *Urban Policy and Research*, 36(4), 399-416.

Gutiérrez, J., García-Palomares, J.C., Romanillos, G. & Salas-Olmedo, M.H. (2017). The eruption of Airbnb in tourist cities: Comparing spatial patterns of hotels and peer-to-peer accommodation in Barcelona. *Tourism Management*, 62, 278–291.

Guttentag, D. (2015). Airbnb: disruptive innovation and the rise of an informal tourism accommodation sector. *Current issues in Tourism*, 18(12), 1192-1217.

Guttentag, D. (2019). Progress on Airbnb: a literature review. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 10(4), 814-844.

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

Hajibaba, H., & Dolnicar, S. (2017). Substitutable by peer-to-peer accommodation networks? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 185–188.

Hall, C.M. (2009). Sharing space with visitors: The servicescape of the commercial exurban home. In P. Lynch, A. McIntosh, & H. Tucker (Eds.), *Commercial Homes in Tourism* (pp. 80-92). Routledge.

Hall, C. M., Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2020). Pandemics, transformations and tourism: be careful what you wish for. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-22.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1759131>

Hall, C.M., & Müller, D.K. (Eds.) (2018). *The Routledge handbook of second home tourism and mobilities*. Routledge.

Hall, C.M., & Williams, A. (2020). *Tourism and innovation* (2nd edn.). Routledge.

Hall, C.M., Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2020). Pandemics, transformations and tourism: Be careful what you wish for. *Tourism Geographies*, DOI: 10.1080/14616688.2020.1759131.

Hou, L. (2018). Destructive sharing economy: A passage from status to contract. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 34(4), 965–976.

Ju, Y., Back, K. J., Choi, Y., & Lee, J. S. (2019). Exploring Airbnb service quality attributes and their asymmetric effects on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 342-352.

Jung, J., Yoon, S., Kim, S., Park, S., Lee, K. P., & Lee, U. (2016). Social or financial goals? Comparative analysis of user behaviors in couchsurfing and Airbnb. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference extended abstracts on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 2857-2863).

Juul, M. (2015). The sharing economy and tourism: Tourist accommodation. Retrieved from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/568345/EPRS_BRI\(2015\)56834_5_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/568345/EPRS_BRI(2015)56834_5_EN.pdf).

Karmann, M. (2012). *The rise of collaborative consumption on the example of couchsurfing*. GRIN Verlag.

Kilubi, I. (2016). Investigating current paradigms in supply chain risk management—a bibliometric study. *Business Process Management Journal*, 22(4), 662-692.

Kim, C.S., Bai, B.H., Kim, P.B. & Chon, K. (2018). Review of reviews: A systematic analysis of review papers in the hospitality and tourism literature. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 70, 49–58.

Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12-25.

Kulshreshtha, S., & Kulshreshtha, R. (2019). The emerging importance of “homestays” in the Indian hospitality sector. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 11(4), 458-466.

Lalicic, L. & Weismayer, C. (2018). A model of tourists’ loyalty: the case of Airbnb. *Journal*

of Hospitality and Tourism Technology 9(1): 80–93.

Leoni, G., & Parker, L. D. (2019). Governance and control of sharing economy platforms: Hosting on Airbnb. *The British Accounting Review*, 51(6), 100814.

Liu, Y., Nie, L., & Li, L. (2016). Homogeneity, trust, and reciprocity: Three keys to the sustainable hospitality exchange of couchsurfing. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(2-3), 145-157.

Luo, Q. & Zhang, H. (2016). Building interpersonal trust in a travel-related virtual community: A case study on a Guangzhou couchsurfing community. *Tourism Management* 54: 107–121.

Lyu, J., Li, M., & Law, R. (2019). Experiencing P2P accommodations: Anecdotes from Chinese customers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 323-332.

Mahadevan, R. (2018). Examination of motivations and attitudes of peer-to-peer users in the accommodation sharing economy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 27(6), 679-692.

Marques, L., & Gondim Matos, B. (2019). Network relationality in the tourism experience: staging sociality in homestays. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(9), 1153-1165.

McKinsey & Company (2020). Consumer sentiment is evolving as countries around the world begin to reopen. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/marketing-and-sales/our-insights/a-global-view-of-how-consumer-behavior-is-changing-amid-covid-19>.

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

Morozov, E. (2013). The ‘sharing economy’ undermines workers’ rights. *Financial Times*, retrieved from <https://www.ft.com/content/92c3021c-34c2-11e3-8148-00144feab7de>.

Müller, D. K., & Hall, C.M. (2018). From common ground to elite and commercial landscape. In C.M. Hall & D.K. Müller (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second home tourism and mobilities* (pp. 115-121). Routledge.

Narasimhan, C., Papatla, P., Jiang, B., Kopalle, P.K., Messinger, P.R., Moorthy, S., ... & Zhu, T. (2018). Sharing economy: Review of current research and future directions. *Customer Needs and Solutions*, 5(1-2), 93-106.

Naumov, N., Varadzhakova, D., & Naydenov, A. (2020). Sanitation and hygiene as factors for choosing a place to stay: perceptions of the Bulgarian tourists. *Anatolia*, 1-4. a, DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2020.1771742.

Olya, H.G.T., Altinay Gazi, Z., Altinay Aksal, F. & Altinay, M. (2018). Behavioral intentions of disabled tourists for the use of peer-to-peer accommodations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 436–454.

Oskam, J., & Boswijk, A. (2016). Airbnb: the future of networked hospitality businesses. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 2(1), 22-42.

- Pahlevan-Sharif, S., Mura, P., & Wijesinghe, S.N. (2019). A systematic review of systematic reviews in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 39, 158-165.
- Palgan, Y. V., Zvolška, L., & Mont, O. (2017). Sustainability framings of accommodation sharing. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 70-83.
- Phua, V.C. (2019). Perceiving Airbnb as sharing economy: the issue of trust in using Airbnb. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(17), 2051-2055.
- Piscicelli, L., Ludden, G. D., & Cooper, T. (2018). What makes a sustainable business model successful? An empirical comparison of two peer-to-peer goods-sharing platforms. *Journal of cleaner production*, 172, 4580-4591.
- Prayag, G., & Ozanne, L.K. (2018). A systematic review of peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation sharing research from 2010 to 2016: progress and prospects from the multi-level perspective. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 27(6), 649-678.
- Priporas, C.-V., Stylos, N., Rahimi, R. & Vedanthachari, L.N. (2017). Unraveling the diverse nature of service quality in a sharing economy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(9), 2279–2301.
- Prothero, A., Dobscha, S., Freund, J., Kilbourne, W.E., Luchs, M.G., Ozanne, L.K., & Thøgersen, J. (2011). Sustainable consumption: Opportunities for consumer research and public policy. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 30(1), 31-38.
- Puckett, M.B., & Diffily, D. (2004). *Teaching young children: An introduction to the early childhood profession*. Cengage Learning.
- Pung, J. M., Del Chiappa, G., & Sini, L. (2019). Booking experiences on sharing economy platforms: an exploration of tourists' motivations and constraints. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1690434>
- Reeve, J. (2014). *Understanding motivation and emotion*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Richardson, L. (2015). Performing the sharing economy. *Geoforum*, 67, 121-129.
- Rizal, H., Yussof, S., Amin, H., & Chen-Jung, K. (2018). EWOM towards homestays lodging: extending the information system success model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 9(1), 94-108.
- Rodríguez-Pérez de Arenaza, D., Hierro, L. Á., & Patiño, D. (2019). Airbnb, sun-and-beach tourism and residential rental prices. The case of the coast of Andalusia (Spain). *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1705768>
- Rosen, D., Lafontaine, P.R. & Hendrickson, B. (2011). CouchSurfing: Belonging and trust in a globally cooperative online social network. *New Media & Society* 13(6), 981–998.
- Seyfi, S., Hall, C. M., & Kuhzady, S. (2019). Tourism and hospitality research on Iran: Current state and perspectives. *Tourism Geographies*, 21(1), 143-162.

- Sharpley, R. (2000). The influence of the accommodation sector on tourism development: lessons from Cyprus. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 19(3), 275-293.
- Sigala, M. (2017). Collaborative commerce in tourism: implications for research and industry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(4), 346-355.
- So, K. K. F., Oh, H., & Min, S. (2018). Motivations and constraints of Airbnb consumers: Findings from a mixed-methods approach. *Tourism Management*, 67, 224-236.
- Spasojevic, B., Lohmann, G., & Scott, N. (2018). Air transport and tourism—a systematic literature review (2000–2014). *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(9), 975-997.
- Sung, E., Kim, H., & Lee, D. (2018). Why do people consume and provide sharing economy accommodation?— A sustainability perspective. *Sustainability*, 10(6), 2072.
- Sutherland, W., & Jarrahi, M.H. (2018). The sharing economy and digital platforms: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 43, 328-341.
- Swig, R., (2014). Alt-accommodation impact felt in San Francisco. *Hotel News Now*, Retrieved from <http://www.hotelnewsnow.com/Articles/23683/Alt-accommodation-impact-felt-in-San-Francisco>.
- Ter Huurne, M., Ronteltap, A., Corten, R., & Buskens, V. (2017). Antecedents of trust in the sharing economy: A systematic review. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 16(6), 485-498.
- Tonner, A., Hamilton, K., & Hewer, P. (2016). Stepping into strangers' homes: Exploring the consumption phenomenon of home exchange. In *Consumer Culture Theory* (pp. 29-45). Emerald.
- Tsai, H., Song, H., & Wong, K.K. (2009). Tourism and hotel competitiveness research. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(5-6), 522-546.
- Tussyadiah, I. P., & Pesonen, J. (2016). Impacts of peer-to-peer accommodation use on travel patterns. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1022-1040.
- Tussyadiah, I.P. & Pesonen, J. (2018). Drivers and barriers of peer-to-peer accommodation stay – an exploratory study with American and Finnish travellers. *Current Issues in Tourism* 21(6), 703–720.
- Tussyadiah, I.P. (2016). Factors of satisfaction and intention to use peer-to-peer accommodation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 70-80.
- Tussyadiah, I.P., & Zach, F. (2017). Identifying salient attributes of peer-to-peer accommodation experience. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(5), 636-652.
- UNWTO (2020). International tourist numbers could fall 60-80% in 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.unwto.org/news/covid-19-international-tourist-numbers-could-fall-60-80-in-2020>

Urbonavicius, S., & Sezer, A. (2019). Accommodation providers' motives in sharing economy: comparison between Turkey and Lithuania. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 13(4), 393-409.

Van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2014). Visualizing bibliometric networks. In *Measuring scholarly impact* (pp. 285-320). Springer, Cham.

Watson, M. (2020). Disrupting the disruptors: how Covid-19 will shake up Airbnb. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/apr/06/disrupting-the-disruptors-how-covid-19-will-shake-up-airbnb>

Wen, J., Kozak, M., Yang, S., & Liu, F. (2020). COVID-19: potential effects on Chinese citizens' lifestyle and travel. *Tourism Review*. doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2020-0110

Wood, C. (2020). *Airbnb is establishing new cleaning protocol to limit spread of COVID-19 - Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/airbnb-24-hours-between-rentals-limit-covid-spread-2020-4>.

World Bank Group (2018). Tourism and the sharing economy: policy & potential of sustainable peer to peer accommodations, Retrieved from: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/161471537537641836/pdf/130054-REVISED-Tourism-and-the-Sharing-Economy-PDF.pdf>.

Wyman, D., Mothorpe, C., & McLeod, B. (2020). Airbnb and VRBO: the impact of short-term tourist rentals on residential property pricing. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1711027>

Xie, K.L. & Kwok, L. (2017). The effects of Airbnb's price positioning on hotel performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 67, 174–184.

Young, C.A., Corsun, D.L. & Xie, K.L. (2017). Travelers' preferences for peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodations and hotels. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(4), 465–482.

Yu, M., Cheng, M., Yu, Z., Tan, J., & Li, Z. (2020). Investigating Airbnb listings' amenities relative to hotels. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1733497>

Zervas, G., Proserpio, D. & Byers, J.W. (2017). The rise of the sharing economy: Estimating the impact of Airbnb on the hotel industry. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54(5), 687–705.

Figure 1: A typology of P2P accommodation
Source: After Palgan et al., 2017

Figure 2: Literature screening process
After Pahlevan-Sharif et al., 2019; Uman, 2015

Figure 3. Publication number by year.
Source: Authors.

Figure 4: P2P accommodation trends during 2000-2015

Figure 5: P2P accommodation trends during 2016-2019

Table 1: Topic classification

Category	Sub category	Example
Conceptual development	P2P vs traditional accommodation, authenticity, moral economy, informal tourism accommodation, disruptive innovation, satisfaction, repurchase, intention to use, reputation, loyalty, service quality, trust, collaborative consumption, hedonic pricing, past experience, traveler personality, value co-creation, customer experience, cultural capitalism, hedonic and utilitarian values, involvement, risk perception, perceptions toward the website, belonging, Aristotle's rhetorical theory, memorable experiences, dynamic pricing, perceived trust, brand, trustworthy.	Phua, 2019; Rosen et al., 2011; Ju et al., 2019
P2P motivation	Couchsurfing motivation, Airbnb motivation, sustainability, host motivation, guest motivation.	Mahadevan, 2018; Urbonavicius & Sezer, 2019; Sung et al., 2018
P2P barriers	Trust, interpersonal trust, drivers and barriers of P2P accommodation.	So et al., 2018; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018
Impacts of P2P	Travel patterns, hotel revenue, hotel, budget hotels, employment, sustainability, hotel sales growth, hotel performance, urban arena, regional impact, hotel customers' behavior, on hotel profitability.	Contu et al., 2019 ; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2016
Regulation	Urban regulation, regulating business innovation, spatial regulation.	Gurran et al., 2018 ; Grimmer et al., 2019 ; Leoni & Parker, 2019
Literature review		Prayag, & Ozanne, 2018 ; Dann et al., 2019 ; Dolnicar, 2019

Table 2. How to respond to P2P accommodation

Author(s)	Strategies to respond to P2P accommodation
Hajibaba and Dolnicar (2017)	Learning from P2P accommodation strategies and factors that make them more attractive for travelers, such as meaningful interaction with the hosts.
Gunter and Önder (2018)	As one of the main values of P2P accommodation and especially Airbnb is being large group friendly, offering bigger rooms that can accommodate more than two travelers is important for the traditional accommodation.
Brauckmann (2017)	Providing low cost, more individualized rooms, and services for longer stays. Additionally, using portals such as Airbnb to sell rooms for small inns and guesthouses can be an effective response.
Guttentag (2015)	Restricting P2P accommodation providers to certain areas and time/seasons. Legalization of P2P accommodation through certification.
Fang et al. (2016)	Government must regulate and formulate market policies for P2P platforms to guarantee the benefit of all stakeholders.
Bernardi (2018)	Analyzing and understanding the needs of generation Y as the main target market of P2P platforms and businesses. Redesign the traditional accommodation.
Xie and Kwok (2017)	Price difference and price dispersion could decrease the negative effects of Airbnb on hotels.
Lyu et al. (2019)	Developing experiential tours for tourists in corporation with local travel agencies to interact with locals and experience local culture.
Gutiérrez et al. (2017)	Reducing the competitive advantage of Airbnb over traditional accommodations through taxation.