

Airbnb: Understanding the Concept, Recognizing the Values

Ramesh Raj Kunwar

Department of Conflict, Peace and Development Studies, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

kunwar.dr@gmail.com

Article History

Received 12 April 2020

Accepted 20 April 2020

Keywords

Airbnb, network hospitality, sharing economy, disruptive innovation, trust

Abstract

Peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation into the tourism market through a model of disruptive innovation is going to be very popular in the world. This has been coined as network hospitality led by Airbnb platform which will work as a mediator between the hosts and guests. Trust plays the major role for decision making to buy the shelter. The objective of studying this new area is to understand in better way through the help of secondary sources. Academic research is generally guided by the theories. Therefore, the researcher aimed to know which kind of concepts and models were applied by previous scholars. The study is confined to the Airbnb and Couchsurfing. For this study, the researcher has followed umbrella type of review research which will shed light on the knowledge of peer-to-peer accommodation and sharing economy.

Introduction

Airbnb

Airbnb as a subset of modern hospitality is becoming more popular in twenty first century. Therefore, it is chosen

Corresponding Editor

Ramesh Raj Kunwar
kunwar.dr@gmail.com

for this study as it is the largest platform of its kind. This new innovation in rental platform has brought tremendous changes in hospitality sector; however, this industry flourished particularly in the city centers. Airbnb is privately owned rental website for countries around the world that provides a peer-to-peer platform for individuals to rent rooms, flats, apartments, villas and other temporary accommodations at a wide range of prices (Dalir, Mahamadaminov, & Olya, 2020).

Airbnb is the largest platform of its kind, with over six million hosts in 191 countries providing temporary housing to 300 million travelers (Airbnb, 2018). It is an online platform where people can book rooms/accommodation and travel experiences (e.g. excursions). Airbnb itself does not own, rent, manage or control the properties rented out on its website; however, it has grown very rapidly over the past several years, with millions of tourists having used the platform for service in more than 100,000 cities in the world. The net worth of Airbnb is valued at US\$ 38 billion as of 2018, a significant increase relative to 2017 which was US\$ 31 billion (Lock, 2019; Airbnb, 2019a; in Dalir et al., 2020). Its tasks are limited to listing spaces, processing payments, acting as an escrow and offering damage insurance to hosts. The company takes a 9-12% service fee for service reservation (EPRS, 2017). This study confines to introduction, Couchsurfing, home, network hospitality, review of literature, the concept (sharing economy, disruptive innovation, trust, motivation, moral identity, overtourism and circular economy), and conclusion. This study will be very useful to the students, researchers, academics, entrepreneurs, policymakers, planners and other general readers to understand tourism and hospitality in better way. Understanding the concept, recognizing the value as an approach has been borrowed from Williams (2010) for making the title of this study.

Platforms act as intermediaries, matching peers and taking over certain tasks to ensure smooth transactions (Hagiu & Spulber, 2013; Parker & Van Alstyne, 2005; in Möhlmann & Geissenger, 2018). The emergence of digital platforms based on network algorithms that connect millions of people around the globe has paved the way of digital ventures tapping into the potentials of networks and digital crowds. The Airbnb's model unlicensed short term rentals is considered illegal in many cities that apply restrictions to the activities of Airbnb's hosts and guests (Coffey, 2017; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020). These restrictions include commanding Airbnb's guest to pay an occupancy tax or limiting the number of days that property owners can rent out their place per year (Coffey, 2017). In Paris, hosts can only rent their place out for a maximum of 120 days a year while London limits the maximum number of 90 nights (Coffey, 2017). In 2017, Venice and Barcelona protested against over-tourism due to unlicensed Airbnb properties (Coldwell, 2017; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020). In response to this, Palma (Spain) banned short term rentals of private homes to tourists (Day, 2018; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020).

According to venture capitalists, Airbnb is worth \$ 25 billion- more than major hotel chains Hilton (\$ 24.1 billion market capitalization), Marriot (\$ 18.7 billion), Starwood (\$ 12.7), and Windham (\$9 billion). But that do not mean hotels are scared of the new kid on the block. New research from Stanley shows that the hotel industry remains healthy, buoyed by strong growth in revenue per available room and occupancy rates, two of the industry's most important metrics (Truong, 2015). Zervas, Proserpio, and Byers (2017) have correspondingly differentiated between the hotels and Airbnb. Their study shows that Airbnb provides fewer amenities and services whereas the hotels will have many goods and provide elaborated services to their guests. There are five industries-standard price tiers (budget, economy, mid-price, upscale, and luxury) which do not fit into the Airbnb whose price is very low comparing to the hotels. Airbnb will not have conference and meeting rooms which are considered as quintessential for hotels. There will be less impact of Airbnb on chain hotels which has a larger marketing. To some extent, the independent hotels might be affected by Airbnb.

Since the early 1990s, several studies have been conducted to identify the factors determining the price of hotel accommodation. The hotel price falls into five categories: site- specific categories (hotel location and its investment), quality- signaling factors (based on how buyers get information and good marketing), hotel services and amenities (different facilities inside the hotel), accommodation specification (number of rooms, age of buildings, and presence of business centers, car parking area, bar, fitness center, swimming pool etc.), and external market (attraction, guest willingness to pay). In the hotel industry, stars and chain affiliation are identified as quality signaling factors (Wang & Nicolau, 2017, pp.121). The study confirms that the factors related with site, property attributes, amenities, services, rental rules, and customer reviews also significantly influence the prices of sharing economy based accommodation rentals, as they do in hotel industry (Wang & Nicolau, 2017, p.130). The seeds of a significant transformation within the tourism accommodation sector were led in 2007 in the form of three air mattresses on the floor of a San Francisco apartment. A major conference was in town, and two recent university graduates had used a simple website to successfully advertise their apartment as an 'AirBed & Break-fast' for conference delegates booking to avoid the city's high hotel prices. Pricing is widely acknowledged to be one of the most critical factors determining the long term success of the accommodation industry (Hung et al., 2010; in Wang & Nicolau, 2016).

Since the emergence of P2P accommodation sharing providers, such as Airbnb and Couchsurfing, many positive impacts have been argued to emanate from this type of alternative accommodation (Martin, 2016; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). For instance, it has been suggested that accommodation providers will generate revenue

from their under- utilized space and consumers will pay less for accommodation (*Economist*, 2013). It has been claimed that P2P accommodation provides a unique and authentic experience compared to traditional forms of accommodation (Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). It is therefore of no surprise that the traditional hospitality industry has “mixed” feelings about the P2P accommodation industry (*Economist*, 2013; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018).

In tourism and hospitality marketing and management, identifying various accommodations attributes that influence hotel selection and guest satisfaction is considered important due to its practical relevance in attracting new guests and retaining current patrons. Indeed, various studies suggest that there are different hotel features that guests evaluate and use as decision criteria in the hotel selection process (Clow, Garretson, & Kurtz, 1994; Dolnicar, 2002; in Tussyadiah, 2015). It is suggested that guest decision making, which includes hotel selection, satisfaction, and post-purchase behavior, is a result of cognitive and affective response to hotel attributes (Westbrook, 1987; in Tussyadiah, 2015). Herzberg’s Two- Factor Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1962; in Tussyadiah, 2015) has been used to explain the different hotel attributes that contribute to satisfaction (Balmer & Baum, 1993; in Tussyadiah, 2015). The theory suggests the following conditions: (1) hygiene (maintenance) factors, whose absence would lead to conditions of dissatisfaction, and (2) motivators (true satisfiers) factors, whose presence would lead to conditions of satisfaction.

In the case of P2P accommodation (Airbnb), the guest choose three types of accommodation: an entire house/ apartment, a private room (often with shared facilities), or a shared room. Costs saving, value for money, and a drive for community are confirmed as motivators for the use of P2P accommodation (Guttentag, 2013; Möhlmann, 2015; Owyang, 2013; in Tussyadiah, 2015).

The mutual review system of hosts and guests is seen as the foundation of trust in Airbnb transactions (Finley, 2013; Guttentag, 2013; Lehr, 2015; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016), even though precisely the reciprocity of the system is considered to undermine its reliability (Slee, 2013; Zervas et al., 2015; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016). The users refer to this study are the hosts and their properties as their listings. Each host is associated with a set of attributes including a photo, a personal statement, their listings, guest reviews of their properties, and Airbnb certified contact information. Similarly, each listing displays attributes including location, price, a brief description, photos, capacity, availability, check-in and checkout times, cleaning fees and security deposits (Zervas et al., 2017, p.690). Airbnb describes itself as “a trusted community marketplace for people to list, discovers, and book unique accommodation around the world” (Zervas et al., 2017, p.689). Prospective hosts list their spare rooms or apartments on the Airbnb platform; establish their own nightly, weekly or monthly

price; and offer accommodation to the guests. Airbnb derives revenue from both guests and hosts for this service: guests pay a 9% to 12% service fee for each reservation they make, depending on the length of their stay, and hosts pay a 3% service fee to cover the cost of processing payments (Zervas et al., 2017).

Couchsurfing

Couchsurfing, as mentioned above, is another important and popular hospitality platform which will also play the role of intermediary between hosts and the guests. Couchsurfing, is heralded as the emblem per excellence of the 'sharing economy' (Kamenetz, 2011; Sacks, 2011; in Germann Molz, 2013, p.215), employs a variety of technical mechanisms and reputation systems to connect travelers with willing hosts in their destination and, perhaps more importantly, to build a high degree of trust among strangers. Collaborative consumption and the sharing economy thus build on the same foundation of moral economy (Germann Molz, 2013). Germann Molz, on the ground of Beck (2003, p.70), explains that moral economy is based not on the exchange of money, but on cooperation and generosity, shared goods and services, and mutual help and support, a moral economy involves a far different kind of exchange from the market economy (2013, p.915).

Couchsurfing is a global network of travelers who host each other for free in their homes, usually for a night or two. Though the history of Couchsurfing goes back to 2001, started by Ramon Stoppelenberg, Dutch nationality, who left home and launched a website, which later on turned into CouchSurfing.com was originally launched in 2003 founded by an American web developer named Casey Fenton as a noncommercial site. The network grew quickly, and with more than 3.5 million members worldwide by 2012, Couchsurfing is by far the largest hospitality exchange site online (Germann Molz, 2013). Like other, online social networks, the Couchsurfing website consists primarily of members' profiles featuring autobiographical descriptions, photographs, and links to friends in the network, along with references from previous hosts and guests, all of which help to establish an individual's reputation and trustworthiness within the community (Germann Molz, 2013). Appealing to the Internet's early principles of democratic, inclusive, and non-commercial exchange, hospitality exchange networks like Couchsurfing seem to reassert what many commentators writing in the early 1990's saw as the 'true' intentions of the Internet: to create a virtual global community that would bridge political, cultural and geographical divides (Rheingold, 1994; in Germann Molz, 2013, p.224). From the beginning, the founder of Couchsurfing maintained that the goal of Couchsurfing was not about money, but about creating a better world. By rejecting profit models and commercial exchange, Couchsurfing seemed to offer a new economic model that realized the moral affordances of the Internet. Thus, Couchsurfing was seen as a beautiful possible: to travel the world without money. But as time passed by Couchsurfing now faces a

moral dilemma as it shifts from a non-profit organization to a benefit corporation (Germann Molz, 2013, p.220).

Trust is as crucial to the effective functioning of hospitality communities as reciprocity, and the websites seek to circulate trust as a way of ensuring safety in the physical encounters between members (Germann Molz, 2007). The most extensive security system that these websites operate is the 'reputation system'. Reputation systems, which are common in commercial websites like eBay or Amazon.com marketplace. Resnick et al., (2000; in Germann Molz, 2007) explain how online reputation systems work: A reputation systems collects, distributes and aggregates feedback about participants' past behavior, ...These systems help people decide whom to trust, encourage trustworthy behavior, and deter participation by those who are unskilled or dishonest (Germann Molz, 2007).

In her article on the 'technologies of hospitality', Bialski (in Germann Molz, 2011) points out the ways in which Couchsurfing encounters differ from both commercial hospitality enterprises and informal hospitality offered between friends and family because Couchsurfing is governed neither by the rules of a market system nor by the constraints of familial obligation, the terms of reciprocity between hosts and guests are constantly in flux. Bialski argues that this fluidity can produce deeply meaningful, trustful and transformative encounters between strangers (Germann Molz, 2011).

This not-for-profit status of the sites is inextricably tied into this formation of community, as the Hospitality Club website indicates: The Hospitality Club is a non-commercial project .We founded it because we truly believe in the idea that bringing people together and fostering international friendships will increase intercultural understanding and strengthen peace. We do not want to make a profit with this site (Germann Molz, 2007, p.73). In 2011, when Couchsurfing lost its bid for non-profit status, it converted instead into a B Corp, or 'benefit corporation'. Couchsurfing opens up private domestic spaces to strangers, troubles the hosts/guests dichotomy and notions of reciprocity, and promises access to more 'authentic' experiences of local life (Germann Molz, 2011). This is relatively new for the profit corporate models adopted primarily by businesses with pro-social or environmental agenda. Organizations under this model are audited by third party groups, similar to agencies that certify products as 'fair trade' or 'organic', which assess them on their social benefit and impact on the environment, and not solely on maximizing shareholder investment. After making the change, Couchsurfing raised US\$ 7.6 million from a small number of external investors (Germann Molz, 2013).

Home

The intimate domain of the host's home and local neighborhood thus constitutes a 'xenotopos' which Dennis Zuev describes as a shared terrain where strangers are

able to become familiar with one another's lives and rhythms (Germann Molz, 2011). Home benefits are significantly associated with an overall attitude toward Airbnb (So, Oh, & Min, 2018; in Zhu, Cheng, Wang, Ma, & Jiang, 2019). More importantly, various studies suggest that "feeling home" or a homely feel impacts Airbnb guests's behaviour intention when they choose Airbnb or recommend to others, at least indirectly (So et al., 2018; in Zhu et al., 2019). Guests being made to "feel at home during the stay is a key to satisfying stay in P2P accommodation" (Tussyadiah & Zach, 2017; in Zhu et al., 2019). In comparing Airbnb to hotels, the average nightly rate for Airbnb lodging in Boston was 24.5% less than the average nightly rate for a hotel room in 2015. Moreover, tourists who stay in Airbnb accommodations appreciate the opportunity to experience the local culture by staying in a place like home, living like a local and participating in local events and activities (Milazizi et al., 2018; in Dalir et al., 2020). Social integration, economic gains and enjoyment of the local activities are among the individuals' motivation to use digital sharing economy platforms (Hamari et al., 2016; in Dalir et al., 2020).

Airbnb is promoting their *a home away from home* (Liang, Choi, & Joppe, 2018), *home feeling, a community built on sharing; feeling at home* (belongingness) (Liu & Matila, 2017); and *'living with locals'* (Tran & Filimonau, 2020) where the tourists not only experience the life of a local, but also develop a profound connection with the hosts. Home is etymologically linked to the German, *hēm*, meaning "a person's house or abode, the place where a person leaves or was raised, native country, homeland" (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 2018). The meaning of home was evolved from signifying a physical place, such as a house or a flat, to a set of social, economic and sexual relations (Bowlby, Gregory, McKie, 1997; in Zhu et al., 2019). It is widely acknowledged not only as physical dwellings with functional features but also a place generating attachment, connecting one's present to past and the feature and building one's identity from house to state and country (Coolen & Meesters, 2012 p.3; in Zhu et al., 2019, p.308). Four dominant facets of home categorized the literature, namely, physical structure and the meaning attached to it (material structure and design of the house), spatial dimension (house with neighborhood within a region), temporal facet (the house where they were born and brought up and lived happily) and social relations (social relations to family or group of friends, or even a community) (Zhu et al., 2019).

Airbnb describes itself as a "home sharing" service that facilitates access to spare rooms and temporarily vacant homes. Hosts using are engaging in a form of economic activity that has long been a urban housing markets (Schreier & Turner, 1986; Jefferson-Jones, 2015), from private boarding in the twentieth century (O'Hanlan, 2005) to contemporary private rental "share houses" (Clark & Tuffin, 2015; in Crommelin, Troy, Martin, & Pettit, 2018, p.5). Airbnb hosts seem to emerge as

a “community of practice” with the aim to share knowledge, experience and also set boundaries between what might be understood as responsible hosting behavior (Farmaki, 2019).

Network hospitality

In order to understand the network hospitality, first and foremost, According to Brotherton (1999), hospitality is “a contemporaneous human exchange, which is voluntarily entered into, and designed to enhance the mutual well being of the parties concerned through the provision of accommodation, and/ or food, and/ or drink”(p.168). In course of studying hospitality, the present author (Kunwar, 2017) identified more than twenty one types of hospitality. It is Lashley (2000) who developed three domains of hospitality (hospitality in the social domain, hospitality in the private domain and hospitality in the commercial domain). Probably, network hospitality as developed by Germann Molz (2011) could be placed into fourth domains of hospitality after Lashley (2000).

Social networks now have the capacity to mediate trust relationships (Cook et al., 2005; Foddy et al., 2009; Möhlmann & Geissinger, 2018). Based on this notion of collaboration intensity, it can be argued that Germann Molz’s (2011) coining of the term “network hospitality” may be appropriate to capture different forms of P2P accommodation sharing (Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). Within this definition are embedded, hospitality concepts such as host-guest relationships, questions of power and social control, reciprocity and exchange risk and trust as well as broader issue of equity related to who is included or excluded in the new forms of global community that coalesce online. Germann Molz introduces the term ‘network hospitality’, drawing on Wittel’s (2001) concept of ‘network sociality’, to gesture towards a qualitative sift in the way individuals imagine and performs hospitality in a mobile, mediate and networked society. It is meant to refer to the way Couchsurfers connect to one another using online networking systems, as well as to the kinds of relationships they perform when they meet each other offline and face to face. According to Wittel, social relationships look and feel different today because sociality is no longer premised on community, but rather on diffuse networks of people and technologies. Unlike community, which for Wittel refers to a sense of stability, coherence and belonging derived from long-lasting social ties, physical proximity and shared history, network sociality is fleeting, dispersed and managed at a distance by a range of technologies. Network sociality is ‘de- localized, it is a sociality on the move, a sociality over distance’ (Wittel, 2001, p.70; in Germann Molz, 2011, p. 216).

Objective and methodology

The objective of studying this subject is to highlight the unknown artifacts of Airbnb on the front of tourism and hospitality academia. For this study only available

research articles are consulted. This study is based on the published journals and books. Knowledge production and knowledge dissemination will be possible from two ways: either through original research work which requires financial grant or funding or in the absence of this, the alternative will be the review of secondary sources. Basically, this study is based on interdisciplinary approach. According to Vinsentin (2011,p.xiii), "... interdisciplinary is a means to identify and study new themes that single discipline would not able to put into focus, describe interpretably themselves". Newell (2007, p.240; in Repko, 2012) writes, interdisciplinary study is a two part process: it draws critically on disciplinary perspectives, and it integrates into a more comprehensive understanding ...of an existing complex, phenomenon [or into] the creation of new complex phenomenon" (Repko, 2012, p.15).

This study has selected umbrella review for preparing the whole diverse information published in different journals. Out of fourteen types of review, umbrella review refers to compiling evidence from multiple reviews into one accessible and usable document. Focuses on broad condition or problem for which there are competing interventions and highlights reviews that address these interventions and their results (Grant & Booth, 2009, p.95).

Review of literature

'Review' is defined as 'to view, inspect, or examine a second time or again'(Oxford English Dictionary, 2008; in Grant & Booth, 2009, p.92, 107). Review articles can cover a wide range of subject matter at various levels of completeness and comprehensiveness based on analysis of literature that may include research findings (Grant & Booth, 2009, p.97). Review papers tend to include both quantitative (i.e., meta-analytic, systematic reviews) and narrative or qualitative components; together, they provide platforms for new conceptual frameworks, reveal inconsistencies in the extant body of research, diverse results ,and generally give other scholars a "state-of-art" snapshot of a domain often written by topic experts (Bem, 1995; in Palmatier, Houston, & Hulland, 2018). Basically, Palmatier et al. (2018) have presented the review based on domain-based review papers, theory -based review papers and method-based review papers. Domain based review papers review, synthesize, and extend a body of literature in the same substantive domain. Theory based review papers review, synthesize, and extend a body of literature that uses the same underlying theory. Method based review papers review, synthesize, and extend a body of literature that uses the same underlying method (Palmatier et al., 2018).

It is Guttentag (2019) who has reviewed altogether 212 different research papers which are related with rental platform or P2P accommodation. The latest review on Airbnb by Guttentag (2019) has categorized his overall airbnb research into six different thematic categories- Airbnb guests, Airbnb hosts, Airbnb supply and its

impacts on destinations, Airbnb regulations, Airbnb's impact on the tourism sector and Airbnb Company. They are Prayag and Ozenne (2018) who have reviewed 71 papers on P2P accommodation sharing over the 2010-2016 published in various academic journals. As they found 30 papers appeared in tourism and hospitality journals publishing which represented a third (35.3%) position of all the articles. From a disciplinary perspective, tourism, leisure, and hospitality has published the most articles (47.9%) followed by business disciplines (18.3%) and law (11.3%). They found that 43.6% studies adopted quantitative methods and 25.4% were based on qualitative methods and 7% studies followed mixed method (p.6).

Adopting this approach, Prayag and Ozanne (2018) follow the multi-level perspective (MLP) to understand P2P accommodation recommended by Cheng (2016). From the systematic review, Prayag and Ozanne (2018) have identified seven key themes: conceptual development; regulation; macro-level impacts; regime response; host behavior; guest/ host experience; and marketing issue. In order to develop these concepts, the authors consulted MLP or socio- technical transition theory for the purpose of understanding system transitions. The MLP was used to explore socio-technical transformation of societal functions, such as mobility and transport, energy, sharing economy, and housing (Martin, 2016; Nykvist & Whitmarch, 2008; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). They also studied on transitions in hospitality (Bowie, 2018; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018) and tourism (Gossling, Hall, Ekstrom, Engeset, & Aall, 2012; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). A central feature of the MLP is the interaction at multiple levels of analysis. The framework incorporates a macro-level of socio- technical regimes; and a micro-level of landscape developments, a meso-level, socio-technical regimes and a micro-level of innovative technologies and niche actors (Geels, 2002; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). The landscape level includes long term political, economic, socio- cultural and technological macro developments, which influence consumers and business. At the meso-level, socio-technical regimes comprise the multi-actor network of social groups who populate an industry and adhere to a semi-coherent set of rules (Prayag & Ozanne, 2018).

Although Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012; in Belk, 2014) conflate collaborative consumption and sharing in their concept of "access-based consumption", they accurately describe the domain and motivation of collaborative consumption in observing that instead of buying and owning things, consumers want access to goods and prefer to pay for the experience of temporarily accessing them (p.881; in Belk, 2014). Collaborative consumption is the subset of Bardhi and Eckhardt's (2012) notion of access- based consumption that they call market- mediated access. At the end, Belk (2014) concludes that sharing makes a great deal of the community; it may also develop great deal of sense for businesses that are sufficiently flexible, innovative and forward thinking.

Felson and Spaeth (1978; in Belk, 2014, p.1597) define acts of collaborative consumption as “those events in which one or more persons consume economic goods or services in the process of economic goods or services in the process of engaging in joint activities with one or more others (p.614). They include examples of speaking on the telephone, drinking beer, with friends, and having sex while using birth control products. Botsman and Rogers (2010, p.xv; in Belk, 2014) who see the concept as including traditional sharing, bartering, lending, trading, renting, gifting, and swapping”. This view is also too broad and mixes marketplace exchange, gift giving and sharing. Elsewhere Belk (2014) calls the transactions on these faux sharing commercial ventures “pseudo-sharing” in that they often take in a vocabulary of sharing (e.g. car -sharing) but accurately short- term rental activities.

Zervas et al. (2017) studied on the rise of sharing economy from the view point of economic perspective. In this study they used economic theory of two-sided markets- for example, structural model that establish theories of price structural models that establish the theories of price structure and usage (Rochete & Tirole, 2003; Rysman, 2009; Weil, 2010; in Zervas et al., 2017), and models that connect innovations in product design to network effects (Parker & Van Alstyne, 2005; in Zervas et al., 2017). There are few studies carried out by Jym & Rysman (2012; Jin & Rysman, 2012; in Zervas et al., 2017) is closely related with the concept of Zervas et al. (2017).

Zervas et al. (2014; in Heo, 2016) estimated that a 1% increase in Airbnb listings causes a 05% decrease in hotel revenues in the US state of Texas. Later, Zervas et al. (2017) analyzed over 600,000 listings on Airbnb worldwide and reported that nearly 95% of them boast an average user- generated rating of either 4.5 or 5 stars (the maximum). There is another study which has been carried out by Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2004), and Shaw, Bailey, and Williams (2011) who applied a theory known as Service- dominant logic proposed by Vargo and Lusch, 2004). This theory explains the growing popularity of sharing economy businesses. SDL claims that the paradigm has shifted from company- centric value creation to co- creating value with consumers (Shaw et al., 2011). SDL emphasizes the importance of interaction between consumers and service suppliers, as this is the enabler of co- creation of value (Vergo & Lusch, 2008; in Heo, 2016).

While quoting to European commission report(2018), Farmaki (2019) writes that, there are approximately 30 million adults in Europe who feel frequently lonely, with 75 million people meeting friends and family at most once a month. Loneliness is defined as “the unpleasant experience that occurs when a person’s network of social relationships is significantly different in either quality or quantity”. Lonely individuals will typically seek connectedness to, and affirmation from, others as a means to mine feeling of loneliness (Perlman & Peplau, 1984; in Farmaki, 2019). Within this context, tourism as a social force often emerges as a means of escaping loneliness (Larsen,

2007; in Farmaki, 2019) for reducing the feeling of loneliness. Now a days, online travel communities and sharing economic platforms have been found positively influence online socialization and sense of belonging (Lee & Hyun, 2015; Möhlmann, 2015).

In a study of ‘to share or to access’, Xie, Kwok, Chen and Wu (2020) have reviewed the concept of status quo bias developed by Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler (1991), Samuelson & Zeckhauser (1988), the loss aversion theory developed by Kahneman and Tversky (1982) and the novelty seeking theory developed by Assaker and Hailak (2013; in Xie et al., 2020), the authors show that the selection of the type of peer-to-peer accommodation would depend on both the quantity and quality aspects of the previous traveler stays. They further express that they could not find the influential factors such as length of stay, travel purpose, budget, traveler age, the size of the traveler part, and preference.

Airbnb in China

Airbnb in China is different than the other countries; therefore, the author has focused on Chinese hospitality as unique traditions in the world. Chinese hospitality is known as *haoke* and *jiedai* and the hosts and the guests are called *zhu* and *ke* respectively (Chen, 2017). Airbnb is going to be very popular in China. It is estimated that there are 78 million users in 2017 and its overall transactions equate to approximately 14.5 billion Yuan (China State Information Center, 2018a; in Zhang, Wang & Cheng, 2020). By 2018, there have been more than 3.5 million P2P accommodation listings offered by different platforms in 500 Chinese cities. The P2P accommodation has been run by two different platforms: foreign funded Airbnb known as *Aibying* (literally means “love and welcome each other”) and locally funded Airbnb which is known as *Xiaozhu*. *Ziaozhu* was first introduced in 2012 whereas the *Aibying* was introduced in 2015.

In Chinese Airbnb much more there are four cultural traditions which are known as *Renqing*, *Guanxi*, *Mianzi*, and *Yuan* as mentioned by Zhang et al. (2020). These cultural traditions are linked with Chinese locally funded Airbnb. *Zhu and ke* (Zhu et al., 2019, p.20; Chen, 2017) (host- centric foundation with distinct ways of treatment towards guests (friends), strangers and enemies) paradigm, *Mianzi* (Chen & Zhang, 2019) (Chinese cultural-norm and largely represents their social status) , and *Guanxi* (Zhu et al., 2019, p.20)(usually, it works in concentric circles where family members and close friends are at the centre and distant acquaintances and colleagues are in the periphery which symbolizes that believe in hierarchically structured network of social relations. As far as *Yuan* and *Renqing* attributes are concerned, they focus on contextual factors to play a role in the case of *Yuan* and the emotional response,

gift exchange and social norms in the case of *Renqing*. Thus, Chinese people tend to socialize with others according to different social rules (Zhang et al., 2020).

Airbnb in Nepal

Over 300 homestays and apartments of Nepal provide service like Airbnb as a platform for bookings which are listed on Airbnb. This model of shared economy is also gaining popularity among Nepal's hospitality entrepreneurs. A snap survey conducted by Republica shows a typical Airbnb host makes anywhere between 50,000 and 80,000 per month. Airbnb hosts get good bookings during peak tourist season i.e. September to December. While use of Airbnb in Nepal is growing with every passing year, government officials do not seem much aware about its operations. Hoteliers, however, have expressed concerns over increasing use of Airbnb by tourists visiting Nepal that all the hotels are required to register before operation, but Airbnb properties in Nepal are neither registered nor are they paying tax to the government (Pradhan, 2019). The tariff rate of Airbnb rental platform in Nepal starts minimum from US\$ 10 and goes maximum to US\$ 100; however, US\$ 15- US\$ 25 are the most transacted tariff in Nepal (<https://www.airbnb.com/s/Kathmandu--Nepal>). Likewise, 'OYO' is another popular digital rental platform in Nepal. The study in the field of Airbnb- a digital rental platform has not been undertaken yet in Nepal; therefore it is very important to conduct a research on this platform.

The concept

According to Stephen Holiday (2019), the word concept is a noun that generally means thought or idea or notion. In other words, a concept is what one develops after he/she has studied an issue for some time and considered all aspects. A concept is a symbol expressed in language that represents a phenomenon Or an abstract idea generalised from particular instances (Novak, 1998, p.21; Wallac & Wolf, 2006, pp.4-5; in Repko, 2012, p.126). After the meaning of concept, we should know what conceptualization is.

Since 2010 many tourism and hospitality scholars including business studies have been continuously studying on Airbnb, sharing economy, Peer-to-Peer accommodation by following various theoretical models, approaches and concepts borrowed from different disciplines such as psychology, economics, sociology, marketing and so on. Among the various theories, the special focus has been made on sharing economy, disruptive innovation, trust, motivation, moral identity and circular economy. Under the umbrella of sharing economy, P2P accommodation has developed rapidly, generating wide impact on traditional hospitality industry tourists and policy-makers worldwide (Guttentag, 2019). One of the most studied themes is P2P user experience (Liang et al., 2018; Mody, Suess, & Lehto, 2017; in Zhang et al., 2020). Various aspects of P2P user experiences have been examined

including host-guest interaction (Cheng & Zhang, 2019; Farmaki & Stergiou, 2019), user-platform interaction (Sigala, Toni, Renzi, Pietro, & Mugion, 2019). The study of Brochado, Troilo, & Shah (2017) indicates an overall convergence of Airbnb guests experience among India, Portugal and the United States. In contrast, Chinese users' P2P accommodation experiences are found to be different from Western users (Zhu et al. 2019) and can be strongly related to the unique Chinese culture and traditions (Zhang et al., 2020; Cheng & Zhang, 2019). Conceptualization is the process of specifying what we mean when we use particular terms.

Sharing economy

Benkler (2004; in Belk, 2010, p.717) sees sharing as “nonreciprocal pro-social behavior”. Belk (2007, p.126; in Belk, 2010, p.717) defines sharing “the act and process of distributing what is ours to others for their use and/ or the act and process of receiving or taking something from others for our use”. Sharing is a phenomenon as old as humankind, while collaborative consumption and the “sharing economy” are phenomena born of the internet age. The sharing economy is an economic model based on a set of exchange and sharing practices, both material goods and services and knowledge (Girard & Nocca, 2017; in Naydeonv, 2018). Sharing economy can be defined as “economic activity that is peer- to- peer, or person-to-person, facilitated by digital platforms” (Schor, 2015, p.14; in Phua, 2018). This sharing of excess capacity may often be more efficient than the production of new goods or services, helps to justify the sharing economy’s reputation for supporting sustainability (Schor, 2014). Schor (2014; in Crommelin et al., 2018) had identified four broad categories of economic activity generally included in the sharing economy: Recirculation of goods (e.g. reselling/ giving away goods through eBay or Gumtree); increased utilization of durable assets (e.g. home or car sharing via digital platforms like Airbnb, Couchsurfing, or Zipcar and car next door); .exchanges of services (e.g. hiring a cleaner through Airtasker); and sharing a product assets (e.g. co- working spaces and market spaces). Each of these categories does involve sharing of excess capacity in an asset or service, which is one of two qualities Benkler (2004; in Crommelin et al., 2018) identifies as essential elements of the sharing economy. Freken et al. (2016) as cited by Osmak and Boswijk (2016), claim to distinguish the sharing economy from other economic forms:

1. Sharing is about consumer-to- consumer platforms and not about renting or leasing a good from a company (business-to-consumer).
2. Sharing is about consumers providing each other temporary access to a good, and not about the transfer of ownership of the good.
3. Sharing is about more efficient use physical assets and not about private individuals delivering each other a service.

Specifically this study identifies the factors determining the price of sharing economy based accommodation, which differ from those determining hotel price (Wang & Nicolau, 2017). This study highlights on Airbnb, a provider of travel accommodation (Zervas, et al., 2017) and ‘the founder of sharing economy’ (Wang & Nicolau, 2017). Because Airbnb has served more than 50 million guests since it was founded in 2008 and has a market capitalization eclipsing \$ 30 billion. Some scholars have also carried out their works on peer- to-peer accommodation from economic perspective (Zervas et al., 2017). Their findings show that hosts who offer accommodation to rent on Airbnb usually charge higher prices if their accommodation has received high star ratings (Gutt & Herrmann, 2015). In the context of sharing economy, the digital platform in community represents a company or an organization, with some of those platforms profiting from a strong brand image. Every night, the hundreds of thousands of tourists choose not to stay in a traditional tourism accommodation, such as a hotel, but rather stay in the residence of a stranger found online via Airbnb (Guttentag, Smith, Potwarka, & Havitz, 2017).

The sharing economy is the result of technological and socio-economic progression (Belk, 2014). The explosive growth of peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation service presents a potential transformation in the competitive landscape of accommodation sector (Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018). The rapid development of information and communication technologies, both hardware (smartphones and iPads) and software (Web 2.0 applications), has enabled users to generate their own content, share information, collaborate, and conduct transactions via online platforms/ marketplace (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; in Wang & Nicolau, 2016). The platforms have emerged as alternative suppliers of goods and services traditionally provided by long-established industries. Consumers have so far enthusiastically adopted the services offered by firms such as Airbnb, Uber, Lyft, and TaskRabbit. The rapid growth of peer-to-peer platforms has arguably been enabled by two key factors: technology innovations and supply-side flexibility. Technology innovations have streamlined the process of market entry for suppliers, facilitated searchable listings for consumers, and kept transaction overhead low. Supply-side flexibility is another hallmark of these platforms: Uber drivers can add or remove themselves from the available supply of drivers with a swipe on an app, and similarly other suppliers can readily list and delist the selection of goods or services they offer (Zervas, et al., 2017, p.687).

The notion of sharing also presumes trust between groups (Lee, 2015; Parigi & Cook, 2015; in Phua, 2018). Böcker and Meelen (2016) define the sharing economy as “consumers granting each other temporary access to their underutilized physical assets (“idle capacity”), possibly for money” (Meelen & Frenken, 2015). Examples of sharing ventures that fit this definition are Airbnb and Couchsurfing for apartment sharing. Many terms and definitions circulate to describe the so-called “sharing

turn” in the economy: the trend that more and more products are shared rather than privately owned (Nesta, 2014; Botsman, 2013; Grassmuck, 2012; in Böcker & Meelen, 2016). But, Böcker and Meelen (2016) focus on peer-to-peer exchanges of goods between consumers. Like other scholars, they also use the term “sharing economy” rather than access- based consumption (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; in Böcker & Meelen, 2016) or “collaborative consumption” (Belk, 2014) because the latter two also refer to large scale business to consumer services such as Spotify or Zipcar.

Most existing studies investigate social and psychological aspects of the sharing economy based accommodation phenomenon, such as motivation of consumers (Guttentag, 2015; Möhlmann, 2015; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2016). The academic literature on the sharing economy can be divided into several areas, one explores the psychological approach of sharing (Belk, 2010; Belk, 2014; in Heo, 2016) while others focus on the legal and financial perspective (Guttentag, 2013; Kassin & Orsi, 2012; Zarvas, et al., 2017) or on topics related to the characteristics of the P2P sharing transactions (Kohda & Masuda, 2013; in Heo, 2017) and the topics have been discussed in various contexts such as car, house and toy sharing. Belk (2007, p.127; in Heo, 2017) describes sharing as “an alternative to the private ownership that is emphasized in both market place exchange and gift giving”. Later, Belk (2010; in Heo, 2017) provided a theoretical review to distinguish “sharing in” and “sharing out” in terms of gift giving and exchange. Similarly, Kennedy (2015; in Heo, 2017) tried to suggest conceptual boundaries of sharing and explain how sharing is positioned as a mode of economy, distribution, and social intensification (Heo, 2017).

The sharing economy concept has been embraced by governments, entrepreneurs and commentators as delivering new forms of opportunity for local and national economies. Accommodation-sharing platform Airbnb is often considered a sharing economy exemplar, and has promoted itself as helping middle-class residents to gain and retain a foothold in expensive housing markets. This narrative is particularly salient in “global cities”, poor housing affordability and high tourist demand inevitably coexists (Crommelin et al., 2018). Policy makers need to recognize the different impacts of these uses in their responses to Airbnb and sharing economy (Crommelin, et al., 2018). Perhaps the one thing that observers agree on is that the sharing economy is a nebulous and poorly-defined concept (Schor, 2014; Slee, 2015; Miller, 2016; Zale, 2016; Frenken & Schor, 2017; in Crommelin, et al., 2018). To an extent, this reflects the concept’s relative novelty, as a phenomenon that has existed for less than a decade. But this uncertainty also reflects the diversity of services associated with the sharing economy (Crommelin et al., 2018).

A study on an online review of Airbnb found the reviews to be overwhelmingly positive (Zervas, Proserpio, & Byers, 2015; in Phua, 2018). But, Phua’s study suggests that some guests’ frustration came from their perception of Airbnb as different from

another platform, as sharing economy and travelers' community that have a stronger value placed on trust instead of it being mainly a platform with some services (Phua, 2018). Frenken et al. (2015; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016) define the sharing economy as consumers granting each other temporary access to underutilized physical assets ("idle capacity"), possibly for money.

At enjoying some moderate success, particularly at the 2008 Democratic National Convention, the website was pre-launched in 2009 as Airbnb.com, and service was expanded beyond shared accommodations to also include the rental of full residences (Guttentag, 2015, p.1102). Airbnb is part of a larger rise in the 'sharing economy' (often also called 'collaborative consumption'), one aspect of which involves individuals renting access to their under used assets, ranging from living spaces to cars to power tools (Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Geron, 2013; Guttentag; 2015). Basically the new comers are found in online platforms that range from accommodation (e.g. Airbnb, HomeAway, CouchSurfing,) to transport (e.g. Uber, BlaBlaCar), and also include customer reviews (e.g. TripAdvisor), general information (e.g. Wikipedia, Wikitravel), Travel guiding (e.g. ToursByLocals), and food and beverage (Eatwith), among others (Moreno- Gil & Coca- Stefaniak, 2020, p.1). The best known P2P accommodation sharing organizations include Airbnb, Couchsurfing and 9flats (Marchi & Parkeh, 2015; in Prayag & Ozanne, 2018). With P2P accommodation sharing, these include lower pricing, the provision of unique tailored experiences, and mechanisms to facilitate interaction and trust between strangers (Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2015). Airbnb and Uber are also called sharing economic platforms generated revenues of over \$ 640 billion in 2017 (Juniper Research, 2017; in Xie et al., p.77). Take Airbnb as an example, the dominant peer-to-peer (P2P) accommodation-sharing company reported \$ 93 million in profit in 2017 (Bort, 2018; in Xie et al., 2020). One of the selling points of the accommodation services in the sharing economy is their ability to provide travelers unique social interactions between hosts and other guests as a means escape loneliness (Farmaki & Stergiou, 2019).

Airbnb being part of sharing economy is questionable, particularly with increasing popularity, as the goals of both guests and hosts involve both costs-saving and profit learning. Airbnb "looks less and less like a prosumer-dominated 'sharing economy'. Indeed, it appears to be a new arena for capitalist economy" (Ritzer, 2015, p.440; in Phua, 2018, p.3). Now, the hosts on Airbnb are a mixed of professionals and non professionals and non-professional in this industry. For example, realtors and home management agents are also listing properties for rental on the site (Phua, 2018). The question of sharing outside of the immediate family is where the phenomenon of sharing becomes the most interesting and has the greatest social and theoretical implications. From the consumers' perspective, several motivations underlying participation in collaborative consumption have been suggested, despite being supported by anecdotal evidence. The

global economic crisis caused consumers to rethink their values, to be more mindful with their spending habits, and to be more resourceful (Gansky, 2010; in Tussyadiah & Posenen, 2018). The movement towards collaborative consumption, is driven by the increasing value of access as an alternative mode of consumption, as opposed to ownership (Bardhi & Eckhard, 2012; Botsman & Rogers, 2011; in Tussyadiah & Posenen, 2018). Collaborative consumption is perceived as offering more value with less cost (Botsman & Rogers, 2011; Gansky, 2010; Lamberton & Rose, 2012; Sacks, 2011; in Tussyadiah & Posenen, 2018). Widlocks (2004, p.61; in Belk, 2010, p.725) observes that “sharing food with neighbors, relatives, or anyone who happens to be around at the time is done for the sake of shared enjoyment of whatever it is that is being shared. Sharing in this perspective is not primarily sharing out between dyads of givers and receivers but a sharing in, extending the circle of people who can enjoy the benefits of the shared resource”. Sharing out (Ingold 1986; in Belk, 2010) involves giving to others outside the boundaries separating self and other, and is closer to gift giving and commodity exchange, while sharing within the family in that it involves regarding ownership as common, such that the others are included within the aggregate extended self. The rapid rise of the sharing economy is driven by various factors, including societal (e.g. increasing population density, desire community, etc.), economic (e.g. monetize excess inventory, increase financial flexibility, etc.), and technology (e.g. social networking, mobile devices, and payment system) (Owyang, 2013; in Tussyadiah & Posenen, 2018).

Disruptive innovation

Nowadays, a lot of forms lead to generation of disruptive innovation. Existing dominant players and products eventually lose their position in the market because of this disruptive innovation. Christensen et al. (2015; Ma, 2018; Joshi, 2018) defined disruptive innovation as a term in the field of business administration which refers to an innovation that creates a new market and value network, and eventually disrupts an existent market and value network, displacing established market leading firms, products, and alliances. According to the theory, all innovations are not regarded as the disruptive.

The innovative approach to tourism accommodation espoused by Airbnb and other similar companies can best be viewed through the lens of disruptive innovation theory, which was proposed and popularized by Clayton Christensen in several seminal works (Bower & Christensen, 1995; Christensen, 1997; Christensen & Raynor, 2003; in Guttentag, 2015, p.1194). Innovativeness refers to how early an individual tends to be in adopting innovations. Innovativeness is sometimes examined using chronological adopter segments (Rogers, 2003; in Guttentag et al., 2017). Innovativeness is very closely related to the notion of novelty-seeking (Hirschman, 1980; in Guttentag et al., 2017), which is a concept more common within

the tourism literature. Conceptualized as a desire for new and unfamiliar stimuli (Lee & Crompton, 1992; Snepenger; in Guttentag et al., 2017), novelty seeking has been central to some classic tourism typologies (Cohen, 1972; Plog, 1974; in Guttentag et al., 2017) and has been used various tourism segmentation studies (Chang, Wall & Chu, 2006; Mo, Havitz, & Howard, 1994; in Guttentag, 2017).

The rapid growth of peer-to-peer platforms has arguably been enabled by two factors: technology innovations and supply side flexibility. Technology innovations have streamlined the process of market entry for suppliers, facilitated searchable listings for consumers, and kept transaction overheads low (Zervas, et al., 2017). Just a few years ago, the emergence of network hospitality businesses was hardly a topic of academic or of commercial interest although networked. Hospitality businesses as Airbnb are a recent phenomenon; rapid growth has made them a serious competitor for the hospitality industry with important consequences for tourism and for tourist destinations (Oskam & Boswijk, 2016). According to Oskam and Boswijk (2016), technological innovation, sociological, philosophical and an economical factor play important role to bring total societal transformations.

This theory outlines a process through which a disruptive product transforms a market, sometimes to the point of upending previously dominant companies. A disruptive product will generally under perform with regards to the prevailing products' key performance attribute(s), but will offer a distinct set of benefits, typically focused around being cheaper, more convenient, or simpler or consequently, the disruptive product appeals to the low-end of the market or creates a completely new market. This process of disruptive innovation can occur in economic sector, and tourism is no exception. A recent example of this process within tourism can be found in the rise of online travel agencies (OTAs), like Expedia, Travelocity, and Orbitz (Christensen & Raynor, 2003; in Guttentag, 2015, p.1194). The disruptive innovation by Guttentag (2015), the collaborative consumption by Tussyadiah (2015) and Tussyadiah and Pesonen (2016), peer-to-peer survey of short-term rental users and survey of Airbnb users by Nowak et al. (2015), authenticity by many above mentioned authors. Most of the studies have shown that price (or economic benefits) has become the major motivational factors. Household amenities and space have additionally acknowledged in several studies (Guttentag et al, 2017). As mentioned above, authenticity has become another important factor for choosing Airbnb.

Trust

Definitions of trust (Mayer, Davis, Schoorman, 1995; Bamberger, 2010; [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_\(social_science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_(social_science))) typically refer to a situation characterized by the following aspects: one party (trustor) is willing to rely on the actions of another party (trustee); the situation is directed to the future. In addition,

the trustor (voluntarily or forcedly) abandons control over the actions performed by the trustee. As a consequence, the trustor is uncertain about the outcome of the other's actions; they can only develop and evaluate expectations. The uncertainty involves the risk of failure or harm to the trustor if the trustee will not behave as desired ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_\(social_science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_(social_science))).

Trust refers to a firm belief in the reliability, truth, and ability or strength of someone or something (Marsh & Dibben, 2005, in Wilkins, C.H., 2018). Trust has also been defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party (Balkrishnan, Dugan, Camacho, 2003; in Wilkins, C.H., 2018). Trust, in general, is taken as the belief (or a measure of it) that a person (a trustee) will act in the last interests of another (the trustor) in a given situation, even what controls are unavailable and it may not be in the trustee's best interest to do so (Marsh & Dibben, 2005). The study of trust is also linked with untrust, distrust and mistrust (Marsh & Dibben, 2005) but the present author has not visited in these areas. Trust is widely recognized as a strategic, relational asset for business organizations. It is "paramount for product acceptance, a good working atmosphere, and smooth relationships with local government, investment criteria, and so on" (Garcia-Marza, 2005, p. 209; in Castaldo, Premazzi, Zerbin, 2010, p. 657).

Among the various concepts of Airbnb studies, trust has been considered as one of the most important attributes which will shed light on the relationship between three different agencies-digital platform, guests and hosts. Trust has been portrayed as a dyadic relationship between a trustor and a trustee; but in many transactions, in the case of sharing economy, there is found three parties involved: the (digital) platform provider, and a pair of peers acting on that platform. Thus, the conventional dyadic relationship between trustor and trustee is extended to a triad (Hawlitschek et al., 2016b; Weber, 2014; in Möhlmann & Geissinger, 2018). Based on the triadic nature of platform mediated peer trust, Möhlmann and Geissinger (2018) have discussed on interpersonal trust and institutional trust. Interpersonal trust lies at the core of trust in the sharing economy since it refers to relationships between peers acting on these platforms. The sharing platform provider is an enabler for interpersonal trust, while at the same time being dependent on being perceived as a trustworthy institution itself. The institutional trust may refer to a variety of mechanisms, processes and structural assurances that are in place-this might be in particular frameworks, or rules and regulations. It may refer to institutional security or sharing economy platforms embedded in these legal systems (Möhlmann & Geissinger, 2018). Schoorman et al. (2007) argue that ability, is an important antecedent of trust, along with benevolence and integrity as this concept was already founded by Mayer et al. (1995).

Ert, Flisher and Magen (2016) in their study on trust and reputation (is a public opinion that represents a collective evaluation of a group regarding the characteristic

of an entity or a person; Wang & Vassileva, 2007; Ert et al., 2016) in the sharing economy found that consumers are affected by both product attributes (apartment size, location), and shelter attributes (reputation, visual appearance). They have concluded that guests on Airbnb use not only the listing's information, but also the host's information to make their decision. The reliance on the visual cues (host's photos) might be facilitated by the bias of non-visual one (host's reputations). The personal photos play significant role whereas non-visual (reviews) information has an additive effect on trust building (Ert et al., 2016). Trust is a subjective feeling that the trustee will behave in a certain way according to an implicit or explicit promise she makes. It is an essential ingredient for transactions in online P2P marketplaces, since two strangers are unlikely to engage in a monetary transaction without trusting one another (Ert et al., 2016, p.64).

Trust is fundamental to the sharing economy, but difficult to establish online in the absence of traditional factors (such as eye contact) or external systems (such as credit and monetary systems). In this case technology offers a solution to its own problem, replacing traditional strategies of establishing trust with new mechanisms like online reputation systems, self-disclosing profiles, digital photographs, or public online associations with other trustworthy people (Germann Molz, 2013, p.221). The highest level of trust is indicated through vouching. Members can vouch for one another only if they have been vouched for themselves by three other Couchsurfers who have met them in person (Germann Molz, 2013). Trust also invites distrust. There has been considerable discussion in the literature about the concept of distrust, as well as the relationship between trust and distrust particularly within the framework of organizational literatures. According to Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis (2007), both trust and distrust are the opposite ends of the same continuum. Webster's defines distrust as "the lack or absence of trust". In sociology, Ross, Mirowski and Pribesh define "mistrust" (see in detail Marsh & Dibben, 2005, pp.17-33) as the "absence of faith in other people" (1979, p.568; in Schoorman et al., 2007).

This study examines two types of trust: institution-based trust (trust in Airbnb) and disposition to trust (trust in hosts or guests). The institutional form of trust can be defined as a buyer's perception that appropriate conditions are in place to facilitate transaction success with the marketplace's sellers. In highlighting the function of institutional-based trust, Pavlou (2002; in Liang et al., 2018) seems to neglect its social dimension as part of the definition. This was addressed by McKnight et al. (2002; in Liang et al., 2018) who treat institution-based trust as a belief in the possibility of gaining "a satisfactory outcome from a transaction made on a presented structural condition" (i.e. in the Internet) (p.316). It refers to individual's perception of the institutional environment - in their case an experimental website providing advice on legal matters. Adapting McKnight et al.'s definition to this study on Airbnb,

institution - based trust refers to an individual's perception of the institutional environment, including its structures and regulations that contribute to making him/her comfortable with making a purchase through this website.

Bicchieri et al. (2004) suggests that trust refers to a "disposition to engage in social exchanges that involve uncertainty and vulnerability, but there are also potentially rewarding (p.286; in Liang, et al., 2018). While most scholars agree that trust is a psychological state (Rousseau et al., 1998; in Liang et al., 2018), it can be studied in terms of its cognitive or affective aspects (Lewis & Weigert, 1985; Johnson & Grayson, 2005; in Liang et al, 2018). Disposition to trust is another subject matter which has also linked with the study of Airbnb hosts. This has been regarded as a prerequisite of social behavior and is a general rather than situation specific, focused on the faith in humanity (Gefen, 2000; in Liang et al., 2018). Tan and Southerland (2004; in Liang et al., 2018) argued that competence, benevolence and integrity are three important competence of trust. McKnight et al. (2002) defined disposition to trust more specifically in the online context "as the extent to which a person displays a tendency to be willing to depend on others across a broad spectrum of situations and persons" (p.339). Liang et al.'s (2018) study follows the definition of McKnight and write "as the extent to which Airbnb consumer displays a tendency to be willing to trust Airbnb hosts across a broad spectrum of situations.

The authors (Mao et al., 2020) have adopted the e-commerce trust formation model which is based on cognitive approach which enables personal trust as experience, calculative, cognition, personality, and institution- based trust known as five trust bases for analyzing antecedents trust- in-hosts derived from personal psychology and transactional perspectives. Their study begins from experienced - based trust which refers to experience and social exchange knowledge with another party (McKnight, Choudhury, Kacmar, 2002; in Mao et al., 2020). If a trustor possesses first hand data about trustees through prior interactions, then he/ she can determine appropriate trust levels, predict trustees' competences, and reduce the possibility of being taken advantage of by those trustees (Gefen, 2000). Trust is a dynamic process that can either increase or decline based on experience. Studies have shown that experience with e-commerce positively influences consumers' willingness to make online purchases (Metzger, 2007; in Mao et al., 2020), as is the case for traveler using Airbnb.

Möhlmann and Geissinger (2018) adopt a sociological point of departure to understand trust in the context of the sharing economy. This stands in contrast to the economic literature, which often considers trust as an "implicit form of contracting" when describing certain transaction situations. In this regard, economists usually draw on theory addressing transaction costs which discussing trust. However, from a sociological perspective, and in related (information systems) management literature, trust is understood as a more comprehensive concept, also capturing

underlying framework conditions such as personal character traits that might be highly influenced by socialization processes, and the institutional settings in which individuals act (Zucker, 1986; in Möhlmann & Geissinger, 2018). Möhlmann and Geissinger (2018) explain how trust evolved and transformed from family - and institutional- based trust to platform - mediated peer trust in the context of the sharing economy. They argue that trust and trustworthiness (“visual-based trust”; in Ert et al., 2016) in the sharing economy stem from interpersonal relationships that expands outwards in a “radius of trust” (Fukuma, 1995; in Möhlmann & Geissinger, 2018), including trust mediated by digital platforms. Mayer et al. (1995) define trustworthiness as a “willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party, based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party”. Mayer et al. (1995) take this interpersonal perspective as a starting point for further contemplation of organizational trust.

Airbnb has recently provoked sharp media criticism and suffered adverse effects due to concern regarding trust violation (Mody, Sues, & Dogru, 2019). Documented issues include safety (Kennedy, Jones, & Gielen, 2018), security (Phua, 2018), discrimination (Cheng & Foley, 2018), licensing and tax payments (Lines, 2015), and customer service (Phua, 2018), collectively resulting in customer dissatisfaction, disloyalty, and distrust towards Airbnb. With its leading role and ambitious development in the sharing economy, negative reputation and general distrust towards Airbnb may hinder sustainable development of the entire hospitality sharing business. Most of the studies show that Airbnb does not compete with hotels due to its appeal to different market segment, such as vacation rentals and home-stays, and customer base, such as young budget travelers (Guttentag, 2015). As such, trust is a serious issue for Airbnb and deserves further investigation (Mao, Jones, Li, Wei, & Lyu, 2020). Trust, according to Gefen (2000; in Mao et al., 2020), is a driving mechanism behind behavior and social life that forms the basis of economic exchanges and social interaction. Accordingly, Mao et al. (2020) investigated through trust and trust- in-hosts and antecedents of trust- in -hosts. Within this framework they first made efforts to define and describe personal trust linking with affective, cognitive, conative, and behavioral dimensions based on the study of Wang et al. (2014). It typically involves favorable expectations of others’ actions and a willingness to be vulnerable with others (Mayer et al., 1995; in Mao et al., 2020).

Motivation

Tourists’ motivations for choosing Airbnb have been investigated by some scholars (Guttentag, 2015; Guttentag, et al., 2017; Tussyadiah, 2015; Tussyadiah & Pessonon, 2016; Quinby & Gasdia, 2014; Nowak et al., 2015; Lamb, 2011). The term motivation has been defined in different ways, but essentially refers to the reasons why

someone engages in a particular behavior (Hawkins, Mothersbaugh, & Best, 2007). In the nascent literature on the sharing economy, there is an increasing interest in the motivations driving participation. Of the many motivation theories that exist Self Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci; in Böcker & Meelen, 2016, p.12) is frequently drawn upon in sharing economy studies (Tussyadiah, 2016; Hamari et al., 2015; Belloti et al., 2015; in Böcker & Meelen, 2016). In this perspective behavior is driven by intrinsic motivations, which emerge from inherent satisfactions of the activity, and by extrinsic motivations, which relate to outcomes that are separate from the behavior.

Hamari et al. (2015) and Tussyadiah (2016) refer to Lindenberg (2001; in Böcker & Meelen, 2016) to further distinguish intrinsic motivations coming from enjoyment of the activity and from the internalized value conforming to the norm. Tourism literature generally has adopted Dann's (1977, 1981; in Guttentag, et al., 2017) push-pull motivation framework that recognizes both the internal drives that inspire someone to travel ("push factors") and the particular characteristics of certain travel product that pursued the travel to choose it ("pull factor"). While conceptually distinct, push and pull factors are often closely related (Kim, Noh, & Jogratnam, 2007). The push motivations are aligned with psychology, consumer behavior, and some tourism literatures as an inner force or drive to satisfy an internal need (Gnoth, 1999; Hawkins et al., 2007; in Guttentag et al., 2017). In contrast, pull motivations are more aligned with the idea that consumers choose products to seek certain benefits, and such benefits also serve as a common basis for customer segmentation (1968; in Guttentag et al., 2017).

The studies have highlighted on interaction with locals, social benefit from enjoying such Airbnb, sustainability, and location to be the motivational factors. Guttentag (2015) argues that Airbnb does not only enhance the interaction between the hosts and guests, but also allows visitors to connect to the local community. Hamar, Sjöklint, & Ukkonen (2015; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020) advocate the importance of local experience in Airbnb's choice which is in line with Pine and Gilmore (1999; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020) who posit that unforgettable and unique experiences are the main drivers of all transactions within the sharing economy. Likewise, Morgan, Lugosi, and Ritchie (2010) believe that customers not only buy products and services for the material value, but also the experiences delivered alongside the purchase. Precisely, Airbnb is promoting their 'living with locals' where tourists not only experience the life of a local, but also develop a profound connection with the hosts. Thus, Airbnb can benefit both tourists and hosts as tourists have an opportunity to learn more about the destination they visit through the information and tips provided by hosts while, for hosts, this implies the money earned will stay destination (Tussyadiah, 2015).

So far as demotivation is concerned, it describes a decrease in the level of motivation (Dorney, 2001; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020). In the hospitality context,

demotivation represents the factors that prevent visitor choosing accommodation as the core impediment in hotel selection. Despite the similarities, due to the nature of the sharing economy, security and safety concerns represent important attributes in Airbnb choice as demonstrated by Chan and Lam (2013; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018 in Tran & Filimonau, 2020). These concerns are rooted in the lack of trust in strangers when using the online booking platform. Indeed, trust plays important role in customer engagement with Airbnb. Tussyadiah and Pesonen (2018) identified consumer unfamiliarity with Airbnb as one of the major inhibitors of purchase intentions. Given relative novelty of Airbnb, consumers awareness of this accommodation option is yet limited. Language represents another barrier as well as the problem of miscommunication between guests and hosts (Sthapit & Jimenez-Barreto, 2018; in Tran & Filimonau, 2020). Airbnb acknowledges this challenge and attempts to address it by using its tailor-made translation platform based on crowdsourcing (Safar, 2014; in Trant & Filimonau, 2020).

Moral identity

It is noteworthy to follow the study carried out by Germann Molz (2013) who confined her study to online hospitality exchange network Couchsurfing in relation to moral economy of alternative tourism. In this study the author has discussed on Couchsurfing's technical systems, software design, and search algorithms enable participants to engage in a moral economy as a structure of non-commodified exchange based on the trust and as a set of intimate and authentic interpersonal interactions. In conclusion, Germann Molz (2013, p.226) highlights that Couchsurfing's moral affordances-connecting with strangers, sharing material resources, and engaging caring relationships- are inseparable from the discourse of guilt, discipline, pleasure, authenticity, virtue which shapes the moral terrain of alternative tourism more generally. She further emphasizes that moral terrain could be understood by paying attention to the way alternative tourists incorporate social networking technologies into their projects of better world (Germann Molz, 2013, p.227).

There is another school of thought which is known as 'moral identity' linked with network hospitality. Moral identity has been defined as a "self- conception organized around a set of moral traits"(Aquino & Reed, 2002, p.1424; in Farmaki, Stergiou, & Kaniadakis, 2019, p.3). In other words, if individuals feel that moral traits such as being as altruistic, honest, friendly, caring, and fair are central for defining their sense of self, they have a strong moral identity. Thus being a moral person may occupy different levels of centrality in people's self-identity (Reed, 2002; in Farmaki et al., 2019). The above conceptualization of moral identity corresponds to Erikson's (1964; in Farmaki et al., 2019) model which comprises of two dominant characteristics: first, identity is rooted in the core of one's being and second it involves being true to oneself in action (Erikson, 1964). Accordingly, Aquino and Reed (2002) theorized that moral

identity has a private and public aspect labeled, respectively, as internalization and symbolization. Internalization reflects the degree to which moral traits are central to the overall self- schema. Symbolization reflects the degree to which these traits are manifested outwardly to others. Aquino and Reed (2002) proposed that people with a strong moral identity should strive to maintain consistency between conceptions of their moral self.

By following the theories of Aquino and Reed (2002), Farmaki et al. (2019) conducted research on Airbnb host's responsibility in which they focused on moral identity crucial point. Their points are moral identity affects hosting practice. To this they developed a typology of Airbnb hosts linking their understanding of moral identity as a self- assigned construct guiding their behavior with the level of 'professionalism' in hosting practice in P2P transactions (i.e. economic or social) and degree of commitment and hospitality expertise as the role of hosts. But such kind of hosts might have high or low moral identity. Their typology illustrates a spectrum Airbnb hosts :(a) those emerging as moral agents in P2P accommodation whose hosting practice seems to be based on moral self desiring to help to the others in need, (b) agentic hosts who have a practical view in terms of their morality that seems to define their professional identity by safeguarding their reputation (consulting accountants), (c) opportunistic hosts who will define their economic interests (paying taxes), (d) a moral hosts who justify immoral behavior in the context of situational factors where there is lack of regulatory framework on P2P accommodation and/ or peer's immoral behavior (Farmaki et al., 2019).

As Turner (2013; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016), Global Head of Civic Partnerships at Airbnb, explains: our business model is based on people who can't afford their homes and need extra money, so they rent out their homes". The company's success is also be explained by the secondary effects of this basic propositions: a compelling experience value propositions: "Live like a local"; easy access and the establishment of a trusted marketplace, through engagement and community (P2P); the power of the network, leading to increasing scale advantages; and. leveraged assets (Ismail et al., 2014; Boswijk et al., 2015; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016). Trust is an important concern for internet transactions in general and more so if the transaction entails admitting strangers to one private environment. Obviously traditional hotels have a competitive advantage because they reduce risks through standardization, safety regulations and business reputation. Airbnb "horror stories" are abundant on the internet, as well as articles assessing the risks (Nicholls, 2015; Folger, 2015; Lehr, 2015; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016). Kohada and Masuda (2013; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016) suggest that the value created by sharing services resides precisely in the absorption of the risks of customers. Trust represents a value as "reputational capital" allows for higher prices (Ikkala & Lampinen, 2014; in Osmak & Boswijk, 2016).

Many cities worldwide are currently struggling to find ways to regulate Airbnb (Guttentag, 2015). In general, three regulatory approaches have been identified in the existing literature: (1) prohibition, (2) laissez-fair, and (3) allowing it with certain restrictions (Jefferson-Jones, 2014; Miller, 2014; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Laissez- fair can hardly be regarded as regulation since no concrete measures are taken, but some cases , local governments have been able to make a deal with Airbnb in order to receive taxes over transactions made on the platform (Lines, 2015; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Prohibition implies banning STRs altogether, in the entire community or in a certain district. Several researchers have emphasized that not all cities should adopt the same strategy to regulate Airbnb, because its impacts can be different (Gurran & Phibbs, 2017; Guttentag, 2015; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018), depending on geographic location and the type of property rented out (Edelman& Geradin, 2016; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018) or the popularity of the destination (Oskam & Boswijk, 2016). So far, most regulations are failing to achieve their goal, as they approach Airbnb as a traditional industry player, not taking much of its innovative aspects into account (Espinosa, 2016; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Moreover, regulations are expected to vary from one city to another (Guttentag, 2015; Oskam & Boswijk, 2016), as local circumstances- and hence Airbnb's impact on the city-differ.

Overtourism and circular economy

Tourism is not only economic activities, as tourist destinations offer so much more than just products and services- it is the whole system of nature, culture, and history that makes a destination different and competitive. Tourism is a means for local prosperity, and seen through the lenses of the sustainable development, it has to respect both local people and the traveler, cultural heritage and the environment UNESCO (2006; in Nedyalkova, 2016). In order to know about circular economy, we have to know what overtourism is because it is linked with both sharing economy and circular economy.

Coca Cola Grant (2016; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018) described how residents in Barcelona experienced a loss of local culture and cohesion in their neighborhood, which is a concern voiced in many cities across the world (Gallagher, 2017; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Although neighborhoods can profit from increased attention and income, Airbnb and other short term rentals (STRs) can also be disruptive to the traditional lodging industry and trigger gentrification processes; housing affordability and availability are jeopardized when housing units are turned into vacation rentals. Local governments worldwide are struggling to regulate STRs and their negative externalities (Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Therefore, this research looks at several different aspects of policy- making process surrounding Airbnb cities, by answering the following research questions: how do different cities regulate the impacts of Airbnb? The selected cities are all located in Europe or the

United States, where Airbnb is most present (Gutierrez et al., 2017; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). These include Amsterdam, Anaheim, Barcelona, Berlin, Denver, London, New Orleans, New York, Paris, San Francisco, and Santamonica.

So far as restrictions are concerned, scholars have shown four types of restrictions: quantitative restrictions, location restrictions, density restrictions, and qualitative restrictions. Quantitative restrictions include limiting the amount of STR accommodations (Jefferson-Jones, 2014; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018), the amount of allowed visitors or days rented (Guttentag, 2015; Gottlieb, 2013; Miller, 2014; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018), and the amount of times an Airbnb can be rented out per year (Jefferson-Jones, 2014). Locational restrictions confine STRs in specific locations (Gurran & Phibbs, 2017), while density restrictions limit the number of STRs in certain neighborhoods (Jefferson-Jones, 2014). Lastly, qualitative restrictions define the type of accommodation, for example, a complete apartment versus a room or commercial-style Airbnb (Jefferson-Jones, 2014). Local residents worldwide have started to complain about negative impacts of Airbnb-rentals in their neighborhood. Nuisance complaints range from noise caused by visitors (loud parties and drunken behavior), to issues with traffic, parking and waste management, and safety concerns when strangers enter the neighborhood and buildings (Gallagher, 2017; Gurran & Phibbs, 2017; in Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018).

Like other businesses in the travel and tourism industry, Airbnb's operation is subject to seasonality, which can cause over-tourism and fluctuation in revenue (Costa et al., 2018; Goodwins, 2017; in Dalir et al., 2020). Seasonality derives not only from the natural seasons (e.g. summer and winter) but also from commercial and religious seasons (e.g. Christmas and Easter holidays) that affect tourists' decision making thus the revenue of tourism and hospitality services (Rosselló & Sansó, 2017). Overtourism is relatively a new term, also called "loving places to death", "dealing with success" and "tourismphobia" (*Touristofobia* appeared for the first time in 2008 coined by a Catalan anthropologist Manuel Delgado; in Milano, Novelli, Cheer, 2019) (Goodwins, 2017; Dredge, 2017; in Dudds & Butler, 2019), or "Anti-tourism" (Dikinson, 2018) has been defined "the excessive growth leading the overcrowding in areas where residents suffer the consequences of temporary and seasonal tourism peaks, which have enforced permanent changes in their lifestyles, access to amenities and general well-being" (Milano, Cheers, & Novelli, 2018; Dudds & Butler, 2019). Goodwins (2017; in Innerhofer, Erschbamer, & Pechlaner, 2020) defines overtourism as a phenomenon that describes destinations where hosts and guests, locals and tourists, feel that there are too many and that quality of life in the area, or the quality of the experience, has deteriorated unacceptably. Overtourism can also be described as unchecked and unsustainable tourism leading to significant problems. When tourism is not managed correctly, it has the potential to cause much

damage and disruption (Couldwell, 2017; in Innerhofer et al., 2020, p.4). According to Goodwin (2017, p.1; in Dudds & Butler, 2019), destinations experience overtourism when “hosts or guests, locals or visitors, feel that there are too many visitors and that the quality of life in the area or the quality of the experience has deteriorated unacceptably”. The efficiency of services can be decreased when large masses of tourists are concentrated at a destination during a brief ‘peak’ season and little tourist activity occurs during the rest of the year (Lim & McAleer, 2001; in Dalir et al., 2020). Overtourism revenue instability has influence local communities’ perceptions and attitudes toward the tourism industry (Matev & Assenova, 2012; in Dalir et al., 2020). “Overtourism has become a heavy burden for numerous ‘must-see’ locations in recent years, with a sharp rise in international holidaymakers fuelled by budget airlines and the widespread popularity of rental platforms, like AirBnB. The resultant overcrowding has caused environmental, infrastructural, and cultural damage to a number of destinations, and directly impacted local residents’ lives as they are priced out of their homes to accommodate the tourist demand” (Dickinson, 2018).

Anti-tourism is an umbrella term in best understood as a range of negative attitudes or actions towards either a subset or general class of tourists. A.V. Seaton (2000, p.27; in Clancy, 2020, p.15) defines it as “a generic term for adverse criticism of tourists and tourism”. Instead of looking for maximizing the number of tourist arrivals, destination management organizations (and politicians) need to focus on a more balanced approach in tourism growth, i.e. maximizing destination’s tripple bottom line (profit, people, planet; Elkington, 1997; Joshi & Kunwar, 2018; see in detail Böcker and Meelen, 2016) within its carrying capacity (Seraphin & Ivanov, 2020).

Seraphin and Ivanov’s (2020) study claims that overtourism is an indication of a revenue management (which is a marketing and pricing management concept used by a wide range of sectors, including the tourism and hospitality industry; (Forgacs, 2017; Hayes & Miller 2011; in Seraphin & Ivanov, 2020) failure, on both destination and corporate levels, because the demand surpasses the capacity of the destination. Jamieson (2019; in Seraphin & Ivanov, 2020) has identified the lack of management skills at destination and attractions level as a reason for overtourism. In this regard, Clancy (2020, p.22) views that overtourism is not a single cause as many locals are in the midst of a competitive struggle for the city, and thus far many local government and tourist authorities have chosen to side tourists over residents. Failure to change that is likely to lead to more, not fewer, protest against tourists

Smith (2018) has tried to link circular economy (an economic system aimed to minimize physical materials and eliminating waste and continual use of resources) and externalities (the hidden, indirect, impacts-social and economical) in Airbnb. A circular economy is one in which resources are used efficiently to gain the most value from them. What is left over at the end of their life is recycled or reused so as

to reduce waste. It differs from the traditional linear economy whereby things are used, worn out and thrown away in that it instead encourages the reuse and repair of products, and promotes energy savings. The overall goal is to achieve a better balance between people, planet and economic growth (Brightly, 2017). The technologies Airbnb utilizes are not going away soon. Moreover, the regulation is not yet developed as fast to new business models. Therefore, the sharing economy is creating negative externalities that traditional regulation is often ill-equipped to address. It is also being criticized for its rapid growth, such as exacerbating overtourism in cities causing social and environmental impacts; however there are other sharing platforms whose priority is to reduce social and environmental impacts. Bewelcome (first non-profit and open source based travel and hospitality exchange); Trustroots (being built by small team of activists who felt that the world of sharing is being taken over by cooperation trying to monetize peoples' willingness to help each other) and Fairbnb.coop project are valid alternatives to commercial platforms to address the world of short-term accommodation rentals, hosts, guests and neighbors could collectively decide together with municipalities for fairer rental process and more sustainable and more rewarding for the whole community. Similarly, Fairbnb.coop project also argues on investment of platform's profit back in the community where the platforms actually operates from. Smith (2018) concludes that, "the sharing economy is part of circular economy, one which looks to reduce waste by optimizing the use of assets- such as spare rooms or empty flats in the case of Airbnb compared to traditional accommodations like hotels" (p.14).

Conclusion

The extant literatures show that Airbnb as rental platform is rapidly becoming popular in the field of tourism and hospitality sector. In comparison to the other areas of hospitality industry, it was lately originated in 2009. Within very short span of time, this sector attracted many researchers of different disciplines to carry out their research on Airbnb and produced knowledge in the academia that has been gradually disseminated in the field of tourism and hospitality industry. Sharing is the pre-dominant concept of Airbnb rental platform and P2P accommodation. This study finds sharing economy, disruptive innovation, trust, motivation, moral identity and circular economy as the major attributes of Airbnb studies.

Sharing economy is the most universal form of human economic behavior, distinct from and more fundamental than reciprocity...Sharing has probably been the most basic form of economic distribution in hominid societies for several hundred thousand years (Price, 1975; in Belk, 2010). Trust is a major impediment to Airbnb use (Tussyadiah, 2015). To address it, Airbnb encourages users' social connections by sharing personal experiences and facilitating the guest-host interaction (Chen, 2017). Guests and hosts exchange information on their interests of staying and

renting the properties and this communication intensifies during the course of stay and continues after the stay on account of the post-visit reviewing system. Most of the studies carry out the comparison between hotel and Airbnb. There is also a belief that Airbnb does not compete with hotels due to its appeal to different market segment, such as vacation rentals and home-stays, and customer base, such as young budget travelers (Guttentag, 2015). Airbnb's Web 2.0 features allow trust to be established between hosts & guests. This trust is necessary for the widespread acceptance of peer-to-peer accommodation, as many people will understandably be wary of hosting a stranger or sleeping in stranger's home. Airbnb's key trust mechanism is its reviewing features, which allows hosts and guests to post public reviews about one another. As Lauterbach et al. (2009; in Guttentag, 2015) state with regards to CouchSurfing which has similar reviews that, 'Reputation mechanisms are essential for online transactions, where the parties have little prior experience with one another.'

The sharing economy has penetrated the tourism and hospitality marketplace facilitated by online social networking platforms; consumers coordinate the acquisition and distribution of access to accommodation among their peers through services such as Airbnb, a phenomenon known as collaborative consumption (Belk, 2014). Revenues generated from peer- to-peer (P2P) accommodation have surpassed US\$3.5 billion in 2013 with growth exceeding 25% making it as a disruptive economic force (Geron, 2013; in Tussyadiah & Zach, 2015). The rapid rise of peer-to-peer accommodation presents opportunities (generates local income, provides alternative employment) and challenges (regulatory issues) for tourism destinations (Geron, 2012; 2013; in Tussyadiah & Zach, 2015). Consumers should choose sharing platforms based on short and long-term gain as well as individual and community benefits.

Based on the analysis, P2P rental reviews put more emphasis on the hospitality on the hosts (i.e. the experience of being welcome in someone's home) and the locals, with guest highlighting the quiet neighborhood within short walking distance to local restaurants and shops as well as within minutes by bus to downtown. Besides providing nice, clean room, and comfortable bed, the guests would also get morning tea/coffee, private bathroom, and other amenities. Learning and appropriate regulation for fair reporting and fraud protection will be central- although it will need a light touch to encourage innovation while still watching for problems (Malhotra & Van Alstine, 2014). Fang, Ye, & Law (2016) suggest that "the government should formulate appropriate policies for its regulation" which will ultimately satisfy the guests, make benefit to the people and revenue collection for the government. With the rise of P2P accommodation rentals and their impact on the traditional hospitality sector, several researchers have started to explore on it. It is Guttentag (2013; in Heo, 2016) who the tourists use Airbnb not only because of economic benefits but also because of its

experiential values. Smith (2018) argues on the negative externalities of Airbnb and circular economy based activities in the destination should be practiced. Möhlmann's (2015) revealed the satisfaction and likelihood of choosing sharing option again to be predominantly explained by deterrents explaining users' self-benefit such as utility, trust, cost, savings, and familiarity. Tussyadiah (2015) found that sustainability (social and environmental responsibility), community (social interactions), and economic benefits (lower cost) are three main factors that motivate users to stay in Airbnb accommodations.

Identifying stakeholders and understanding relations, potential for collaboration and conflicts between stakeholders are critical issues for destination management (Buhalis, 2000; in Heo, 2016). As sharing economy business have emerged as a new stakeholder for the tourism industry, it is important to understand their role and influence on other stakeholders in the tourism industry. In general, tourists (or consumers), host community (or tourism destination) and the tourism industry (or business owners) are regarded as tourism's three major stakeholders in the tourism literature (William, 2003; in Heo, 2016). If a local resident is providing any type of sharing economy service to tourists, his or her attitude toward tourism development may be different from normal local residents. Hoteliers and taxi drivers tend to see Airbnb and Uber is unfair competition and believe they are evading taxes and regulations. The sharing business model is still its infancy. Accordingly, sharing economic services are expected to have a negative impact on local tourism businesses and conflicts among different tourism stakeholders may become quite virulent. The popularity of the sharing economy in tourism may reflect tourist's desire to connect with the local community (Heo, 2016).

The study estimated Airbnb guests spent \$ 56 million in the city, with the majority on non- accommodation expenditures like food and beverages (\$ 11.8 million), retail (\$ 10.8 million), and entertainment (\$ 5.7 million). The study also found Airbnb guests stayed an average of two days longer than the average tourist (5.5 vs. 3.5 days), and averaged greater total trip expenditures than hotel guests (\$1100 vs. \$ 840). Additionally, the study found Airbnb guests were particularly likely to visit and spend money in areas outside of the tourist core, partly because many Airbnb guests stayed in those areas (72% of the city's Airbnb listings were located of the six central zip codes, as compared with 20% of the hotels) (Airbnb, 2012b; Lawler, 2012; in Guttentag, 2015, p.1208).

Recently, the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak has affected almost all the sectors in the globe where tourism industry is no exception. Thus, Airbnb has also suffered as an impact of COVID-19 pandemic. It is reported that, there has been a significant drop in bookings estimated in between 41% to 96%. In response, the Airbnb Company has lowered its internal valuation from \$31 billion

to \$26 billion (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Airbnb>). Temperton (2020) has also recently published one online article on Airbnb. In this article, the author has critically examined how COVID-19 has impacted on Airbnb in the world.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Rajan Kumar Rai of Department of Conflict, Peace and Development, T.U. Likewise I would also thank to Nimesh Ulak, Lecturer of IST College, Kathmandu, affiliated to Salzburg University of Applied Sciences, Austria. Also my thanks go to Nishan Raj Kunwar.

References

- Airbnb (2018). *New 2018 data: Airbnb grows responsibly and spreads tourism across the country*. [Retrieved From: <https://news.airbnb.com/new-2018-data-airbnb-grows-responsibly-and-spreads-tourism-across-the-country/>]
- Belk, R. (2010). Sharing: table 1. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 715–734. Doi: 10.1086/612649
- Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1595–1600. Doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001
- Böcker, L., & Meelen, T. (2017). Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analyzing motivations for intended sharing economy participation. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 28–39. Doi:10.1016/j.eist.2016.09.004
- Brightly, C. (2017). *Tourism and circular economy*. [Retrieved from: <https://igcat.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/05/TOURISM-AND-THE-CIRCULAR-ECONOMY-.pdf>]
- Brochado, A., Troilo, M., & Shah, A. (2017). Airbnb customer experience: Evidence of convergence across three countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 63, 210–212. Doi:10.1016/j.annals.2017.01.001
- Brotherton, B. (1999). Towards a definitive view of the nature of hospitality and hospitality management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11, (4), 165-173.
- Castaldo, S., Premazzi, K., & Zerbin, F. (2010). The meaning(s) of trust. A content analysis on the diverse conceptualizations of trust in scholarly research on business relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96, 657-668. Doi 10.1007/A10551-010-0491-4.
- Chen, X. (2017). Multidimensional study of hospitality and the host- guest paradigm in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30 (1), 495-513.

- Cheng, M., & Zhang, G. (2019). When western hosts meet eastern guests: Airbnb hosts' experience with Chinese outbound tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 288–303. Doi:10.1016/j.annals.2019.02.006.
- Clancy, M. (2020). Overtourism and resistance: Today's anti- tourist movement context. In Innerhofer, E., Erschmbaner, G., & Pechlaner, H. (Eds.) *Overtourism: Tourism Management and Solutions* (pp.14-24), London: Routledge.
- Crommelin, L., Troy, L., Martin, C., & Pettit, C. (2018). Is Airbnb a sharing economy superstar? Evidence from five global cities. *Urban Policy and Research*, 1–16. Doi :10.1080/08111146.2018.1460722
- Dalir, S., Mahamadarminov, A., & Olya, H.G.T. (2020). Developing a seasonal taxation: Developing a seasonal tax system. *The Economics of Revenue Management in Hospitality and Tourism*, 1-14.
- Dickinson, G. (2018). 'Overtourism' shortlisted as word of the year following telegraph travel campaign. *The Telegraph*. [Retrieved From: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/news/overtourism-word-of-the-year-oxford/>]
- Dolnicar, S. (2018). *Peer- to- Peer Accommodation Networks: Pushing the Boundaries*, Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.
- Dudds, R. & Butler, R.W. (2019). Introduction. In Dudds, R. & Butler, R.W. (Eds.) *Overtourism* (pp.1-5), De Gruyter.
- Elkington, J.(1998), "Accounting for the Triple Bottom Line". *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 18-22. [Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb025539>]
- EPRS (2017). *Tourism and the sharing economy*. European Parliamentary Service (EPRS).
- 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. Doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2016.01.013
- Fang, B.,Ye, Q, & Law, R. (2016). Effect of sharing economy on tourism industry employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57, 264-267.
- Farmaki, A. & Kladou, S. (2020).Why do Airbnb hosts discriminate? Examining the sources and manifestations of discrimination in host practice. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 181-189.
- Farmaki, A. & Stergiou, D.P. (2019). Escaping loneliness through Airbnb host-guest interactions. *Tourism Management*, 74, 331-333.

- Farmaki, A., Stergeiou, D. & Kaniadakis, A. (2019). Self perceptions of Airbnb hosts' responsibility: A moral identity perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-21.
- Germann Molz, J.G. (2007). Cosmopolitans on the couch: Mobile hospitality and the internet. In Germann Molz, J.G. & Gibson, S. (Eds.) *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp.65-82), Aldershot: ASHGATE.
- 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*. Doi: 10.1108/jhtt-08-2018-0075.
- Guttentag, D., Smith, S., Potwarka, L., & Havitz, M. (2017). Why tourists choose Airbnb: A motivation- based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1-18.
- Joshi, B.P. (2018). Disruptive innovation in hospitality human resource. *Journal of Tourism and Education*, 8, 48-61.
- Joshi, B. & Kunwar, R.R. (2018). Sustainability in the hospitality industry A study of Nagarkot, Nepal. *Journal on Tourism & Sustainability*, 1(2), 35-47. [Retrieved from: <http://ontourism.online/index.php/jots/article/view/27>]
- Innerhofer, E., Erschbamer, G., & Pechlaner, H. (Eds.)(2020). *Overtourism: Tourism Management and Solutions* (pp.3-13), London: Routledge.
- Kunwar, R.R. (2017). What is hospitality? *The Gaze: Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*, 8 (1), 55-115.
- Lashley, C. (2000). Towards a theoretical understanding. In Lashley, C & Morrison, A. (Eds.) *In Search of Hospitality* (pp.1-17), Oxford: Butterworth/ Heinemann.
- Liang, L. J., Choi, H. C., & Joppe, M. (2018). Exploring the relationship between satisfaction, trust and switching intention, repurchase intention in the context of Airbnb. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 69, 41–48. Doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.10.015
- Ma, F. (2018). *Disruptive innovation: A case study of AirBnB*. [Retrieved From: <https://medium.com/@feinima/disruptive-innovation-a-case-of-airbnb-450c75d5c910>]
- Marsh, S. & Dibben, M.R. (2005). Trust, untrust, distrust and mistrust-An exploration of dark(er) side. In Hermann, P. (Ed.) *Trust Management* (pp.17-33), Springer.
- Mao, Z. (2020). Sleeping in a stranger's home: A trust formation model for Airbnb. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 67-76.
- Milano, C. Cheers, J.M., & Novelli, M. (2018). Overtourism is becoming a major issue for cities across the globe. *The Conversation*, 18 July 2018.

- Milano, C., Novelli, M., & Cheer, J.M. (2019). Overtourism and tourismphobia: A journey through four decades of tourism development, planning and local concerns. *Tourism Planning and Local Development*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1599604>
- Mody, M., Suess, C., & Lehto, X. (2017). The accommodation experiencescape: A comparative assessment of hotels and Airbnb. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29. 10.1108/IJCHM-09-2016-0501.
- Möhlmann, M. & Geissinger, A. (2018). *Trust in the Sharing Economy: Platform-Mediated Peer, Trust*. Researchgate.
- Naydenov, K. (2018). Circular tourism as key for eco-innovations in circular economy based on sustainable development. Doi:10.5593/sgem2018/5.3/S28.017
- Nedyalkova, S. (2016). Applying circular economy principles to sustainable tourism development. In *PM4SD European Summer School-Abstract and Conference Proceedings, Akureyri* (pp. 38-44).
- Nieuwland, S. & van Melik, R. (2018), Regulating Airbnb: How cities deal with perceived negative externalities of short term rentals. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 811-825.
- Oskam, J., & Boswijk, A. (2016). Airbnb: The future of networked hospitality businesses. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 2(1), 22–42. Doi: 10.1108/jtf-11-2015-0048
- Palmatier, R.W., Houston, M.B., & Hulland, J. (2018). Review articles: Purpose, process, and structure. *Journal of the Academic Marketing Science*, 46, 1-5.
- Phua, V. C. (2018). Perceiving Airbnb as sharing economy: The issue of trust in using Airbnb. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–5. Doi:10.1080/13683500.2018.1440539
- Pradhan, S. (2019). Airbnb is thriving but hoteliers are worried. *myRepublica*. [Retrieved from: <https://myrepublica.nagariknetwork.com/news/airbnb-is-thriving-but-hoteliers-are-worried/>]
- 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. Doi:10.1080/19368623.2018.1429977.
- Putriya, A. R., Hermawan, P., Novani, S., & Putro, U.S. (2018), Peer-to-peer accommodation service process: A framework of service blueprint. *Advances in Economics, Business and Research Management*, 72, 210- 217.

- Qin, D., Lin, P., Feng, S., Peng, K., & Fan, D. (2020). The future of Airbnb in China: Industry perspective from hospitality leaders. *Tourism Review*, 75, <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-02-2019-0064>
- Repko, A.F. (2012). *Interdisciplinary Research Process and Theory*, London: Sage.
- Seraphin, H. & Ivanov, S. (2020). Overtourism: A revenue management perspective. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, Doi: 10.1057/s41272-020-00241-7
- Sigala, M., Toni, M., Renzi, M. F., Di Pietro, L., & Guglielmetti, R. (2019). Gamification Airbnb enter. *e-Review of Tourism Research*. 16. 2019.
- Smith, J. (2018). *Transforming Travel: Realizing the Potential of Sustainable Tourism*, Wallingford: CABI.
- Temperton, J. (2020). Is this the end of Airbnb? [Retrieved from: <https://www.wired.co.uk/article/airbnb-coronavirus-losses>]
- Tran, T. H. & Filimonau, V. (2020). The (de)motivation factors in choosing Airbnb amongst Vietnamese consumers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 130-140.
- Truong, A. (2020). *Why the hotel industry isn't afraid of Airbnb (yet), explained in five charts* quartz. [Retrieved from: <https://qz.com/551612/why-the-hotel-industry-isnt-afraid-of-airbnb-yet-explained-in-five-charts/>]
- Tussyadiah, I. P., & Pesonen, J. (2016). Drivers and barriers of peer-to-peer accommodation stay—An exploratory study with American and Finnish travelers. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(6), 703–720. Doi:10.1080/13683500.2016.1141180
- Tussyadiah, I. P., & Zach, F. J. (2015). Hotels vs. Peer-to-peer accommodation rentals: Text analytics of consumer reviews in Portland, Oregon. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Doi:10.2139/ssrn.2594985
- Vinsentin, C. (2011). Food, agr-culture, and tourism. In Sidali, K. L., Spiller, A., & Schultz, (Eds.) *Food, Agri- Culture and Tourism* (pp.xiii-xv), Springer.
- Wang, D., & Nicolau, J. L. (2017). Price determinants of sharing economy based accommodation rental: A study of listings from 33 cities on Airbnb.com. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 62, 120–131. Doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.12.007
- Williams, P. (2010). *Educational tourism: Understanding the concept, recognizing the value* [Retrieved from <http://www.insight.org.uk/articleitem.aspx?title=Educational%20tourism:%20Understanding%20the%20Concept,%20Recognizing%20the%20Value,>]

- Wilkins, C. H. (2018). Effective engagement requires trust and being trustworthy. *Medical Care*, 1. Doi:10.1097/mlr.0000000000000953
- Wirtz, J., So, K.K.F., Mody, M.A., Liu, S.Q., & Chun, H.H. (2019). Platforms in the peer-to-peer sharing economy. *Journal of Service Management*, 30 (4), 452-483.
- Xie, K., Kwok, L., Chen, C.C., & Wu, J. (2020). To share to access? Travelers' choice on the types of accommodation-sharing services. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 77-87.
- 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. Doi:10.1509/jmr.15.0204
- Zhang, G., Cui, R., Cheng, M., Zhang, Q., & Zhiyong LiA. (2019). A comparison of key attributes between peer-to-peer accommodations and hotels using online reviews. *Current Issues in Tourism*. [Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1575339>]
- Zhang, G., Wang, R., & Cheng, M. (2020). Peer-to-peer accommodation experience: A Chinese cultural perspective. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 33, 1-9.
- Zhu, Y., Cheng, M., Wang, J., Ma, L., & Jiang, R. (2019). The construction of home feeling by Airbnb guests in the sharing economy: A semantics perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 308–321. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2018.12.013
- Zhu, Y., Ma, L., & Jiang, R. (2019). A cross-cultural study of English and Chinese online platform reviews. *Discourse and Communication*, 1-24.

URLS

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Airbnb>

<https://www.airbnb.com/s/Kathmandu--Nepal>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_\(social_science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_(social_science))

<https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-concept>