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Abstract
Since the beginning of the 21st century, the world has witnessed an evolution caused by the exponential spread of the Internet and mobile connectivity. New social networks and business models have arisen, fostered by an emerging need to react to the economic crisis and to the concerning global overpopulation and scarcity of resources. A new socio-economic phenomenon called sharing economy has brought disruption into the world of capitalism industries and traditional commerce enabling the reutilization and exchange of assets and resources among private people. The present work investigates the entrance of sharing economy business models in the tourism sector, especially in the accommodation industry, disrupting the old structures and providing a new form of supply. The sector of vacation rentals in Ticino will be analyzed providing an overview of traditional and non-traditional accommodation suppliers in the region, investigating the market potential in terms of revenues of shared forms of accommodation. The comparison of secondary data from literature and primary data collected through an empirical research, in the form of a questionnaire provided to vacation rental owners of Ticino, will provide a measure and description of the sector in the attempt to estimate the potential economic value of the secondary home and vacation rental market of Ticino. The results will prove that the market potential of the sector is estimated to generate revenues for 28 million Swiss francs annually.
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Introduction

Since the last twenty years the world has undergone a radical change caused by the exponential development of the Internet in number of users and countries with access to it ("Number of Internet Users Worldwide from 2005 to 2016," 2016). New business models have arisen, fostered especially by Internet and mobile connectivity (OECD, 2014). People are always more connected and they exchange information at a high speed, always being updated about facts, trends and issues concerning the society. Traditionally in history, a business was represented by an exchange between a producer -or reseller- of a good or service and the consumer, who paid for that good in order to own it (Demary, 2015). This has been considered an economic model since the introduction of money in societies. Later, production evolved until reaching an era of hyper-consumption, given by economic wealth and economies of scale, causing mass production. Recently, instead, we have been witnessing a change towards collaborative consumption, a new business model in which ownership of a good is no longer essential and people prefer to pay for the access to certain types of goods belonging to others. This model is today present especially within the tourism sector, which has undergone a process of renewal of traditional and mature structures and models, evolving from the trends of sharing and peer-to-peer commerce (Henne, 2014). With the change in business models and the emergence of new needs with consequent new types of services offered, travelers of today have changed their habits related to the three phases of travel consumption, taking advantage of innovative service providers, in the era of mobile and ubiquitous connection (Stamboulis & Skayannis, 2003). Today a consistent amount of decentralized peer-to-peer communities, representing the sharing economy, have emerged as innovative providers of accommodation services among the traditional long-established industries, in order to react to the differentiation of the tourism demand. They provide a different way of consumption that facilitates the less wealthy but always more demanding and hyper-connected travelers from all around the world (Zervas, Proserpio, & Byers, 2014). Few of these business models have been created or adopted by innovative entrepreneurs in the attempt to revolutionize the mature tourism structures and to fulfill the rising needs of a demand that is no longer satisfied by

---

1 The number of Internet users is constantly rising as witnessed by the quantity of people accessing to it, which grew from 2.93 billion in 2014 to 3.17 billion in 2015. This is due to easier technology access, more developed countries and the rise of mobile connection. Furthermore, technology improvement has caused the lowering of Internet costs.

2 Rodrigues and Druschel (2010) define peer-to-peer platforms as systems in which content generation is highly distributed and decentralized for the effect of the organic growth and stronger user self-organization.
traditional service providers. This is the case of Uber, the company, which makes any common person a taxi driver, or Airbnb, which makes a hotel room out of a private apartment.

The objective of this work is to investigate the phenomenon of sharing economy and the emergence of new business models in the field of tourism, specifically in the accommodation sector. The investigation carried out in this work will provide an overview of the model adapted to tourism services, focusing on the sector of vacation rentals in the area of Ticino. It will try to estimate the scale of the sector and its potential market value in terms of revenues. Therefore, the starting point and key question of the thesis is:

*What is the estimation of the potential market value of sharing-economy accommodation forms in Ticino?*

**Chapter one-Part 1** explores and analyzes the literature about the concept of sharing economy, investigating the definition, history and peculiarities of the field. It moves towards the concept at its basis, collaborative consumption, explaining the different kinds and uses, and it describes the product and services of the sharing economy with statistics of the field.

**Chapter one-Part 2** provides an overview of the sharing economy in tourism, analyzing the trends and the development of the phenomenon within travel and tourism related companies. A focus will be put on the accommodation sector describing the difference between traditional and non-traditional forms of accommodation and presenting the sector of vacation rentals.

**Chapter one-Part 3** describes the tourism accommodation market of Ticino, from traditional to non-traditional forms of accommodation. In this section, secondary data in the form of statistics from the tourism observatory of USI (O-Tur) will be presented to describe quantitatively the accommodation supply in the region of Ticino.

**Chapter two** describes the methodology used to answer the research question. A first analysis of secondary data from literature will highlight the correlation between sharing economy and the sector of vacation rentals. Data about vacation rentals in Ticino was used to determine the scale of the sector. Second, an empirical research, that is part of a greater investigation carried out by O-Tur and ACAV Ticino –Associazione Case e Appartamenti di Vacanza Ticino–, will be highlighted. The research is a qualitative and quantitative survey that was conducted on a sample of 685 owners of secondary-home rentals, subscribed to professional agencies and online platforms that are members of the association ACAV
Ticino. The survey had the objective to investigate the structure, prices and occupancy of vacation rentals in Ticino in order to provide an evaluation of the market.

**Chapter three** consists of the results and findings of the analysis made on literature and the empirical part. A comparison between data resulting from literature and data collected through the survey will be presented. The estimation of the potential revenue market value of shared forms of accommodation in Ticino will provide the final answer to the research question. The chapter will conclude with personal considerations on the research and future developments for the investigation.
Chapter 1, Part 1

Literature review

The Sharing Economy

This chapter describes the definition, history and characteristics of the phenomenon of sharing economy according to the present literature about the issue. Part 1 explains the concept and theory of sharing economy and continues with the description of economic business models based on sharing economy, in the field of tourism. Part 2 provides an overview of the tourism sector within the framework of sharing economy, highlighting how the industry has changed following the emerging phenomenon; it continues with the specific case of the accommodation sector and the emergence and growth of online platforms for vacation rental. Part 3 describes the tourism accommodation market of Ticino, providing an overview of the traditional and non-traditional tourism supply of the canton and describing the sector of vacation rentals.

Literature about the concept of sharing economy is very recent and fragmented in different types of sources. The majority of sources come from the Research field, with analytical and empirical studies presented in scientific journals. However, accurate, up-to-date and accessible material comes from other types of sources: specialized tourism and/or business websites; online business and tourism magazines; reports and studies presented by consultancy firms, commissioned by corporations and Institutions like the European Union.

1.1 Definition and history

Sharing means putting something in common. It is from this concept that a particular type of business, or economy, has been identified in order to describe a phenomenon that has evolved in the first decade of the new millennium. It is a form of economy based on the sharing of resources and knowledge between peers, subjects that are considered as equal on the same level, who put in common something for a certain purpose. The concept behind sharing economy has deep roots into the history, as the first forms of exchange and common use of goods refer to the practice of bartering, in an era in which money still did not exist. Exchanging goods and knowledge is something human beings have always done in history. But the term as we know it today has a very recent development and has evolved
in order to classify the phenomenon of collaborative consumption used in very recent companies of the information technology field. The so-called start-ups of sharing economy, indeed, are mainly IT companies, which **gather underutilized assets from private users and make them accessible to the population through easy and intuitive online platforms, with business models based on fees/commissions and/or affiliation taxes**. The success of these new-millennium businesses lies in the innovation they brought to the market, **taking an old model like collaborative consumption into the structures and conformation of today’s market.** The emergence of so many companies based on this concept set the actual beginning of the so-called sharing economy.

To better understand the sharing economy, it is necessary to analyze the concept of collaborative consumption that stays behind. The term **collaborative consumption** first appeared in the scientific article “Community Structure and Collaborative Consumption: A Routine Activity Approach” published in 1978 in the journal *American Behavioral Scientist* by researchers Marcus Felson and Joe L. Spaeth. In the research, the authors define the

> “acts of collaborative consumption (...) those events in which one or more persons consume economic goods or services in the process of engaging in joint activities with one or more others”. (Felson & Spaeth, 1978, p. 614)

The concept of community, elaborated by Hawley (1950), is also the basis of their research: community is seen as a structure of localized subjects interconnected by relationships occurring at the same time in a same and shared space. De facto, the binding elements of a community, according to Hawley first and to Felson and Spaeth then, are the basis of what today other researchers point out as collaborative consumption. Any action connected to the **sharing of any kind of activity or good leads to a proliferation of exchanging, trading, bartering or renting, namely gaining access to products that are not privately owned but can be used commonly by different people.**

One of the greatest sources of information about collaborative consumption in the recent days is the writer and TEDx speaker Rachel Botsman. Together with Roo Rogers, she wrote the most influential book about the phenomenon, explaining the definition, the existing types of shared consumption and its development and irruption into our lives. Botsman and Rogers sustain that the origin of the phenomenon “is rooted in technologies and behaviours of online social networks” (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a, p. xx), because of the rise of Internet as the place of manifestation of a renewed consciousness about the importance of community. Environmental concerns and economic issues moved people “away from top-heavy, centralized and controlled forms of consumerism towards one of
sharing, aggregation, openness and cooperation” (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a, p. xx). Collaborative consumption is the shift from a twentieth-century mentality of hyper-consumption, in which the only possibility to use resources was to own them, to a completely new, more-conscious mentality defined by reuse, recycle, sharing and access to objects owned by others. At the basis of this new mentality, there are many motivations: the most important asset anyway is the confrontation among people, which improved through the cyber world that made it easier to communicate with each other and enhance exchange of information. This is why the phenomenon started online. Another very important issue to consider is that in the past fifty years human beings have consumed more resources than all the past generations together did, and since the 80’s we have consumed one third of the planet’s resources. For this reason, there is an always-growing concern about the scarcity of resources and a growing consciousness about the need to stop it. Sharing items and services is one of the methods used to stop hyper-production and conspicuous consumption (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a). These terms have a long history and were used long before the creation of the World Wide Web. In the 19th century, economist and sociologist Thorstein Veblen (1899), the pioneer in the study of behavioral economics, studied the behavior of the new rich social class that emerged from capital accumulation during the Second Industrial Revolution, an era that brought to a progressive increase in the production of goods that soon overcame the demand. This upper class of people used the power to buy and own goods and services as a form of ostentation of their power and status, which resulted in hyper-consumption or consumerism. From this view, Veblen created the term conspicuous consumption, indicating the act of spending and consuming goods and services to publicly manifest the social status and prestige (Veblen, 1899). In the 20th century, the display of wealth belonged to the middle class, and later in history was typical of emerging countries’ population, where people use hyper-consumption as a way to contrast the impression of economic inferiority. However, combating hyper-consumption is not the only reason why mature consumers are switching their habits towards a more conscious consumption. Sensibility towards nature and resources and a higher literacy about technology and online communications forms paved the way to the fundaments of sharing economy (Albinsson & Yasanthi Perera, 2012). It is indeed undoubted that collaborative consumption is the concept at the basis of sharing economy, which aim, according to Botsman and Rogers (2010a), is to discover the value of idling and underutilized resources in order to promote access to them instead of ownership (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a).
The author of the platform collaborativeconsumption.com has long debated the incorrect use of different terms and definition of the described phenomenon. Indeed, Botsman (2015b) differentiates the concepts as follows:

1. **Collaborative economy**: “Systems that unlock value from underused assets by matching ‘needs’ and ‘haves’ in ways that bypass traditional intermediaries and distribution channels.” Examples given for this form of economy are Etsy and Kickstarter. (Botsman, 2015b, para. 8)

2. **Sharing economy**: “Systems that facilitate the sharing of underused assets or services, for free or for a fee, directly between individuals or organizations.” Examples given for this form of economy are Airbnb and Bla Bla Car. (ibid., para. 14)

3. **Collaborative consumption**: “Systems that reinvent traditional market behaviors—renting, lending, swapping, sharing, bartering, gifting—in ways and on a scale not possible before the internet.” Example is Zipcar. (ibid., para. 7)

4. **On-Demand economy**: “Systems that instantly match buyers and sellers to deliver goods and services immediately when people need them.” Example is Uber. (ibid., para. 11)

These four definitions are clearly marked as indicating the same phenomenon but through different perspectives: collaborative and sharing economy underline the economic aim that lies beneath the surface of accessing underused assets; collaborative consumption is the reinvention of the ancient bartering; on-demand economy underline the importance of technology and the Internet to make the exchange among people possible. What is clear is that all of the definitions are characterized by common concepts, namely “underused assets” to indicate goods or services that are not used all year round, “sharing” meaning exchanging those goods and services and “matching needs” indicating that these underused assets can match the needs of other people. Thanks to technology and the redefinition of peer communities, what was not possible to be owned for some individuals suddenly became accessible through the consolidation of trust towards strangers. Buying second-hand clothes online became the habit thanks to eBay; sleeping on the sofa at a stranger’s house became feasible and safe thanks to Couchsurfing; taking a car for a small ride into the city center became normal even for those who could not afford buying one, thanks to Zipcar. Collaborative consumption has overwhelmed our lives in a way that influenced the old business modes.

### 1.2 Digital technologies and collaborative consumption

According to Hamari, Sjöklint and Ukkonen (2015), the sharing economy is a technological phenomenon emerged with the growth of the Web 2.0 that facilitated the emergence of
online platforms promoting user-generated content, sharing and collaboration—like open-source software, online encyclopedias, peer-to-peer file sharing etc.—. They argue that these forms of exchange are part of the sharing economy, a phenomenon that comes from the development of technologies and platforms that have simplified the access and share of physical and non-physical resources. The characteristics of these platforms are actually the same of CC services, which in their research have been studied under the technological perspective: thus collaborative consumption is a technological phenomenon and a category of sharing economy, which is rather an emerging consumer culture (Hamari et al., 2015). Sundarajan (2013) is of the same opinion with his theory: he states that digital technologies are enablers of a total reinvention of exchange models and processes and not only the mean through which these old models are sped up in order to give life to new activities. What is emerging from the different studies about the phenomenon is that digital platforms and a higher accessibility to Internet are the key to an increased interaction among so defined peers, namely people with same needs who can provide and receive access to goods and services through social interaction and communication (Belk, 2007, 2010, 2014; Botsman & Rogers, 2010b; Dervojeda et al., 2013; Gansky, 2010; Hamari et al., 2015; OECD, 2014; Torregrossa, 2013; Zervas et al., 2014). Data about Internet usage speaks clearly about the constant growth of users around the globe.

![Figure 1: Global Internet usage growth per year ("Number of Internet Users Worldwide from 2005 to 2016," 2016, p. 1)](image)

Broadband Internet availability is increasing widely while connection costs are constantly decreasing. Not only people but also objects are more and more connected to Internet; linked to this idea is the newborn definition of “Internet of Things”: the concept stands for the connection of any device to the Internet creating a giant network of connected things that also includes people. Also, mobile connection globally is increasing at a fast pace. Worldwide penetration of mobile phones passed 50% in September 2014 (“Global mobile phone internet user penetration 2019,” 2016), meaning that more than half of the world’s
population uses a mobile phone. The number of Internet users globally exceeded 3 billion in November 2014 (over 7.3b); the number of active mobile connections surpassed the total world population recently. This means that mobile connection is reaching the levels of desktop connections and population will be always more online from mobile devices (Kemp, 2015). This rapid growth of Internet usage and the constantly growing need of connectivity leads the population to the use of digital technologies for any kind of need, especially when travelling. For this reason, talking about technology and mobile connectivity is so important to understand the basic conditions that favor an environment of mutual exchange and communication, which through the consolidation of trust enables collaborative consumption.

An important study made by Nicholas John (2013), analyzing 63 newspapers talking about collaborative consumption, highlighted that CC is built as high-tech phenomenon involved in the internet in smartphones and social networks. This happens for three main reasons. First, technology is the enabler of the collaborative exchange; second, CC can happen offline only after a prior online practice, making technology the enabler of the exchange; third, all the terminology and concepts used to describe CC were born from the world of high-tech startups in the field, who built their business models based on it. This analysis could prove that collaborative consumption is the result of communication enabled by contemporary ICTs, which gave birth to economic activities connoted by the term sharing economies. Another evidence of the importance of digital technologies in the emergence of CC comes from pioneering entrepreneur Lisa Gansky in her publication called “The Mesh” (2010), an inspiring book explaining the evolution of business through the use of social platforms and digital technologies dominating it. These digital technologies, like social media and wireless networks, will foster the massive collection of data coming from the users accessing the Internet, which will be useful to provide people with goods right in the moment they need it. Gansky is promoting the theory “buy less, use more”: since the economic crisis has forced us to rethink about the use we make of things, about their cost and the environmental risks, people do not want to own stuff anymore but to share it with others, with less economic and environmental costs. The Mesh is a sharing network-enabled system that allows any node of the network to link to one another in order to exchange information and assets. “It is a metaphor to describe a whole new phase of information-based services” (Gansky, 2010, pp. 15–20). The principle of the Mesh is to sell the same product for repeated times, generating multiple profits and multiple customer contacts. In this way, utilizing assets for multiple times for a company means exploiting less
resources and increasing efficiency, since a Mesh network based on shared transactions can deliver an improved customer service because of a greater choice given to consumers at a low personal cost. A Mesh business is characterized by four elements:
1. an object or skill or time that can be shared and offered with a community of people;
2. ICT networks that are used to collect and aggregate information related to customer demand and usage of products;
3. a great emphasis on physical goods that can be shared, reused and recovered, enhancing a local exchange circle;
4. an augmented word-of-mouth through social networking platforms. (Gansky, 2010, p. 15)

![Figure 2: Types of Mesh businesses according to Lisa Gansky (2010, p. 20)](image)

1.2.1 Types of collaborative systems

Studies about collaborative systems highlighted different categories. Hamari et al. (2015) conducted their study mapping 254 platforms related to this model and they found out that there are two main categories of exchange: “Access over ownership” and “Transfer of ownership” (2015, p. 3). The majority of platforms are part of the former category, while there are a consistent number of platforms related to the latter category.

*Access over ownership* model is a form of exchange based on the activities of lending/renting of goods, spaces or services for a limited time in exchange of money, often in the form of a fee. Examples of this model are Airbnb for apartment rental or Netflix, the online TV-series streaming service. This is the most common model of collaborative consumption and renting is the most typical activity.

Instead, *Transfer of ownership* refers to the passage of ownership from one user to another through the activities of lending, giving, swapping, or buying of second hand goods. An example is the Italian platform “Armadio Verde”, an online marketplace for the swapping of children’s clothes³.

---
³ [www.armadioverde.it](http://www.armadioverde.it)
Based on the research of Hamari et al. (2015) the majority of the 254 CC online platforms studied are of the first type, Access over ownership, in the form of renting. This result is plausible since the mode of exchange can become a profitable business model based on commission fees per transaction.

Botsman and Rogers (2010b) have identified three types of collaborative systems:

- **Product service systems** are used to provide goods and services without selling them as products. In this way, a person’s private owned goods can be shared or rented among peers through companies. There is a shift to a usage mind-set, for which people can access to a product’s benefits without owning it.

- **Redistribution markets** are those in which privately owned goods that are not necessary after their use are redistributed to others in need. In this way, all the objects that would remain unused are given to people who are looking for them. Redistribution of goods may become the 5th “R” after “reduce, reuse, recycle and repair”, the process of a sustainable commerce.

- **Collaborative lifestyles** is a way of exchanging more intangible assets like time, money, space and skills among people with similar interests and needs who form a community in which the exchange happens. It can happen on a local or neighborhood level, such as giving an idling parking space to those who need one, or on a global scale, for example in tourism through peer-to-peer apartment rental. (Botsman & Rogers, 2010b, pp. 71–75)

According to a study made by Marco Torregrossa (2013), Managing Director of Euro Freelancers and the European Sharing Economy Coalition⁴, the social and economic system that enables the exchange and access to underutilized assets through digital technologies is part of the Collaborative Economy, a broader environment that should be explained in order to understand the phenomenon. The Collaborative Economy can be divided into four macro-categories:

---

⁴ The European Sharing Economy Coalition (EURO-SHE) is a European network of different stakeholders born with the aim to support sharing economy businesses and practices through the development of policy frameworks with the objective to raise awareness on the importance of SE in Europe’s economy. The coalition is officially recognized by the European Commission (“European Sharing Economy Coalition,” n.d.).
1. **Production**: “design, production and distribution of goods through collaborative networks” (Torregrossa, 2013, p. 4)

2. **Consumption**: “maximum utilization of assets through efficient models of redistribution and share access” (ibid., p. 4)

3. **Finance**: “person-to-person banking and crowd-driven investment models that decentralize finance” (ibid., p. 4)

4. **Education**: “open education and person-to-person learning models that democratize education” (ibid., p. 4)

It is between the two first categories—production and consumption—that sharing economy is comprehended. As highlighted in Figure 6, **collaborative consumption can happen between different stakeholders: business-to-business, business-to-consumer or peer-to-peer**. In the first case **companies exchange or share assets among them**; in the second case **companies own products and they rent them to consumers**; in the third case **the exchange happens among peers usually with the intermediation of a company through an online service platform**. In all these cases, the type of exchange is one of the three systems described by Bostman and Rogers (2010b). The Sharing Economy itself happens in the B2C section, where companies or businesses are the creators of the exchange model useful for the final consumers. In this model, a company acquires and rents products to consumers. **Zipcar** is a great example of B2C model. The company buys cars and rents them to the members of the platform. Often, the costs of maintenance of the owned goods are too high for the business model to be profitable. **In the Peer Economy**, instead, the exchange of goods/skills/space happens among peers avoiding companies to invest in capital in order to create the business. **Companies** in this model are the intermediaries of the exchange happening online and they rely on a community of users who are the actual suppliers usually in exchange of a revenue share of the generated transaction. In the P2P model, owners of the goods can use the generated revenue for the maintaining costs and they generate a reutilization circle that contrasts hyper-consumerism.
According to Torregrossa (2013), there are different categories of CC: Meals sharing, Skills sharing, Travel costs sharing, Land sharing, Insurance and mortgage sharing, Medical equipment sharing, Lawyers sharing, Home-office sharing, Money sharing, Boats and private jets sharing, Energy sharing, Dogs sharing, Bathrooms sharing. Online marketplaces are created every day for different purposes. To date, the greatest and most successful examples of CC are related to digital currency (lending), goods delivered through mail (clothes, books), sharing of expensive goods (apartments, cars, technologic appliances) and services (graphic design, translation, etc.) (Torregrossa, 2013). But B2C and P2P models differ in substantial ways. While B2C business models have higher capital investment and maintenance costs, P2P models have to rely on the ability and efficiency of peers sharing their assets. This means that a company intermediating the exchange between private subjects has to create a solid basis of trust and quality standards in order to make the system work. Ensuring a standard of service based on private subjects can be difficult, but in the long term, if efficient, it can build a strong brand and business model, which can become an evolutionary innovation for a stagnant sector (Ttunguz, 2011). A strong example is Airbnb, which will be described in the following paragraphs and chapters.

1.2.2 Stakeholders of the sharing economy

The subjects involved in the sharing economy are mainly two: the Providers of the good or service and the Users, who solicit the exchange. As described above, the providers can be actual companies who built a business based on the collaborative consumption model, or even private subjects representing the peers of the P2P model. Millennials have grown up in the era of CC and are more inclined in the use of websites or online platforms of the sharing economy. With the spread of these platforms, many sectors witnessed an evolution.
concerning consumer practices and, many times, the old structured businesses started a real war against newcomers in the field. For this reasons another stakeholder of the sharing economy became always more necessary to rule the practices of service selling and intermediation: **public authorities**. Well-known is the case of the sharing economy accommodation platform Airbnb, which was confronted with legal charges in some big tourist destinations, such as New York and Amsterdam. The website risked to close when tourism authorities sustained that private hosts did not pay tourism and income taxes. To fix the issues, Amsterdam City Council decided to fix the argument creating a new accommodation category, “private rentals”, allowing local residents to rent their homes occasionally through shared economy platforms. The city of Amsterdam was the first good example of innovative policy-making demonstrating to support rather than stop the emerging trend of the sharing economy without breaking the rules for fair competition in the tourism industry (“More good news in Amsterdam,” 2014, “New Rules for Airbnb,” 2014). Not only Providers and Users are taking part into collaborative consumption, but also Public Authorities are intervening with regard to policy implementation towards the creation of a legal framework of coexistence between old and new businesses. From the generation of Baby Boomers, those born between ’45 and ’64, who represented the first users of eBay, to the Generation X (’64-’80) who increasingly use bartering services, people of all ages today participate in collaborative consumption and represent the sharing economy natives (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a).

### 1.2.3 Principles of collaborative consumption

Beneath the act of sharing and the willingness of doing it, some basic principles and conditions fostered the rise of the phenomenon. In an era of hyper-connectivity and online social communities, these principles have become the “credo” of society, longing for a better place to live in, with less waste of resources and more respect for the nature.

#### 1.2.3.1 Economy

The economic crisis of the last decade has contributed to the spread of a common sense of scarcity of resources and hyper-consumption (Belk, 2010; Botsman & Rogers, 2010a; Gansky, 2010). As many researchers point out, the economic crisis has created a sense of **mistrust of bigger corporations and brands** that for long have represented the monopoly of consumer goods production. The model has always followed logic of mass production
and economies of scale in order for a business to be profitable\textsuperscript{5}. Economies of scale can be achieved in the long term through increased efficiency in the production chain. However, achieving efficiency means producing at high volumes that can be translated in a continuous use of resources. In the earliest era of real mass production, after the second Industrial Revolution (1870-1914), the number of goods produced and sold was exceeding the number of people who could afford to buy the products. After the Economic Boom\textsuperscript{6} of post-World War II, consumers started to afford expensive goods and common appliances and mass production became stable making big brands and firms very profitable. Periods of Economic Booms are often accompanied by inflation, which can cause consequent times of economic recession. Since the beginning of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century, a global recession caused inflation and unstable markets, bringing middle and lower classes to a restricted buying power. Right in this time, with economic uncertainty and lower buying power, new business models have paved the way exploiting the concept of collaborative consumption in order to maximize efficiency of second hand objects and unused space of consumers’ properties. As Gansky (2010) states, historically, in times of economic recession, consumer attitudes change shifting towards new companies and models, also in the willingness to try new brands. Second, in economic difficulties people tend to reconsider what is necessary and what is optional with a higher attention to the cost/value ratio, thus spending for more valuable goods. These motivations open consumers to new models (Gansky, 2010). According to Torregrossa (2013), the above mentioned situation fosters the idea of collaboration for these economic principles: an optimization of underutilized assets with idling capacity, a shift from individual ownership to shared access, the spread of peer-to-peer marketplaces and social networks and mobile payment technologies (Torregrossa, 2013).

1.2.3.2 Population and resources

As research and statistics point out (UN, 2009), global population will reach 9 billion people by mid-century causing scarce resources to extinguish rapidly. Land, potable water and fossil fuels are among the resources at highest risk of extinction. According to a study made by WWF and cited by Burke & Townsend (2002), the world population has exploited natural resources in such a way that if we continue to plunder the planet at this pace, we will be

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{5} “Mass production, application of the principles of specialization, division of labour, and standardization of parts to the manufacture of goods. Such manufacturing processes attain high rates of output at low unit cost, with lower costs expected as volume rises.” (web source: Tenenbaum & Holstein, n.d.)

\textsuperscript{6} Definition of Economic Boom: “A period of significant output within a population. The period is marked by productivity increases, sales increases, wage increases and rising demand. An economic boom may be accompanied by a period of inflation.” (web source: “economic boom,” n.d.)
forced to look for another planet to live in. The study by WWF set the year 2050 as the expiration date for natural resources on this planet. Humans destroyed more than a third of natural resources in the last forty years (Burke & Townsend, 2002). Between the deforestation of the planet and the melting of glaciers there is a narrow connection, but we are not able to see it because of the consumerism ideals. Natural resources are depleting continuously with old economic models like industrial capitalism. In order to live in a peaceful and sustainable world, Gansky (2010) sustains that we as consumers have to learn sharing the resources we have and we as producers have to change the production models accordingly. Those companies, cities and countries that understand the power of sharing and reallocation of resources before others will define the success of business in the early twenty-first century. Clean tech and renewable energy are among the most promising economic sectors nowadays. Moreover, with the growth of population, there is a trend towards greater urban density, which favors high-connectivity exchanges among people: nowadays sharing a car or bike or tool is much easier than before thanks to the Internet of Things (Gansky, 2010). Related to these conditions is the new credo of the population which involves more and more trust between strangers, more convenience, choice and control of goods, a shift in the power balance from big centralized organizations to distributed networks and finally an overall disillusionment about the consumerist culture and the effects of global recession (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a).

1.2.3.3 Climate change

The concern of population towards global warming and climate change has fostered the growing interest of people in renewable energy, recycling and the multiple utilization of goods and assets. Global warming is caused in major part by air pollution coming from fossil fuel burning, which generates CO$_2$ emissions that are injected into the atmosphere. The increase of CO$_2$ emission levels is due to many factors, among which the increase of population is an indirect cause that brings to deforestation and hyper-exploitation of non-renewable energy sources. Also, the production of consumer goods is an indirect cause. The cycle of production starting from the overexploitation of resources, continues to hyper-production and hyper-consumption stages and can be possible thanks to the transportation of goods around the planet, which cause waste disposal contributing to the pollution of air, land and water, which leads in the long term to global warming (WWF, n.d.). If we as humans start to share and exchange existing goods and create energy from clean resources, we will contribute to the lowering of air, water and land pollution but also to a lower use of fossil fuels, which in change will keep our life on this planet sustainable for
the future generations. This can be achieved reconsidering the life cycle of products, reusing them multiple times thus reducing waste and the carbon footprint connected to it, favoring eco-designs to allow multi-user experiences, enhancing durability suitable for sharing objects.

According to Gansky (2010), the Mesh—the environment in which through hyper-connectivity we can share, exchange and reuse assets—is therefore considered viable and rewarding by five vectors:

1. The loss of trust for traditional companies fostered by the economic crisis.
2. The reconsideration of what is important and valuable.
3. Climate change that forces the rise of goods production costs.
4. The increase of Mesh businesses thanks to denser urban areas.
5. Online information networks able to provide better services. (Gansky, 2010, p. 44)

### 1.3 Motivations of sharing economy

Beneath the willingness of modern individuals to access goods and services rather than owning them, the model of sharing economy has risen to limit hyper-consumption, poverty and pollution among the society and our planet by lowering the costs of transaction related to economic activities made within communities (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a). But there are more motivations that drive consumers to accept the model of collaborative consumption.

The user who decides to take part actively in the sharing economy does it in order to gain benefits that otherwise he/she would not access through a standard living involving a salary and a spending behavior. At the same time, the user who puts at disposal his/her goods for others is different from the user who looks for them to buy or rent, but the motivations and drivers of the behavior are very similar. Based on a research carried out by Latitude (Latitude, n.d.) and cited in the work of Duron T., Moens d.H., Monesi and Sant’Anna T. (2010), the drivers that motivate people in the sharing process are basically four:

1. The economic driver: as already mentioned above, it pushes people to be more conscious about their buying behavior, praising practicality rather than consumerism. SE allows a broader access to resources and mostly with lower prices than brand new products, sometimes even with no cost. Second, the same consumers who can now access more affordable goods can also become the new producers, making money easily by renting, selling second-hand or lending their own resources.
2. The sustainability driver: today civil society, governments, institutions and NGOs are aware of the threat of environmental and social challenges. Sustainability is not a trend but a necessary condition for the earth’s wellbeing. People are aware of this and feel
the need to contribute to a more sustainable living that is facilitated by SE: less production and consumption of goods and more exchange and reuse of things mean less pollution.

3. The social driver: nowadays people are more likely to share because it is becoming a social norm. Only 14% of people trust advertisers, while 78% of consumers trust peer recommendations.

4. The technological driver: the emergence and rapid growth of peer-to-peer technologies (P2P), based on the concept of CC and on communication among individuals, has fostered an increased online interaction among users. Through these technologies, including mobile and ubiquitous connectivity, the sharing economy could spread and expand at impressive rates (Duron T. et al., 2010, p. 4; Latitude, n.d., p. 2).

The motivation to participate in CC is often the aspiration to “do good”, sometimes offering participants to gain economic benefits. The collaborative consumers are often socially minded optimists with a forward thinking, but many of them are motivated by the need to find an always better way of doing things, saving money or time, accessing to better services, being more sustainable and allowing narrower relationships with people rather than objects or brands. Still, there is a basis of principles connected to capitalist markets and self-interest: ideas that drive the monetary exchange (Botsman & Rogers, 2010a).

According to the research of Hamari et al. (2015),

“online collaboration, such as peer-to-peer activity, is fuelled by enjoyment, economic incentive, reputation and self-fulfillment. (...) The application of ideology, such as sustainability and green consumption, is mainly propelled by reputation and economic concern. As a result, we propose four possible and distinguishable categories in which the forthcoming hypotheses are developed, namely sustainability, enjoyment, reputation, and economic benefits”. (Hamari et al., 2015, p. 5)

Thus, they confirm the theories of other authors.

Another study, carried out by ShareNL (Van de Glind, 2013a), a Dutch networking platform aimed at spreading the knowledge about sharing economy, has investigated the growth potential of CC developing a survey that measured the consumers’ willingness to take part in different types of CC. The study was made on 1.330 Amsterdam citizens, among whom the 96% had never taken part in CC and the 99% were older than 35 years old. The survey covered a variety of uses for collaborative consumption –like cars, meals, gardens, skills, accommodation or household goods- and also types of exchange –such as selling, renting, buying, giving, swapping and receiving-. The results underlined the nature of users, happening to be early adopters who came to know about the investigated platforms
through friends-referral and started to use them for practical need. **43.8% of users stated that they would take part in CC as a consumer, and 31.9% instead as a provider.** 84.1% of all respondents would at least take part in one example of CC. Also the motivations to participate were investigated. The findings of the survey indicate that consumer potential of CC could be substantial because of a wide variety of motivations ranging from extrinsic reasons –like money makers- to idealist intrinsic altruism. **The CC consumers are not only digitally savvy Millennials but demographically diverse people that take part in the exchange for the variety of available platforms that permits them to make a transition into a new socioeconomic environment** (Van de Glind, 2013a). The results of the research, that was carried in collaboration with Collaborative Lab, the Department for Research and Statistics of Amsterdam (O+S) and the University of Utrecht, are shown in Appendix 1.

### 1.4 Economics of the sharing economy

Besides definitions, typologies, drivers and motivations of the phenomenon, it is very important to understand how the sharing economy contributes to the GDP. When we think of a model based on reciprocity and collaboration among peers, we would not ever imagine that the model could generate revenues and be profitable, generating value for the economy. Recently, the formation of sharing economy business models and their popularity on the market for many consumers has been driven by various factors. The **global economic crisis of 2007**, **the technological advancement, social networks**, **the transformation and internationalization of culture**, **the mind- and cultural predisposition towards sharing**, an **increased level of trust among strangers** and a **new urban activism and social engagement are all drivers of the spread of these models** (Psarros, Rinne, Jordan, & Pastras, n.d.). A study made by PricewaterhouseCoopers (2014) forecasted a **significant increase of the economic value generated by five of the most promising sectors of the sharing economy.** These sectors will generate a potential revenue of $335 billion by 2025 in peer-to-peer services like finance, online staffing, **accommodation**, car sharing, music streaming, car rental and book/DVD rental (Hawksworth & Vaughan, 2014). Non-monetized transactions were also measured, for example the growth of Couchsurfing, which reached more than 10 million members worldwide (Rosemary & Vanessa, 2015), or the rise of Netflix, the streaming service for TV series, which has more than 20 million subscribers, or also Zipcar, the car sharing service, which counts 500.000 members.

As John Koetsier (2015) stated in an article on VentureBeat.com, today companies with 60.000 employees, valuations of nearly 20 billion dollar and 15 billion dollar in funding are
part of the collaborative or sharing economy (Koetsier, 2015). This is the indicator that sharing economy is not only a new phenomenon, but it generated innovative business models and new revenue methods in many sectors. Among the companies comprised in the 20-billion dollar “lucky ones” are Airbnb and HomeAway, companies in the field of accommodation that will be further discussed. If sharing assets among peers is often the money-saver measure against mass production, it is because behind the exchange per se there is a solid structure that invested in a revenue model for its market potential. Again, according to Koetsier (2015), the categories with the most efficient companies of the sharing economy are goods, money, space and transport. Two categories are also part of services used in tourism. With all these sectors becoming always more collaborative, it is yet hard to provide an answer to a debated question: how much does sharing economy contribute to the GDP and what is the added value of collaborative consumption services and platforms to the economy? Patricia Feubli and Jonathan Horlacher (2015), research analysts from Credit Suisse, published an interesting article about the measure of sharing economy activities’ value contributing to the GDP. They sustain that the more activities shift from traditional to sharing sectors, the harder it is to measure it, thus “obscuring the true economic activity of a country” (Feubli & Horlacher, 2015, para. 1). The value added of an enterprise, which indicates the economic performance, is measured calculating its production minus the value of costs for the personnel, taxes, interests, rentals, etc. To have an indicator for the GDP of a country, it is necessary to sum up the value added of all the domestic enterprises, taking into account only the goods and services produced domestically, excluding the subsidies and adding taxes. Sharing activities are a form of B2C economic exchange, thus relevant to be calculated in the GDP of a country. But much of the activities carried out through sharing platforms are part of the shadow economy, namely activities that involve the exchange of non-publicly-declared money, or even non-monetary exchanges. BlaBlacar at the beginning of its activity was a business model based on the exchange of cash between the car driver and the passengers. Nowadays the transaction happens online with a fee of service remaining to the company. In this way it became a standard enterprise, making profit and paying salaries and taxes and so on. These activities are all part of the calculation of the GDP. However, not in every sharing platform it is possible to estimate the monetary value of the exchange between peers: e.g. it is

7 “P. Smith (1994: 18) defines the shadow economy as ‘market-based production of goods and services, whether legal or illegal, that escapes detection in the official estimates of GDP’” (Schneider & Williams, 2013, p. 23)
unknown how much profit does an Airbnb host make per month renting his apartment, if he does not declare it to the state (Feubli & Horlacher, 2015).

Even if part of the shadow economy or not accountable in a country’s GDP, **collaborative economy business models**, among which are accessibility-based business models analyzed in a report by Dervojeda et al. (2013), are models used by companies to generate revenue in collaborative networks and marketplaces. Through accessibility-based systems, consumers can pay for temporary access-right to goods and services: the access happens between peers, thus to privately owned goods or competencies of the giver. Companies’ role in this sense is to facilitate peer-to-peer markets providing tools and support to consumers and givers and creating the match between the one who owns the good and the one who needs it. The mechanism that drives the match can be demand-driven or supply-driven, or both. The biggest challenge in the creation of this match is trust between peers that can be increased through ID verification and rating systems (Dervojeda et al., 2013).

The created match between peers is the objective of the company, which in exchange is being paid for the use of the platform. There are several business models used by companies of collaborative economy. Rachel Botsman (2015a) estimated the existence of **six business models of the sharing economy**:

1. **Service fees**: the company creating the model for a goods or service exchange keeps a percentage of fee from the total transaction matching two parties of the marketplace, e.g. buyers and seller, hosts and guests, drivers and passengers.
2. **Flat membership/subscription**: the company charges the consumer with a fixed monthly or annual membership fee in order to use the service.
3. **Tiered subscription**: the company charges a fee for the use of the service depending on the frequency of use/number of people using it/number of desired goods.
4. **Membership plus usage**: the company requests a flat membership subscription or tiered subscription plus a fee depending on the use of the service.
5. **White label**: the company offers a back-end platform that can be used and branded by client companies.
6. **Freemium**: the company provides basic services with the use of the platform/app for free, but users can become premium clients paying additional services or exclusive features. (Botsman, 2015a)

Dervojeda et al. (2013) sustain that the **growth of online peer-to-peer business models is exceeding 25% annually, which can be defined a “disruptive economic force”** (Dervojeda et al., 2013, p. 5). The research estimated that in 2013 the value generated by peer-to-peer exchanges reached USD 3.5 billion, money that ended in consumers’ pockets through the sharing economy. This value does not even count the revenues generated by the intermediation of companies, which additionally increases the general economic value.
According to the analyzed studies, the market of peer-to-peer money lending is one of the fastest growing, with a growth rate of 250%. Another sector with fast growth rate is skills and competencies. The platform TaskRabbit estimates a potential earning of USD 10,000 per month for some of its most active users, those who provide peer-to-peer services full-time. It is easy to understand that if the platform will start to provide more technical services, it will cause a disruption in the workforce industry (Dervojeda et al., 2013).

Speaking about future, the MIT Sloane Experts (Contreras & Snir, 2011) forecasted CC to become a potential US$110 billion market. But predictions are not a real time indicator of economy. A way to calculate the weight of sharing economy in a country’s GDP is to split GDP into individual industries and to analyze which sectors faced the greatest disruption due to collaborative consumption models. Currently, according to Feubli & Horlacher (2015), the industries that are mostly affected by the SE are transportation, trade, food services and accommodation. These sectors make up nearly half of GDP in developed countries (45% in Switzerland). To measure the impact of sharing in these industries, it is necessary to understand how many people use sharing services and how much is their total expenditure for them in addition to traditional providers. Multiplying the share of an industry in GDP with the share of people using sharing services within an industry and the share of expenditure for those services it is possible to evaluate the impact of sharing on the GDP for each industry. A calculation made by Credit Suisse found out that in general, the impact of the sharing economy globally is still low at 0.25% of GDP, because the industries that are mostly affected by collaborative economies (accommodation and transportation) are a small part of the total GDP and because, on the other hand, the industries that mostly influence the GDP (finance and insurance) are not enough penetrated by “sharing” business models. Assuming an optimistic scenario in which individuals spend 80% of their income on sharing, the economic value of SE would be around 1 percent of global GDP. The authors stated:

“With this assumption, peer-to-peer commerce in Switzerland generates a value added of roughly 6 billion Swiss francs per year, or 0.95 percent of GDP. In the more conservative scenario, it is assumed that sharing households spend as much a share on peer-to-peer commerce as they spend on online shopping. In this case, the Swiss value added of peer-to-peer commerce is approximately 0.5 billion Swiss francs per year, or 0.1 percent of GDP.” (Feubli & Horlacher, 2015, para. 9)
1.4.1 Statistics on the sharing economy

To have a clearer image of the value and potential of collaborative activities it is yet important to evaluate figures and statistics on the sharing economy. The literature and studies about SE have discovered the causes, motivations and objectives that drive people to exchange goods and services through peer-to-peer platforms. Global company of information and statistics Nielsen conducted an online survey in 2013, the Nielsen Global Survey of Share Communities, which polled more than 30,000 online consumers in 60 countries of the world spread across Latin and North America, Europe, Middle East, Africa and Asia-Pacific. This survey, based on online users’ behavior and on countries with a standard of 60% Internet penetration, shows the general level of development of sharing communities globally. The most interesting facts outlined from the research are the following:

1. **Consumers living in emerging regions appear to be more proactive** to sharing than those living in Europe and North America.
2. The **overall propensity to take part into collaborative consumption is high**, with a global average of 66-68% of the interviewed consumers.
3. **Digital consumers of developing countries are often younger** and more affluent to CC services contributing to eagerness and enthusiasm.
4. **Countries that are most likely to use goods and services from other people are Asian countries** - China (94%), Indonesia (87%), the Philippines (85%), Thailand (84%), Hong Kong (78%), India (78%) and Vietnam (76%) - with two European in the top ten - Slovenia (86%) and Bulgaria (79%) - one of Middle East - Egypt (77%) - and two from America - Mexico (79%), Brazil (78%) -.
5. **28% of global respondents are willing to rent or share goods for a fee**, with a higher average in Asia-Pacific (39%).
6. More than a quarter of global respondents - **26% are willing to share their knowledge and intellectual property with lessons or services**, while in Latin America the value reaches 30%.
7. The products that global respondents would rent or share the most are power tools (23%), bicycles (22%), clothing (22%), household items (22%), sports equipment (22%) and cars (21%).

8. Comparing generations’ behavior, **Millennials are more likely to participate in share communities than older generations.** But surprisingly, the two generations that are mostly taking part in sharing activities are Millennials and Gen. X, while Gen. Z and Baby Boomers have very similar values and the Silent Generation shares less.

9. Speaking about gender, **men are more incline to participate than women** in every region of the world except in Europe, where the total of 44% respondents are evenly split into 50% men and 50% women.

10. **Almost 7 out of 10 respondents (69%) use Internet to share their feedback** about shared products and services on social media, firms’ websites and retailers’ sites.

11. The most influential mean of advertising for 84% of global respondents is word-of-mouth from friends and relatives. (The Nielsen Company, 2014, pp. 2–12)

In Switzerland, the percentage of population actively using services of the sharing economy varies between 0% and 30%, with accommodation and transportation on top – both indispensable sectors in the tourism industry. The share of household expenditure for these services via Internet ranges between 0% -financial- and 14% -accommodation- (Feubli & Horlacher, 2015).

The above mentioned research from PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC, 2015), is a survey that was conducted on the US population in 2014 in order to have a thermometer of the spread of sharing activities across the country. With a total sample of 1,000 online consumers, the research aimed at discovering the weight of the phenomenon and the motivations that
drive consumers to share or rent goods from other people. The 44% of respondents stated to be familiar with the sharing economy, while 56% where not familiar. But statistics tell that 19% of the US adult population has engaged at least once in a sharing economy transaction. The segments that felt happiest after sharing were 18-24 year olds, households with an income ranging between 50k and 75k USD and families with under-18 kids at home. These segments perceived many benefits of sharing activities agreeing it helps them keeping life costs low, it’s good for the environment, it’s a way to build a sense of community because it of trust created among people, owning things is too expensive than sharing them. The research of PwC discovered that 7% of the US population are active providers of the sharing economy, and that 6% of US population has been a participant and consumer in the hospitality sector of the sharing economy, while 1.4% has also been an active provider (PwC, 2015, pp. 8–10).

![Figure 8: Age of the population who are active in the sharing economy according to the study (PwC, 2015, p. 10)](image1)

![Figure 9: Average income of the population who are active in the sharing economy according to the study (PwC, 2015, p. 10)](image2)

1.5 Products and services of the sharing economy

Statistics about Sharing Economy have demonstrated how tourism sector and, in general, categories of products and services used for tourism purposes, are affected by the spread of collaborative and sharing business models. There are specific categories of products and services that were influenced by the sharing economy that, in many cases, gave birth to business models that are now virtuous examples of the sharing economy system. One of these models is the bike sharing. According to data from Statista (2015) during the last ten years, examples of cities that adopted a bike sharing system have increased significantly. This model permits citizens and tourists to use a bicycle for a limited amount of time to bike
across a city in exchange of a fee. The user usually subscribes to the service with his credit card data and accesses to a bicycle through a code or a magnetic card; he is then able to take a bike from a pick up station within the city and put it back in another station once the ride is over. The pricing is structured to encourage short-term usage in order to keep bicycles available for multiple users throughout the day. This system proved to be very effective in big cities where street traffic is a real problem. At the end of 2014, 855 cities worldwide were providing a bike sharing system. Worldwide, the bike sharing fleet has reached and overpassed one million bicycles. (Richter, 2015)

![Figure 10: Chart of the spread of bike sharing systems worldwide (Richter, 2015)](image)

As Hawksworth & Vaughan (2014) show, the categories and sectors of products and services that belong to the sharing economy are mainly clustered in four macro categories: **Hospitality and Dining, Automotive and Transportation, Retail and Consumer Goods and Media and Entertainment**. The first category, which is the object of the present research, was significantly affected by sharing economy forms of business within the accommodation field, and it is expected to reach a **compound annual growth rate of +31% in revenues by 2025, according to PwC research** (Hawksworth & Vaughan, 2014). In this category are comprised peer to peer accommodation companies like Airbnb, Couchsurfing, Homeaway, HomeExchange that will be highlighted in Part 2.
Figure 11: PwC research about the sharing economy estimates an increase in revenues for many sectors compared to traditional rental sectors (Hawksworth & Vaughan, 2014, fig. 3)

Also the transportation sector is one the most affected by the sharing economy, with the presence of multiple online platforms and systems that let users access and use transportation means for a limited time in exchange of a fee, like the above mentioned sector of bike rental. Platforms like Uber, Lyft, Turo (former RelayRides), Hitchcar, Getaround, or BlaBlaCar are examples of companies inspired by taxi riders or car-pooling systems that enable peer-to-peer contact and cost-sharing related to transportation. Retail and consumer goods’ sector was affected with an increase in goods exchange among peers, renting stuff or even selling it second-hand: Neighborgoods, Poshmark, Tradesy are examples of goods’ exchange/rent/selling platforms. Another category which was highly influenced by SE, is Media and Entertainment, with online platforms created for the spread of multimedia resources through collaborative models: Amazon Family Library gives the possibility to share kindle-type e-books among peers; Spotify is a free music provider that also works with subscription plans; SoundCloud is an online platform for music upload and sharing; Earbits is a free online radio. These are just examples of platforms and businesses that are part of this economy, with a consistent expected growth in the future.
Figure 12: Brands of the sharing economy divided by macro-category (Yohn, 2015)
Tourism and the Sharing Economy

1.6 Sharing economy and tourism

There is an ongoing debate about the influence of the sharing economy over tourism and the consequences of an emerging shift of travelers’ preferences from traditional service providers towards non-traditional providers of the sharing model. While traditional tourism providers have to undergo consistent tax controls and inspection about safety measures for consumers, the emerging sharing economy service providers are represented by private users who are not as controlled as public services. **Tourism and the sharing economy are complementary since travelers are always more inclined to the convenience of renting from other users, and technology is the enabler of the exchange activity.** According to a research carried out by the Hellenic Chamber of Hotels (Psarros, Rinne, Jordan, & Pastras, 2015), travel and tourism have emerged as an important sector of the sharing economy for three main reasons:

1. The **sector of travel and tourism is one of the most innovative of the whole economy**, contributing to the creation of new business models as well as new products and services in line with the times. Low cost airlines model and the impact it had on air passenger transport industry is an example.

2. **Tourism is an inherent social and temporary experience that people with openness inclination are able to do.** This is also the basis of sharing activities and the characteristic of sharing economy platforms with flexible temporary services.

3. The profile of travelers has changed: **Millennials, business travelers, families as well as others, are in demand of new services and experiences that traditional providers are not able to give.** Today’s travelers are inclined to share and get in contact with local people to live different and more personalized experiences (Psarros et al., 2015, p. 12).

Sharing meals, taking a tour with a local or sleeping in a typical apartment is becoming an experience that many travelers aim at, engaging in activities that only new SE providers can offer. The emergence of user-generated reviews is another factor that enhanced trust among strangers in this type of local activities. Technological advancement has transformed the act of sharing making it more accessible and reliable by users thanks to online payment and geo-localization applications. In this field, travel perfectly fits the mentality of sharing consumers embracing collaborative consumption in order to live different experiences at the destination.
A very relevant issue related to collaborative forms of tourism and travel-related services is the **controversy of legislation, zoning and tax problems**. In some cities, debates about tax avoidance and safety concerns have been resolved through new legislations, but sharing practices are still hard-fought in many cities. Existing legislations in the tourism industry were made to protect and limit commercial subjects. Now with the sharing economy and uncontrolled collaborative service providers, restrictive barriers were introduced instead of protective ones, forcing new entrants in the market to skirt them or go against them (Euromonitor International, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tax</strong></th>
<th><strong>Workers' rights</strong></th>
<th><strong>Industry regulations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Zoning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Many owners of rooms or car drivers do not pay taxes on the revenue generated through the rental of their properties or the sold services.</td>
<td>• Companies are not required to pay insurance, pension, overtime and holiday pay as their workers are employed by themselves.</td>
<td>• Given the service providers are not employed by these companies, they are not always checked for insurance, criminality and road knowledge or asked to meet hotel safety regulations.</td>
<td>• House shares can be located in residential zones; this can lead to breaking laws designed to protect housing stock or neighborhood noise regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Legislative impediments for sharing economy tourism providers (Euromonitor International, 2014, p. 12)*

Even though sharing economy is not widely accepted by the traditional lobbies of the related industries, still there is an acknowledgement of the fact that consumers are eager to use services of the peer-to-peer or sharing- model. Sharing economy is a constantly growing market that brings new opportunities for new businesses. Thanks to this, new niches develop through specialized platforms and big companies have already started to join the industry in order to match the needs of today’s travellers. (Euromonitor International, 2014)
Euromonitor International (2014) highlighted three categories of the travel industry that were affected by the sharing economy: accommodation, transportation and activities to enrich the experience at the destination.

Table 2: SWOT of the travel sharing economy (Euromonitor International, 2014, p. 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Health and safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Lack of rural sharing</td>
<td>Niches develop</td>
<td>Industrial action</td>
<td>Legal implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sharing economy offers consumers a chance to gain financially from sharing their goods or services, combined with users paying a competitive price for the service.</td>
<td>Consumers are able to offer up their under-utilised resources (a spare room, car or skills), thereby offsetting an initial cost and using the items more productively.</td>
<td>Big companies join in</td>
<td>Recent strike protests by taxi drivers across Europe against the rise of Uber have illustrated the ongoing issues with regulating the sharing economy and working with established competition.</td>
<td>Many sharing economy businesses are not meeting legal obligations in terms of hospitality (tax payments as well as various city regulations such as zoning).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Travel- and non-travel related sharing product and service categories according to Euromonitor International (Euromonitor International, 2014, p. 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Non-Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation: rental, couchsurfing</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport: car-sharing, lift-pooling, bike-sharing</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-destination activities: tours, guides</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.1 Accommodation

Regarded as one of the most affected sectors of tourism service providers, it is also at the center of debates for the recent exponential growth of short-term vacation rental activity. This type of accommodation form is considered “non-traditional”. This sector will further be highlighted in the next paragraphs, with a thorough explanation of the differences and typologies of traditional and non-traditional accommodation forms, representing the focus of the research.

1.6.2 Transport

Transportation industry has witnessed many innovations thanks to collaborative consumption, first of all through bike sharing systems, as previously mentioned. Also car transportation sector was one of the most affected. The rise of car sharing systems and worldwide-recognized brands like Uber, have paved the way to a total redefinition of
traditional transportation. Independent and ride-sharing companies, run by traditional rental companies and car manufacturers, rule the car sharing market. A research by the European Automobile Manufacturers Association (2014) defined car sharing as generally

“accessing a car owned by another person or entity in exchange for an agreed monetary payment. During the period of time when a person has access to a carsharing car, they are responsible for it and its use is for their exclusive benefit.” (Le Vine et al., 2014, p. 4)

The factors that contributed to the great development of car sharing in the recent years are mainly connected to Internet and mobile technology that fostered the growth of sharing economy in the field of mobility. The phenomenon of car sharing is consistent in big cities of Europe and North America with statistics indicating a constant increase in the number of users and vehicles. Research company Frost & Sullivan (2014) estimated the market growth of car sharing with an increase in number of users reaching 5 million by the end of 2014.

![Chart of the increase in number of members and vehicles of car sharing services worldwide](image)

Figure 13: Chart of the increase in number of members and vehicles of car sharing services worldwide (Frost and Sullivan, 2014)

Data is confirmed also by Shaheen and Adam (2016), members of the Transportation Sustainability Research Center from the University of California. Data resulting by their research shows that in 2014 car sharing was an active phenomenon in 33 countries worldwide, across 5 continents with an estimation of 4.8 million members operating with over 104.000 vehicles in approximately 1.531 cities of the world. Data shows Europe is the largest car-sharing region in terms of memberships, accounting for 46% of worldwide members with 56% of global car fleet. Second is North America, accounting for 34% of worldwide members with 23% of vehicle fleets (Shaheen & Adam, 2016).
Navigant Research (2015) reported a growth of the global car sharing market from $1.1 billion in 2015 to an expected value of $6.5 billion in 2024 (Navigant Research, 2015). Another factor of the exponential growth of this sector is due to its complementarity with public transportation. Since car sharing is mainly an urban phenomenon, its use is predominant in big cities in alternative to public transportation, but there are areas in which car sharing is also used as intra-regional service. In Italy, BlaBlaCar is predominantly used as alternative to interregional trains in the form of point-to-point service. Air travel is a sector of transportation that seems to remain out of the sharing economy phenomenon. However, some companies attempted to use the model on private jets and charter flights. In the nautical sector, there are many examples of the sharing model, mainly about the connection between boat owners and renters (Euromonitor International, 2014), but still there are grey areas of non-declared revenue to be kept under control.

1.6.3 In-destination activities

In the field of tourism activity enhancers, namely all the experiences held at the destination that are part of the live there phase of the tourism consumption, the sharing model was introduced in order to provide authentic local activities to guests. Tours and activities play an important role in the travel sharing economy. Traditionally tourists took part into activities or guided tours through travel agencies organizing the trip or individually and directly at the visited attraction. Organized tours are usually booked with more anticipation than self-organized visits. Nowadays the sharing economy has contributed to a better accessibility to guided tours and attractions at the destination, since the creation of user-generated travel review platforms like TripAdvisor but also since the sharing model has influenced the guided tours sector. Holidaymakers, those who decide to build their own tourism experience, are the active users of travel sharing platforms. They book the experiences during the holiday rather than before getting to the destination. Given the tourism activities market is fragmented, recent tourism platforms have emerged to provide...
unique experiences with local residents; examples are Touristlink, Peek, Vayable, GetYourGuide, Viator, which are e-commerce platforms where travelers can book and pay their visit or guided tour, often comparing offers through other travelers’ reviews. Social media play a fundamental role in this sector: online consumer feedback and online word of mouth (e-WoM) have become in the last decade the lever of trust and future consumer spending behavior. Activities and tours are easy to review through social platforms and customers are always more inclined to decide what to do following peers’ recommendations. With the same mentality, modern travelers are inclined to use sharing platforms to experience local guides and tours (Euromonitor International, 2014). In 2014 TripAdvisor entered the tours and activities sector partnering with Viator, a globally established website for booking activities (Chowdhry, 2014). Through this evidence, it is clear that travelers’ reviews have an impact on future buying clients. In this situation, destination promoters enter in the sector partnering with service providers in order to attract more customers through positive reviews. The more collaboration exists between activity providers and DMOs, the more are tourism promotion subjects involved in the sharing economy in the attempt to satisfy incoming visitors. Tourists nowadays are sharing time, houses, meals and activities together at the destination, affecting in this way the destination’s brand perception. According to a study made by destination marketing agency Toposophy (2016), DMOs are starting to recognize the effects of the sharing economy in the market of destination activities; authorities are intervening and taking action between locals and visitors in order to provide authentic experiences in accordance with quality and safety standards. Thanks to sharing economy platforms for visitors, new places, people and experiences became part of the tourism supply in ways that were not possible before. Travellers of today are always more in demand for unique and local things to see and to live; weaker destinations are able to attract new travelers thanks to new tourism service providers; more local and unique activities are able to enrich the tourism experience and improve in this way the destination brand. To compete economically on a global scale, DMOs have to work in order to build a qualitative environment to attract and nurture talented residents, apart from visitors. This is achievable integrating shared activities within the destination and recognizing that the peer-to-peer phenomenon can deliver additional services providing effective solutions to many issues that were not possible to resolve before (Toposophy, 2016). For example, cities that lack accommodation supply, can host more travelers through shared accommodation platforms. Public authorities can intervene in the sharing economy without blocking the natural development of these activities. An
example is the introduction of a tourist tax in the peer-to-peer accommodation sector in order to control the number of visitors and the size of the apartment rental market. In some cities of the world this is already happening, while in others there are still controversies about the sharing economy short-term rental market.

Tourism has proven to be one of the most influenced sectors of the sharing economy, for many reasons. Travellers of today are demanding always more unique experiences that traditional providers are not able to offer. **Internet and mobile technology has made it easier for travelers to access to information about tourism services and their quality, through customer online reviews.** Private individuals are taking the leap in sharing activities as a way to earn additional income renting their spare rooms as accommodation, providing car rides within a destination or guided tours of the destination as unique local experience. DMOs are starting to recognize the potential of sharing economy activities in order to strengthen the destination’s brand and attractiveness. Travellers of today are more inclined to social encounters than before, thanks to trustworthy and secure platforms. Tourism is an activity belonging to people who are naturally inclined to experience social, local, unique encounters, and the sharing economy is based on this concept. One of the benefits of the SE is that individuals are able to participate with a minimum cost of infrastructure. A house, a room or apartment can become in this way a bed and breakfast at no cost. Not only private individuals are taking part in the economy, but also established companies are starting to operate in the field. Expedia, world renowned search engine and tourism service aggregator, partnered with short-term rental portal HomeAway in 2014, to list vacation rental properties on their website. Four Seasons Resort Maui started to offer guests Uber services for home-airport lifts (“Four Seasons Resort Maui at Wailea Announces Complete Suite Experience,” 2015). Travelport has now an agreement with Flight Car (Schaal, 2013), a service enabling people who park their car at the airport to rent them to other travelers while away. This service is bookable at travel agents in the U.S. (Euromonitor International, 2014). These are all evidence of the importance of the sharing economy phenomenon in the travel and tourism sector.

### 1.7 Accommodation Sector

As previously mentioned, the accommodation sector is one of the most affected by the sharing economy. It is part of the hospitality industry, comprehending both lodging and restoration facilities. This industry is based on the relationship between a guest and a host
who is supplying a service aimed at customer satisfaction. The act of receiving a guest also includes the entertainment provided to him/her, thus the visitor is received not only to rest but also to eat and visit the place. In their work *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Lashley and Morrison (2000) investigate the theories of many researchers on the nature of hospitality. As later explored by Slattery (2002) in his scientific article *Finding the Hospitality Industry*, there are three domains in which hospitality can be analyzed: the social, private and commercial domain.

1. **Social domain**

   According to Selwyn’s theory (1980), Lashley & Morrison explain the concept of hospitality in the social domain as follows:

   “The basic function of hospitality is to establish a relationship or to promote exchange of goods and services, both material and symbolic, between those who give hospitality (hosts) and those who receive it (guests)... One of the principal functions of any act of hospitality...is to consolidate the recognition that hosts and guests share the same moral universe or...to enable the construction of a moral universe to which both host and guest agree to belong”. (Lashley & Morrison, 2000, p. 19)

   Therefore, hospitality assumes a social domain for the relationship created among host and guest, supposing the protection of the guest staying at the host’s place. According to Slattery (2002), hospitality has a social, private and commercial domain. In the social domain hospitality is in the nature of society and the natural order of things; it takes place in a social setting and it is influenced by social forces.

2. **Private domain**

   Hospitality can be seen as the “giving of food, drink and sometimes accommodation to people who are not regular members of a household” (Telfer, as cited in Lashley & Morrison, 2000, Chapter 3). Telfer’s theory formerly analyzed by Lashley & Morrison (2000) and later by Slattery (2002), appears to be controversial since it does not provide a measurable definition:

   “if a commercial host looks after his guests well out of genuine concern for their happiness and charges them reasonably, rather than extortionately, for what he does, his activities can be called hospitable.” (Lashley & Morrison, 2000, p. 45)

   Later in the book, Lynch and MacWhannell open an interpretation of the private domain speaking about “quasi hotels” -such as bed and breakfasts and guesthouses- that lie in-between the private and commercial domains being part-time businesses and part-time homes.
3. Commercial domain

Slattery (2002) comments on the relevance of the private domain underlying that it is inaccurate and misleading that the critical relationship in hospitality happens between host and guest. In commercial hospitality venues -such as hotels, restaurants, bars and others- the relationship is between sellers and buyers, where the buyers are customers. In this way the relationship is not philanthropic but instead economic. In the social and private domains the difference between a business and a home is not perceived. In the commercial domain hospitality occurs in venues out of home defined to meet hospitality demand, providing hospitality to outsiders, renting rooms, selling meals and drinks and providing any service the guest requires in exchange of money. Hotels, restaurants and other hospitality venues are businesses in which there is a critical relationship between sellers and buyers rather than hosts and guests. The author does not agree with the vision of Lashley and Morrison (2000) who argue that

“Commercial hospitality provision depends on a reciprocity based on money exchange and limits on giving pleasure to guests...The exchange of money absolves the guest of mutual obligation and loyalty” (Lashley & Morrison, 2000, pp. 13–14)

According to Slattery, this definition condemns the hospitality business for just being a business, assuming that if customers pay their enjoyment is compromised.

4. Three-domain approach

Bob Brotherton and Roy C. Wood (Bob Brotherton, 1999; Wood & Brotherton, 2008), seek a broader definition hospitality through the incorporation of the social, private and commercial domains under a unique definition. 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.” (Lashley & Morrison, 2000, p. 142)

And hospitality management is

“comprised of commercial organisations that specialise in providing accommodation and/or food, and/or drink through a voluntary human exchange, which is contemporaneous in nature and undertaken to enhance the mutual well being of the parties concerned”. (Lashley & Morrison, 2000, p. 143)

What is common in all the domains of hospitality is that the basis is a relationship between a host and a guest, which can be either private or commercial. The provision of
accommodation and food/drink are the basic services provided in this industry (Lashley & Morrison, 2000; Slattery, 2002). The work of Lashley and Morrison best describes the realm of literature about the definition of hospitality, but there seems to lack a common definition of accommodation, one of the greatest sectors of the economy, accounting for major part of the travel and tourism business together with transportation.

As shown by Slattery (2002), the number of hotel rooms globally will double to around 30 million, while hotel chains will see an increase in rooms from 4.5 to 20 million. The number of unaffiliated hotels is not predicted to grow, while quasi hotels are predicted to decline (Slattery, 2002). Following this statement, it is very important to understand the differences between hotels and quasi hotels: in an era of different business models arising in the hospitality field, data is necessary to estimate the similarities and differences—as well as the economic value—between traditional and non-traditional accommodation providers.

According to research from Eurostat (Demunter, 2009), a framework is used to define the difference and typologies of accommodation forms. A main differentiation is made between collective and private accommodation, which will be explained in the next paragraphs. For simplicity, the two categories will be presented as traditional and non-traditional accommodation forms.

1.7.1 Traditional forms of accommodation

According to Demunter (2009), Collective tourist accommodation establishments are

“accommodation establishment(s) that provides lodging for the traveller in a room or some other unit, but the number of places it provides must be greater than a specified minimum for groups of persons exceeding a single family unit and all the places in the establishment must come under a common commercial type-management, even if it non-profit making” (Demunter, 2009, p. 3)

Nevertheless, this definition is vague and not measurable. For this reason there have been different interpretations and data is not always complete and comparable.

Collective forms of accommodation are traditional registered businesses operating hotels, hostels, guest houses and any other form of lodging which is registered as operating business for overnight visitors (Psarros et al., 2015). The traditional providers are:

1. “Hotels and similar structures”
2. “Tourist campsites”
3. “Holiday dwellings”
4. “Other collective accommodation”
5. “Specialized establishments” (Demunter, 2009, p. 5)
Global hotel industry was predicted to generate $550 billion in revenues in 2016. Many of the greatest companies in the world belong to the accommodation sector; an example is InterContinental Hotels Group, with 4,600 hotels worldwide followed by Marriott International with 3,992 and Hilton Worldwide with 3,672 hotels across the world\(^8\) (Statista, 2015). The global hotel industry in 2011 was worth US$457 billion and continued to grow with an increase of US$100 billion yearly in the last 5 years. Europe and Asia Pacific are key regions within the industry with the highest occupancy rates ("Hospitality Net - The Global Hotel Industry and Trends for 2016,” 2015). The impact of hospitality in the global economy is important. Travel and tourism industry has created 266 million jobs and contributed to 9.5% of global GDP. With forecasts of constant increase in revenues and worth, it is a key driver of economic growth at local, regional and global level (EY, 2015).

The indicators of performance measure in the hotel industry are the average daily rate (ADR), the occupancy -expressed in percentage of occupied rooms- and the revenue per available room (RevPAR). In April 2014, the Asia Pacific region witnessed the highest occupancy rate in the world, with 68.8% occupancy. In the same month, the highest ADR and RevPAR were seen in Middle East and Africa. United States instead, has the lowest occupancy rate in the world (Statista, 2015).

1.7.2 Non-traditional forms of accommodation

According to Demunter (2009), Private tourist establishments are:

"The remaining types of tourist accommodation that do not conform to the definition of establishment". (Demunter, 2009, p. 3)

We intend with private establishments all the non-traditional forms of accommodation and the providers who are not officially registered businesses operating in the field of accommodation, like private guest rooms, apartments and houses which are originally private homes and structures, comprising:

- Rented accommodation (rooms or private structures within family houses rented directly or through agencies)
- Secondary homes (private property)
- Other typologies of private accommodation (non-charged accommodation) (Demunter, 2009, p. 5)

In this segment of accommodation providers take part all the subjects who rent their spaces, bedrooms, houses for overnight visitors in the form of holiday rentals. Long

---

\(^8\) Updated data from 2015 shows Intercontinental Hotel Group to be ranked no.1 in the world with 4,840 hotels, Hilton Worldwide no.2 with 4,278 hotels and Marriott International no.3 with 4,117 hotels worldwide ("Global Hotel Ranking 2015," 2015)
before the sharing economy, forms of hospitality exchanged among so-defined peers already existed in parallel to hotels. But the development of the hospitality industry witnessed the rise of hotels as the primary source of accommodation. Today, since the rising of the sharing economy, traditional providers have witnessed a revolution caused by the boom of the shared accommodation phenomenon. The phenomenon of shared accommodation, the object of the thesis, is related mainly to private establishments and short-term accommodation, which, according to Eurostat (Demunter, 2009) can be provided on a commercial basis -as a paid service for strangers- or on a non-commercial basis, accessing to accommodation provided by friends or relatives, without any monetary charge, or even on own-account in a holiday house. The non-commercial type of private accommodation is also defined as “non-rented”; therefore it will not be taken into exam for the purpose of this study.

In the definition of private accommodation, quasi hotels cited by Slattery (2002) can be included. The author estimated that, following national data from the United Kingdom and other research, quasi hotels account for three quarters of short-term serviced accommodation in the UK, which means circa 20% of the room nights available and only 8% of sold room nights. Quasi hotels are part of the short-term accommodation market even if it is the most marginal sector due to its slow decline in demand and the consolidation of the hotel market (Slattery, 2002). According to Lynch, McIntosh and Tucker (2009) private accommodation manifests itself in the form of small hotels, guesthouses, bed and breakfasts, farmstay settings and other types of establishments in which private landlords share their domestic environment with paying guests. In this way, the commercial and private domain of hospitality overlap at different levels of engagement in this type of economic activity. Indeed, there are cases in which the private space is provided to hosts for a short time of the year and others in which the activity of renting is representing a substantial part of the household income (Lynch et al., 2009).

Typologies of private accommodation can be analyzed for their structure: holiday villas, cottages, apartments, townhomes, condominiums, single-family houses or farms are indicating the type of structure used for accommodation. Nevertheless, all these establishments are generally categorized under the term vacation rentals. Vacation rentals, indeed, is the common term used to identify all the forms of lodging in private apartments or houses on a temporary basis rented to visitors for tourism purposes, alternatively to a hotel. The term is commonly used in the U.S., while in Europe the terms villa rental, villa holiday, holiday lets or cottage holidays are more common to define
houses in warm climates (Demunter, 2009). The length of stay in vacation rentals may vary according to the type of establishment; some are rented on a nightly basis as it happens for hotels, others are more inclined to be rented on a weekly or monthly basis. As compared to commercial accommodation, many types of vacation rentals offer the same services and amenities as hotels, such as 24-hour reception, restaurant, housekeeping, maintenance, etc.

1.7.2.1 Sizing of global vacation rental market
As highlighted in a study by Evercore (Sena, McNellis, & McDade, 2015), the global vacation rental market is estimated to worth $100 billion, comprising all forms of private accommodation for commercial purposes. Recently, with the rise of online platforms, online bookings are estimated to represent the 7% of global bookings, with an expected increase to reach 11% in the next five years. With this estimation, the study projected an increase of the online vacation rental market from a value of $30 billion—which represents the global market size with an online penetration of 30%- to $70 billion, with an expected global market growth up to $150 billion (Sena et al., 2015).

![Figure 15: Global value of online vacation rental bookings compared to hotel bookings (Sena et al., 2015, fig. 1)](image)

Vacation rentals market is highly diverse and fragmented. The lodging categories are many, as shown in the previous paragraphs, and there is still a lack of unified categorization within private accommodation. The nature of the business varies among rental owners as in some cases vacation rentals are an all-year activity while in other cases they are a temporary source of income. Literature about the sector has highlighted that the sector has always been part of the leisure travel landscape and that only recently it has emerged as an online phenomenon becoming a critical market with an exponential growth. According to Research and Markets (2016) the global vacation rental market is expected to reach $169.7 billion by 2019 with key regions of the sector represented by Europe and North
America (Research and Markets, 2016). HomeAway, one of the leading platforms for vacation rentals, has defined VR as a private lodging structure rented for 2 or more weeks within a year\(^9\) and has highlighted how still the structures of this type are a small percentage of the rentable properties, in an analysis made on the European countries of UK, France, Germany, Spain and Italy, top players in the market, as shown in Figure 17 (Sena et al., 2015, fig. 1). From the supply side, HomeAway estimated a number of 11.8 million vacation rentals in the cited European countries with an average weekly rental rate of $688. 2.9 million of the total rentals have an average activity of 17 weeks per year, which is carried out directly by the owner (FRBO – For rent by owner) or through property managers and realtors. From the demand side, vacation rentals have a 20-30% share among the different existing accommodation typologies, with an ongoing growing trend, especially in France and UK Vacation rental awareness and usage as an alternative to traditional accommodation is higher in Europe than in the US, with peaks of 60% in European countries compared to 35% of US. Even the demand through online queries related to vacation rental terms has increased of 14% up to 28% in European countries. Travelers prefer vacation rentals as alternative to a hotel mainly because of amenities like the kitchen, more space and the value, like authenticity and characterized structure (VRMA, 2015). According to Statista (Statista, 2016) the worldwide countries with the highest revenues connected to vacation rentals in 2015 were United States, with a market value of $8.1 billion, and Germany, with a market value of $3.7 billion (Statista, 2016).

\(^{9}\) “VR defined as vacation homes rented short-term to vacationers 2+ weeks/year” (VRMA, 2015, p. 3,4)

Euromonitor (2014) quantified a market growth of 19% for peer-to-peer accommodation and private rentals between year 2013 and 2018, including formal rentals of online platforms as well as informal rentals as local homestays (Euromonitor International, 2014).
A study carried out by PricewaterhouseCoopers (2015) shows that 6% of US population has been a consumer in the hospitality sharing economy and 1.4% is or has been a supplier through the most renowned sharing accommodation platforms. The phenomenon of shared accommodation has risen from the sector of vacation rentals, through the intensification of online and social exchange among peers, thanks to the diversification of the accommodation industry. The global vacation rental market has therefore witnessed a rapid growth through online channels and leading players in the field, paving the way to accessory service growth. This is the example of cleaning and key delivery services as well as short-term rental management companies who take care of every aspect from marketing and guest communication till the final cleaning and maintenance of the rented lodging. These online platforms are the realtors of the new era who can guarantee the renters the maximization of profits as well as improved quality and standard of the structure in exchange of a service fee (PwC, 2015).

1.7.3  **Online vacation rental marketplaces**

As previously mentioned, the sector of vacation rentals has witnessed an increase in the accommodation global market share due to the rising of the sharing economy and specialized online marketplaces for the rental of apartments and other types of accommodation. Among the greatest platforms that offer vacation rentals are **Airbnb -2 million listings- and HomeAway -1 million listings- followed by TripAdvisor -650m- and Priceline -257m-**. Airbnb room nights in 2014 have reached 39 million, compared to the 346 millions of Priceline and to the 184 millions of Expedia, which count a total including hotel room nights sold. Airbnb and HomeAway are leaders in the **vacation rental by owner sector** among online travel agencies, a sector that **represents two thirds of the alternative lodging market**. The phenomenon of shared accommodation started with private homes, but in the last decade it witnessed growth and increasing diversity in users and providers (Psarros et al., 2015). The most common **business models** of vacation rental marketplaces are the **pay-per-booking/performance** and the **flat subscription rate**. While in the pay per booking fee users can list their properties for free and are charged a commission for the service upon any transaction concluded, the flat subscription rate in many cases does not guarantee a return on investment since the payment has to be done before listing the property. Nevertheless, guarantees are granted for subscription sites, such as a free trial or a money-back guarantee. **Two key trends** in the online vacation rental market are **consolidation and convergence**. **Consolidation** happens when the traveler is not able to identify the distinction between lodging categories, therefore not able to distinguish a
shared form of lodging from a standard vacation rental. This happens when online travel agencies merge different vacation rental typologies in the same listing (e.g. a room in a shared private apartment appearing in the same listing as a whole commercially rented apartment). Convergence is a factor driving professionalization of the industry; nowadays vacation rentals provide the same amenities as hotels or traditional hospitality (e.g. linen, towels, soap, wi-fi) converging to a traditional type of service offered and making travellers demand these amenities always more, especially the 18-44 demographic segment, which accounts for the greatest growth in the sector (Skift, 2016). But companies that are part of the vacation rental market differ in business models and catered service, from free accommodation to luxury lodging rental. This research will analyze the companies that are most representatives of the sharing economy as well as those with the highest funding capital.

1. Couchsurfing
Characterized by the absence of transactions between the host and the guest, Couchsurfing is a community in which people can offer a place in their homes to guests without charging them. The concept, born with the idea that if you can host somebody for free you could be hosted for free in the future as well, paved the way in the landscape of alternative lodging since a decade and is nowadays one of the greatest online communities for travellers in seek of authentic and social experiences around the world. Beneath the business concept of the platform lies the true meaning of sharing accommodation for the fact that guests and hosts are living in the same house. The subscription to the platform is free as well as the accommodation service provided and it is not necessary to host people in order to be hosted by a member of the community.

2. HomeExchange
With the same vision of transaction-less shared lodging, HomeExchange is an online portal where property owners can list their home to exchange with other property owners around the world. The house exchange is a form of accommodation for travellers who wish to visit other cities/regions/countries exploiting the value of their personal home in exchange of accommodation in other users’ homes. Though the exchange is without transaction, entering the community to list your property has an annual subscription fee of $130 in order to avoid fake users. Once the user has paid the subscription fee, he can enter in contact with thousands of owners around the world and start a negotiation in order to exchange home for a period. If two owners agree to exchange home in the same period they will stay at the respective houses for free. This business model is also based on collaborative consumption and trust.
3. **Nightswap**

Another business model based on reciprocal exchange of accommodation is Nightswap, which differs from Couchsurfing for the fact that the first agreement for accommodation has to be paid in order for the user to start earning “nights” to travel in the future. Registration to the platform is free, the first exchange is to pay according to a rate decided by the owner and a reservation fee of €9,99 for Nightswap service. From the second time on, there is just a booking fee of €9,99 retained by the platform but only if a user hosts travellers he earns “nights” to spend in future travels. The revenue model is based mainly on the first transaction and on the reservation fee. The sharing concept behind this platform is the peer-to-peer accommodation model.

4. **HomeAway**

One of the two biggest players in the short-term accommodation field, HomeAway is a vacation rental marketplace with 1 million listings worldwide (https://www.homeaway.com/1mil/). Founded in 2005 in Texas, it was recently acquired by Expedia at the end of 2015. This platform plays an important role in the holiday rental market, though it was not meant to follow the concept of the sharing economy, since it differs from shared accommodation platforms for the fact that hosts and guests are supposed to sign a renting contract once the user has encountered the lodging online. The company has acquired many smaller competitors along the way and is now managing VRBO, Vacationrentals.com, Homelidays, OwnersDirect, Abritel, FeWo-Direkt, Toprural, Bookabeach, Stayz, Travelmob, Alugue Temporada. Nevertheless, HomeAway and all these brands have become Expedia’s sub-brands. The business model of HomeAway is based on two options: an annual subscription fee starting from $349 for all-year-renting as well as pay-per-booking fees of 8% up to 6 weeks renting. While the first lets you get unlimited bookings and higher earnings, the second is risk-free.

5. **VRBO**

The name is the acronym for “Vacation Rental By Owner”, a model that provides a direct contact between the host and the guest. Originally the platform was independent and then it was acquired by and is now part of the HomeAway brand. Until recently, the platform was based on subscription fees to advertise the properties, thus the transaction happened outside the platform with no control of the monetary exchange. Today it is possible to book and pay online, so the transaction is intermediated by the company and reviews of the service are possible.
6. **Flipkey and TripAdvisor**
TripAdvisor bought Flipkey in 2008 in order to access a broader lodging supply in the accommodation sector. With a listing portfolio of over 300,000 holiday houses, it merged with the world’s largest travel community. Thanks to this acquisition, TripAdvisor is now selling rooms and apartments for short-term accommodation making it easier for private hosts to be recognized by users through the famous travel reviews website. The listing is free and the business model is pay-per-booking.

7. **Wimdu**
With over 300,000 listings in more than 140 countries, this company is based in Germany and focused on the European market. It is a free platform to publish vacation rentals and the business model is pay-per-booking where the client pays a 15% commission on the price of the lodging and the host pays 3% commission for each transaction.

8. **Roomorama**
This is a short-term vacation rental platform in the style of Airbnb, HomeAway and the like with the difference that only guests pay a commission on the booking amount as service fee, while hosts can list their property for free and do not pay any subscription or performance fee. The commission for each reservation is normally 15% (12% if the length of stay is more than 1 month). It was founded in 2009 and features 80,000 objects listed by direct owners as well as property managers.

9. **Homestay**
This company and online marketplace is dedicated to homestay experiences, where travellers are staying at houses with the presence of the owner. This model was created with the intention to provide to travellers authentic local experiences at the destination to make them live as a local. The satisfaction of the guest, in this way, is entirely in the hands of the host. The company features more than 50,000 places across 150 countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guest Fee</th>
<th>Host Fee</th>
<th>Listing Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airbnb</td>
<td>Guests pay a booking fee of 6-10%, depending on the total of the reservation amount</td>
<td>Airbnb hosts pay 3% of the total booking to Airbnb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TripAdvisor</td>
<td>Guests pay a booking fee of 5-10%, depending on the total cost of the rental</td>
<td>FlipKey hosts can either list for free and pay FlipKey 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomeAway</td>
<td>Guests pay a booking fee of 4-10%, but the fee is capped at $480</td>
<td>HomeAway hosts can choose to either pay an annual subscription fee or an 8% pay-per-booking fee (the 8% is 10% if you are Overseas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomorama</td>
<td>Guests pay a booking fee of 15%, or 12% if the stay is longer than 1 month.</td>
<td>Roomorama hosts do not pay Roomorama a fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glower</td>
<td>Guests pay a 15% booking fee</td>
<td>Glower hosts do not pay Glower a fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimdu</td>
<td>Guests pay a 15% booking fee</td>
<td>Wimdu hosts pay Wimdu a 2% processing fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to Stay</td>
<td>Guests do not pay a booking fee</td>
<td>Way to Stay hosts pay a variable percentage of the total booking to Way to Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9Flats</td>
<td>Guests do not pay a booking fee</td>
<td>9Flats hosts pay 15% of the total booking to 9Flats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17: Business model of the most common online vacation rental platforms (“Vacation Rental Fees Comparison,” 2016)*
1.7.4 The Case of Airbnb

Airbnb is one of the companies that most represents the concept of sharing economy accommodation and one of the most debated and at the same time praised examples of disruptive business. Airbnb is a worldwide online platform for the intermediation of short-term private accommodation between private people. It is a website in which people may find any type of accommodation in any city of the world, from rooms, apartments, houses, villas to castles, tents, tree-houses, boats and private islands. With a highly effective marketing strategy based on the authenticity of the travel experience, this company has become in less than a decade one of the most disruptive companies of the hospitality industry. Defined today as the world's leader in sharing hospitality (Quinby, 2016) and one of the top leaders and players in the hospitality industry in general (Austin, Canipe, & Slobin, 2015; Euromonitor International, 2014; Griswold, 2016; Newcomer & Huet, 2016), it has jumped from an economic valuation of $25.5B in 2015 to $30B in 2016, in less than one year. Phocuswright (2016) estimates that Airbnb’s gross bookings in 2015 were close to $7.5 billion, setting it ahead of few regional online accommodation platforms like UK’s Travel Republic, Ireland’s Hostelworld Group and Germany’s HRS. With 2 million listings on its platform (https://www.airbnb.it/about/about-us), it has the greatest spectrum of accommodation rentals in the world, leading the chart of online VR platforms. Numbers of Airbnb are impressive:

- 60 million users
- 640,000 hosts
- 6 million guests
- 2 million listings
• $30 billion economic valuation
• 500,000 average daily overnights
• 191 operating countries
• 80 million total guest arrivals (Smith, 2016)

On average an Airbnb listing can reach an earning of $5,110 per year sharing on average 4 nights per month (Griswold, 2016). Many researchers have studied the phenomenon of the massive explosion of shared accommodation after the birth of Airbnb – among them Botsman & Rogers (2010a, 2010b); Dervojeda et al. (2013); Zervas et al. (2014); Gansky (2010). The crucial moment that set the formal beginning of the company’s activity was October 2007, in occasion of the annual industrial design conference held in San Francisco. Two friends and graduates, who had recently moved to the city and planned to attend the conference, had the brilliant idea to earn some money renting the extra room of their apartment to visiting attendees. They placed an advertising in the conference’ website and hosted three people. It was just the beginning of the business model they later developed giving birth to Airbnb. Joe Gebbia and Brian Chesky were young, talented and smart enough to take advantage of the situation and start the model that revolutionized the accommodation market. With a simple customer value proposition – offering an airbed and breakfast- they then decided to open a website and make it a business, collaborating with web developer Nathan Blecharczyk. Originally born for big events and conferences – crucial was the Obama conference held in Denver, where demand for hotel rooms exceeded the actual supply-, it developed fast and met the enthusiasm of people wanting to share their space and earn extra money. The original website was called airbedandbreakfast.com and officially launched in 2008. After raising the initial money to start the business, the founders immediately presented the project to investors and started to collect funds. Today, thanks to these rounds of investment by big venture capitalists and business angels, the company has been evaluated 30 billion US dollars and is estimated to grow continuously. The reason why Airbnb is a disruptive company is not because it changed a sector that was not enough appealing to travellers, but for the fact that Airbnb has opened and improved the access to a series of alternative or non-traditional accommodation forms that had always been a travel niche or very hard to find. Moreover, Airbnb gave a complete new meaning to private accommodation through the personalization and authenticity of the travel experience. Together with authenticity and local experience, the vision of Airbnb is inclined to responsible tourism, whereas the provision of accommodation in big cities expanded to less touristic neighborhoods fostering their development and bringing positive economic
impact in the visited area. As shown in a report about global economic impact\(^{10}\) of Airbnb (Airbnb, 2014), **74% of lodging is located outside of big hotel areas** and 79% of guests want to explore the specific neighborhood in which they choose to stay. Airbnb guests spend **2,1 times more money and time at the destination** compared to hotel guests, with **42% of their travel expenditure being spent in the chosen neighborhood**. **81% of worldwide Airbnb hosts share the house in which they live and 48% use the earnings to pay the home expenses.** In the respective Italian report created with data collected on the Italian territory (Airbnb Italia, 2016)\(^{11}\), the company affirms that responsible home sharing is one of the propellers of tourism in the Italian economy. 28% of guests travelling with Airbnb admitted that if it was not for the accommodation found through the platform they would not have travelled because of unaffordable prices of traditional accommodation or they would have travelled for less days. While **76% of guests would definitely repeat the experience** lived with Airbnb. In Italy, users of the platform spend on average **38% of their budget in local enterprises** (34% in local restaurants and 19% in entertainment and local shopping). In Italy, 49% of hosts live below the Italian average family income (22.200/year). The number of people that hosted Airbnb guests is 83.300 with a number of 3,6M arrivals in 2015 and an **average stay of 3,6 nights compared to 3 of hotels** (Airbnb Italia, 2016).

Airbnb is a very interesting case of debate about the sharing economy because of three main argumentations.

**Accessing alternative lodging and make it appealing**

Airbnb made it possible to access different typologies of lodging with an inferior price **compared to hotels**, attracting new segments of travellers and making travel affordable for them, causing concern from the traditional hospitality subjects, mainly for security, taxes and permission issues.

**The issue of Super Hosts**

Airbnb divulges information about their hosts, which appears to be just the surface of another phenomenon that is worth to consider: that of the Super hosts. According to a study commissioned by the American Hotel and Lodging Association, carried out by Penn State University (O’Neill & Ouyang, 2016), a small percentage of hosts are better being called **Super Hosts** because they **advertise more units on the platform generating the major part of the company’s revenue**. Multiple-unit operators are those renting 2 or more

\(^{10}\) Global data is an average of the data collected through studies carried out in the following cities: Paris, Amsterdam, Athens, Barcelona, Berlin, Boston, Edinburgh, London, Los Angeles, Montreal, Portland and Sydney.

\(^{11}\) Data from the Italian report was collected from the Italian Airbnb community from January 2015 to January 2016.
units while Full-time operators rent their units all-year round. These users represent the 3.3% of total hosts but they appear to be professional or commercial landlords carrying out the major part of activity of the platform. **Multiple-unit operators are responsible of 40% of Airbnb revenues in 12 studied American markets.** The 7% of users with three or more units generate the 25% of the company’s revenue. This is a major concern for the fact that full-time hosting is illegal in the majority of the studied American cities. As the author of the report stated, this small portion of hosts is able to generate a "disproportionate share of revenue" (O’Neill & Ouyang, 2016, p. 3 Key Findings).

**The illegal and tax issue**

In many cities around the world, Airbnb happened to become a tourism enhancer and accelerator, with private owners hosting people without worrying about the generated income taxation. For this reason in many cities **Airbnb has faced opposition from the public sector and challenges related to income tax avoidance by hosts and tourist tax avoidance by guests.** The violation of local renting laws has brought in many cases to declare illegal the renting of accommodation through Airbnb. Nonetheless, the company has started to cooperate with public administrations in order to remove from the platform the illegal rentals. A remarkable example of adaptation to the business model was the case of Amsterdam city that updated the legislation in order to control occasional short-term accommodation and exploit the benefits of its use on the city tourism (Euromonitor International, 2014).
Chapter 1, Part 3

Tourism accommodation supply in Ticino

1.8 Hospitality in Ticino

The canton of Ticino has an old tradition of leisure tourism and hospitality, since the XVIII-XIX century when the region became a popular destination for foreign and national travellers. Those who travelled to Ticino were noblemen who used to stay for long periods in holidays resorts, often buying villas to transform them into their holiday homes. Before being discovered as the “Sonnenstube”, Ticino was a rural region. Only after the opening of the Gotthard tunnel in 1882, that quickened the North-South communication, the contemporary history of tourism in Ticino started. Tourism and hospitality since then transformed Ticino into a modern region based on services. The first hotel of Ticino was opened in Lugano: Hotel du Parc was opened in 1855 within the property of the Ciani family. It was then enlarged and it became Grand Hotel Palace in 1903 (Visentin, 2013). This long tradition in the hospitality industry is the evidence of the important role played by accommodation in the canton’s economy. Today the tourism reality of Ticino has much evolved. 2015 was the year of the new Swiss tourism law that, besides important strategies, defined the 4 territorial tourism organizations (OTR) of Ticino, based on the old touristic regions: in 2015 OTR Lago Maggiore e Valli registered 48.3% presences, OTR Lugano 39.7%, OTR Bellinzona e Alto Ticino 6.9% and OTR Mendrisiotto e Basso Ceresio 5.1%.

Figure 19: Quota of overnights per OTR during 2015 (Scagnolari, Sarman, & Pellegrini, 2016, fig. 1.17 p.18)

The accommodation supply of Ticino is represented by different categories of traditional and non-traditional providers. In the following paragraphs, data from Swiss federal statistics and Istituto di Ricerche Economiche (IRE) within Università della Svizzera italiana will be reported. The presented data refer to the hotel sector comprising hotels (boarding
houses, restaurants with rooms) and care homes (clinics, sanatoria, thermal establishments).

**Following the 2015 Trend Report of IRE (Scagnolari et al., 2016), the decrease of tourism supply in Ticino since many years has kept constant, with 2015 confirming this trend.** The number of recorded establishments and beds in the canton has decreased of 24.3% and 15.7% respectively. In particular, in the year 2014-2015 the decrease has been recorded as the strongest ever. The reported average number of beds for each recorded establishment in 2015 was 44, which indicates an increase in the average number of available beds per establishment, showing that the strongest structures in the market are the largest ones. Lugano is the region with the biggest establishments, while in Bellinzona and Alto Ticino the structures are the smallest (Scagnolari et al., 2016). Although officially statistics do only take into account traditional hospitality, other forms of non-traditional hospitality are included (holiday homes, campsites and other non-categorized). This data about non-traditional hospitality, although too less and difficult to record, is included in the aggregate statistics for a matter of sample numerosity.

### 1.8.1 Supply market trends

In 2015 in Ticino, the low-category structures have been the most numerous in terms of open establishments (66.4% of the total), while the number of open 3-4- and 5-star hotels remained more or less stable in comparison with previous years.

![Figure 20: Opened establishments for lodging category in the summer period (Scagnolari et al., 2016, fig. 2.3 p.27)](image)

*The ascertained number of operating (open) establishments in 2015 was 347 in the entire region, with a continuing decrease trend since at least 10 years* (Figure 23) (O-Tur, 2016a). The average data of the current year 2016 (recorded from January to May) indicates an average number of 312,4 establishments, confirming the decreasing trend (Tab. 1.1).
If we take into account the number of recorded establishments of 2015 divided per lodging category, we can observe that the majority of establishments are not part of traditional categorized (star system) hospitality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1 star</th>
<th>2 star</th>
<th>3 star</th>
<th>4 star</th>
<th>5 star</th>
<th>No star</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number of recorded open establishments per lodging category in 2015 (O-Tur, 2016a Tab 2.1)

The latest data about the number of available rooms and beds dates back to May 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1 star</th>
<th>2 star</th>
<th>3 star</th>
<th>4 star</th>
<th>5 star</th>
<th>No star</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>8.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Number of recorded available rooms in May 2016 divided per lodging category (O-Tur, 2016a Tab 2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1 star</th>
<th>2 star</th>
<th>3 star</th>
<th>4 star</th>
<th>5 star</th>
<th>No star</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>5.146</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.760</td>
<td>15.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Number of recorded available beds in May 2016 divided per lodging category (O-Tur, 2016a Tab 2.3)

Net occupation rates\(^{12}\) for the same period were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 star</th>
<th>2 star</th>
<th>3 star</th>
<th>4 star</th>
<th>5 star</th>
<th>No star</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Average net occupation rates of available rooms in Ticino in May 2016 (O-Tur, 2016a Tab 2.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 star</th>
<th>2 star</th>
<th>3 star</th>
<th>4 star</th>
<th>5 star</th>
<th>No star</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Average net occupation rates of available beds in Ticino in May 2016 (O-Tur, 2016a Tab 2.4)

1.8.2 Demand market trends

As for supply side, tourism demand in Ticino has seen a decrease in the number of arrivals and overnights in the last three years. From January to November 2015 the total arrivals in  

\(^{12}\) Net occupation rates (%) refer to the % value of the total number of occupied rooms/beds divided the room/bed total net capacity for the selected period (rooms/beds total net capacity is the number of rooms/beds of an establishment during the selected period multiplied for the opening days of the establishment in that period) (O-Tur, 2016a, fol. NOTA)
Ticino were below one million, losing 3.3% compared to 2014, while the presences decreased of -5.7%. Data from the national statistics indicated a decrease especially in the overnights compared to arrivals, consolidating a trend that sees tourists staying fewer days at the destination. Hotel overnights in 2015, indeed, lose 1.6% compared to 2014. Autumn 2015 recorded a positive score of presences for OTRs Lugano and Mendrisiotto e Basso Ceresio (+3.7%), whereas in the other two regions the score was negative: Bellinzona e Alto Ticino and the area of Lago Maggiore e Valli suffered a drop of 2.6% and 6.3% respectively in the hotel demand. Negative records happened in 5-star (-9.1%) and 3-star hotels (-4.7%), while 4-star hotels increased their demand (+4.1%). But the most impressive data of 2015 are about arrivals, overnights and average stay. In all three figures 2015 was a negative year in which all Ticino witnessed -3.3% in arrivals, -5.7% in overnights and a drop in the average length of stay from 2.16 days in 2014 to 2.11 days in 2015 (Scagnolari & Sarman, 2016). 2016 is still being evaluated, but the month of July marked a drastic change witnessing +9.6% in arrivals and +9.5% in overnights in Ticino, a positive trend that continued in August and is predicted to keep stable with comparison to last year (O-Tur, 2016b).

1.9 Traditional accommodation suppliers in Ticino

As highlighted in the second part of the chapter, traditional forms of accommodation are collective establishments providing lodging and food to groups of people exceeding a single-family unit. These forms of accommodation are commercial and publicly registered as businesses. In this category are hotels, internationally categorized by the number of stars, hostels, alpine huts, bed & breakfast and campsites. Ticino has a well-established tradition of hospitality especially in the diversity of proposed solutions. Ticino Turismo (http://www.ticinoturismo.ch), the official tourism DMO of the OTR, lists the forms of traditional accommodation divided by category. Hotels, but also agritourism, alpine huts and campsites are part of the accommodation supply of Ticino: more than 300 hotels, 95 alpine huts, 76 agritourism and 38 campsites are part of traditional accommodation. As far as presences are concerned, 3-star hotels are those with the highest demand volume (registering 612.877 overnights in summer 2015) followed by 0-2 star hotels, which have been shrinking in the last years (Scagnolari et al., 2016, p. 13).
1.10 Non-traditional accommodation suppliers in Ticino

Non-traditional forms of accommodation are all the forms of private accommodation that are used for commercial purposes on a periodical basis but are used as private lodging when not rented. This form of lodging, often not part of any register, is mostly represented by vacation rentals and all those forms of occasional accommodation providers that rent their spaces to travellers for short-stays. In Switzerland, and in the rest of the world, the phenomenon of sharing economy and consequent opening of private houses to travellers has led to an increase in the activity of non-traditional lodging forms through online marketplaces and established brands that made it more accessible to find a place to stay. As Scagnolari, Sarman and Sturm (2014) sustain. Besides the other forms of non-traditional lodging, secondary houses in Europe represent a rough 9% of the total tourism overnight demand for 4 or more nights (13% if considering domestic travel, 3% of international travels). Secondary houses represent a strong reality in Switzerland. Ticino is the second region after the cantons of Valais, Grisons and Bern by number of secondary houses. The reason for this is that there is a consolidated segment of people travelling to their private holiday homes in Ticino mostly from the German and French part of Switzerland. In 2000, there were 420,000 registered secondary houses in Switzerland, of which the 11% were registered in Ticino, representing nearly 1/4 of local homes (Scagnolari et al., 2014). As Sturm and Sarman sustain (2015), the recent phenomenon of online platforms for shared accommodation has touched also Ticino reaching relevant dimensions also in the smallest economic and territorial dimensions, representing an interesting challenge for the traditional tourism key-players, especially in the hotel sector. In 2015, there were about 500 listings on Airbnb. Today, the total number is not publicly visible from the website anymore, but it will be revealed in the next paragraph. The area with the highest number of listed houses is the Locarno region (O-Tur, 2015).

1.10.1 Shared accommodation in Switzerland and Ticino

In an article about the sharing economy, De Vore (2014) reports the findings of a study made by the Swiss-based Gottlieb Duttweiler Institute that asked to 1,100 people in Germany and Switzerland about the motivations to share their objects and spaces to others. The majority of respondents said they are willing to share and trade simply because they cannot afford it, but Swiss people do it because of their good attitude towards the environment and more for social than monetary aspects. Swiss renters of shared accommodation are allowed by laws in many regions to rent their space if they do not make a profit but just cover the expenses. But the need to regulate the sector of shared
accommodation is urgent to contrast the recent phenomenon (De Vore, 2014). A study made by Deloitte shows some predictions about engagement of the Swiss population in the sharing economy: 55% of interviewed people sustained they would share their property or goods in the next 12 months; 65% of French-speaking Swiss are in favour of sharing economy, compared to 32% of German speakers; 21% of Swiss agree with the need of clearer regulations. The most present companies in the field of shared accommodation in Switzerland are Airbnb and Housetrip (owned by TripAdvisor). Accommodation together with transportation, make the 60% of the total activity within sharing economy, both sectors connected to tourism (Zobrist & Grampp, 2015). The greatest study about shared accommodation in Switzerland comes from the Observatoire Valaisan du Tourisme (OTV), who made a research about the growth and expansion of Airbnb in Switzerland from the supply point of view (Schegg et al., 2016; Schegg, Favre, Délétroz, & Larpin, 2015). The study was first published in November 2015 and updated in June 2016, analyzing the lodging supply of Airbnb in Switzerland (4.500 cities), making a comparison with the hotel sector. The major findings of the study will be shown below.

1. **From 2014 to 2016 the number of publicized listings has grown more than three times**: from 6.033 listings in 2014 to **18.494** in June 2016.

2. **The number of beds in Switzerland** passed from 20.841 of October 2014 to **48.198** of June 2016, +131%.

3. In many cantons the supply exceeds the number of 1.000 listings: Zurich 2.805, Valais 2.644, Genève 2.149, Vaud 2.001, Bern 1.795, Bâle-Ville 1.698 and Grisons 1.362. These cantons represent the 80% of all Airbnb listings in Switzerland.

4. The most numerous listings are present in **urban areas** as well as **traditional holiday regions**. Valais canton is ranked on top by number of beds, with 12.295 beds and a market share of 25.5% ahead of Grisons (5.458 beds and 11.3% market share) and Bern (5.111 beds and 10.6% market share). Following these are Vaud, Zurich, Geneva, Bâle-Ville and Ticino.

5. **Airbnb compete with classic hotels in the urban cantons** such as Basel city where the number of beds is already equivalent to **42% of the hotel supply**. In Vaud the percentage is 25% and in Geneva 22%, while the Swiss average is 19%.

6. Prices in the urban areas vary between CHF78/bed in Zurich and CHF134/bed in Basel. In traditional holiday regions beds are substantially less expensive: CHF64/bed in Valais and CHF69/bed in Graubünden.

7. In Switzerland 11.496 houses are **administered by an individual owner** (84% of the renters), while 2.844 houses are managed by owners who publish 2 listings (10.4% of the renters). Those who rent more than 2 listings are called **professional renters** and represent the 5.6% of total renters of Switzerland.
8. In 2015 Airbnb reached 80 million nights sold, whereas **1.35 million nights were sold in Switzerland**, corresponding to 3.8% of hotel sold nights. The prediction for 2016 is to reach 135 million nights globally and **1.9 million in Switzerland**, representing 5.4% of hotellerie’s nights.

9. In Switzerland the number of **total hosts is 300,000**. The **average stay per guest per listing is 4.5 nights**.

10. Ticino is well ranked in the chart for being a holiday destination. With **897 listings and 2,462 beds at the end of June 2016**, the % change from 2014 to 2016 in the number of beds has been of +249%, a growth that is supposed to continue exponentially.

11. Compared with the hotel sector, in Ticino the **number of Airbnb beds (2,462) is still 14% of hotel beds (17,865)**.

12. Another interesting data about the study is the price per listing related to every canton. For Ticino the **average price per bed** is CHF62.87, whereas the **average price per listing is CHF134.42**. The **average Swiss prices for an entire apartment/house are CHF206.81 in total or CHF82.41 per bed**. The prices for shared apartments and rooms are lower. (Schegg et al., 2016)

4. Offre Airbnb par canton (classée par le nombre d’objets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total lités</td>
<td>Part de marché (lités)</td>
<td>Nb objets</td>
<td>Total lités</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>1'243</td>
<td>4'238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valais</td>
<td>3'905</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>12'295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suisse</td>
<td>7'904</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>33'860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaud</td>
<td>2'326</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>4'677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>5'111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâle-Ville</td>
<td>1'352</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>3'211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grisons</td>
<td>1'029</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>5'454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fribourg</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2'688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1'090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1'271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Table of Airbnb supply divided by Swiss canton and by number of listings (Schegg et al., 2016, p. 10)

**1.10.2 The case of ACAV Ticino and Casafille.ch**

ACAV Ticino is the first association of second-home and holiday-home owners in Ticino representing almost 4,000 beds that are rented weekly or daily in holiday houses and **apartments in the canton**. ACAV Ticino (Associazione Case e Appartamenti di Vacanza Ticino) is responsible for the promotion of tourism through an alternative type of lodging, the short-term rental in private homes. The association was born in April 2015 and is formed by 10 active members and representatives of rental-listing portals and estate agents and a committee of 5 people. Through active and structured information, targeted research and evaluation of the results, ACAV Ticino creates important synergies between members of the association and external tourism stakeholders in order to improve and increase the sublease activities for tourism purposes but mostly to raise awareness about this supply market segment in order to be included in the official statistics and taken into
consideration within tourism projects in the region. The association features active and passive members: active members are professional renters administering 10 or more secondary homes, who are charged an annual fee to be part of ACAV; passive members are all those owners of one or more secondary homes who are exonerated from the annual fee. The active members of the association are: Casafile GmbH, HolAp, Fewotessin Sagl, Ferienwohnungen Locarno GmbH, Verzasca Rustici Sagl, Tessin-Ferienwohnungen, My House-Somaini, on-road Ferienwohnungen, MyVerzasca.ch. The President of ACAV Ticino, Oliver Keller, is also the founder and CEO of the first and the biggest short-term rental listing website in Ticino, Casafile.ch, founded in 1998. The portal features private lodging for short-term rental and has a basis of 510 owners of houses, apartments and villas that are being rented on an annual basis. The properties are mostly secondary homes of renters that make a private use of the house for holiday and for short periods, while for the rest of the year they rent it to guests. Casafile.ch provides services for advertising, cleaning and maintenance of the listed houses as well as key handling, in order to provide a 360° service to guests. The reason why this agency is cited as case is because it is the company with the highest number of vacation rentals subscription in Ticino. The other members of ACAV feature a number between 10 and 160 objects per agency for a total of 813 available rentals in the canton. (O. Keller, personal communication, September 22, 2016)

The sector of private accommodation has witnessed an increase in the number of overnights and arrivals during the summer season 2016 in Ticino, a positive sign that underlines the growth of this sector in tourism. As predicted by ACAV Ticino early this year, during summer 2016 tourists showed greatest interest again to travel and stay in Ticino. Compared to 2015, a particularly difficult year in terms of tourism, 2016 was a positive year that could be achieved thanks to a great effort and commitment of on-site agencies and owners who could ensure a great stay to tourists. In addition to the cleanliness and care of the rented house, essential for the customer, the welcoming and friendliness of each tenant are very important features to satisfy the guests’ expectations (“Bilancio positivo per le case di vacanza,” 2016).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of ACAV Ticino</th>
<th>Number objects</th>
<th>Number beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casafile.ch</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verzasca Rustici</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tessin-Ferienwohnungen</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myverzasca.ch</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My House Somaini</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HolAp</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewotessin</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferienwohnungen Locarno</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road Ferienwohnungen</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VillaService Kägi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.760</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Number of objects listed and total beds administered by the rental agencies member of ACAV Ticino (O. Keller, personal communication, September 22, 2016)
Chapter 2

Methodology

Estimation of the revenue economic market value of the vacation rental sector in Ticino

After having analyzed and presented the literature about sharing economy and its application in tourism and the accommodation sector, the following chapter will explain the methodology used to provide an answer to the research question of the thesis, comprising three stages: desk research, fieldwork and data analysis.

The purpose of this research is to explore and investigate the sector of non-traditional accommodation in Ticino as well as to estimate the potential economic in terms of revenues of the sector and its importance in the region’s tourism, in an environment where traditional accommodation is reigning and contrasting private rentals.

In order to answer the research question (What is the estimation of the potential market value of sharing-economy accommodation forms in Ticino?) the findings of the thesis were based on a three-stage approach:

1. The conceptual framework was presented after a desk research on existing literature about the sharing economy, the hospitality and vacation rental sector and the presence of VR in Ticino; a qualitative and quantitative analysis on secondary data was made in order to find evidence to answer the research question.

2. An empirical research was then carried out as fieldwork in order to investigate the nature and characteristics, composition, prices and occupancy of vacation rentals in Ticino. A qualitative and quantitative questionnaire, making part of a greater investigation about secondary houses in Ticino, was structured with the aim to collect primary data to support the theory of the thesis.

3. The data analysis was then carried out on both primary and secondary data in order to draw the findings and identify the answer to the research question.
RESEARCH QUESTION:

What is the estimation of the potential market value of sharing-economy accommodation forms in Ticino?

2.1 Conceptual framework

In order to identify the context of sharing economy accommodation forms in Ticino -subject of the research- the study of literature was useful to provide a conceptual framework of the sector. The presentation of existing literature in chapter one followed a top-down approach, from general to particular. It started from the explanation of the concept of sharing economy, a phenomenon that has brought disruption in the economy, and it continued with the application of sharing economy in the field of tourism. From its application in tourism it then continued with the explanation of the hospitality field, in particular the accommodation sector, which is the focus of the research. An explanation of the difference between traditional and non-traditional accommodation forms was presented in order to clarify the difference between the two and to reach the focus of the study: the vacation rental sector for tourism purposes, defined as non-traditional accommodation. In the last paragraphs of the literature review, then, the specific region of Ticino within this context was presented.

The analysis of literature and secondary data was both of qualitative and quantitative type and conducted in the form of deduction on online and hard sources of information. The sources were selected on the basis of online research.

---

13 From general theories and statements the process aims at the identification of assumptions and deductions related to the vacation rental sector in Ticino.
Qualitative analysis was carried out to identify the importance of the sector of vacation rentals globally, first, and in Ticino, second. The identification of three main contexts was thought in order to define, first on a large scale and after on a local scale, the sector of vacation rentals. Therefore, the analysis of literature followed a logical path:

- The first context of study was related to theories about sharing economy and collaborative consumption, which appeared to be the basis to understand the phenomenon of peer-to-peer accommodation rentals.
- The second context of study is related to the application of sharing economy business models to the traditional sectors of tourism, including accommodation as the focus sector of the research.
- The third context of study was related to the difference between traditional and non-traditional forms of accommodation in order to define the vacation rental sector and to provide an overview of existing literature in the field, especially related to Switzerland and Ticino.

Quantitative analysis was carried out on the numerical data expressed in the literature review in order to identify a hypothetical market value in terms of revenues of sharing economy vacation rentals.

The desk research on secondary data, as highlighted in the findings section, was nevertheless too scarce to provide a realistic answer to the research question. For this reason, a second methodology was needed in order to evaluate the market of private accommodation and secondary home rentals in Ticino through the collection of primary data.

### 2.2 Empirical Research

In order to answer the research question, a second methodology was used with the purpose to analyze more in depth the sector of vacation rentals in Ticino. The primary data, obtained in order to have a realistic vision of the sector, was collected through a qualitative and quantitative questionnaire that was taken by a sample of secondary house/vacation rental owners representing a part of the supply of non-traditional accommodation in Ticino. The empirical research of the thesis was incorporated in a greater project conducted by the Tourism Observatory (O-Tur) of the Economic Research Institute (IRE) of Università della Svizzera Italiana. The objective of the research, in collaboration with ACAV Ticino and guided by Prof. Dr. Stefano Scagnolari, Director of O-Tur and Second Reader of the present thesis, is to collect information about the sector of secondary home rentals in Ticino studying the economic activity and motivation of the owners but also investigating the
motivations of tourists choosing to stay at a vacation rental while travelling. For the purpose of this thesis, a part of research carried out by O-Tur, represented by the questionnaire addressed to the supply, was integrated with questions about online vacation rental platforms in order to obtain specific information related to the present investigation.

Objective

The objective of the questionnaire was to survey a sample of owners of secondary homes in Ticino that are being rented for tourism purposes in order to evaluate specific issues needed to understand the supply market segment and to answer the research question.

Sample

The sample of the survey is represented by owners of secondary homes and vacation rentals in Ticino, which are rented to tourists for a period of the year. In order to reach a wide segment and since the research was commissioned by ACAV Ticino, the sample is formed by the members of the association. As described in Paragraph 1.10.2, ACAV Ticino is formed by 10 professional members representing the greatest estate agencies and online platforms for short-term home rental in Ticino. The representatives of these agencies and listing platforms have contributed to the distribution of the questionnaire to the owners subscribed to their services, permitting to reach the widest potential spectrum of respondents in every district of the canton. In total, the sample of the survey is formed by 685 respondents, all owners of properties that are rented for tourism purposes in Ticino, categorized as non-traditional private accommodation that is used for commercial purposes for a period of time or all-time during the year. Even though the questionnaire was due to be sent to all the members of ACAV Ticino (with a potential reach of 1.000 people, as described in Table 10 par. 1.10.2) the real number of owners reached with the survey is 685, composed by:

- 510 private renters from the website casafile.ch, which incorporates the professional agencies of My House Somaini, Verzasca Rustici, Tessin-Ferienwohnungen and myvervasca.ch.
- 160 renters of the agency HolAp
- 15 renters of the agency VillaService Kägi.
Content
The survey contains questions regarding the owner, the rented property, the rental activity, the guests and the knowledge of online vacation rental platforms, with a focus on prices and occupancy rates of the rentals. The last part pays also importance for the research since it investigates whether the same rented objects are published in different online vacation rental platforms in order to classify them under the sharing economy accommodation terminology.

Structure
The survey is composed of 24 questions plus an introductory identification of the respondent who is asked to specify the estate agency/platform of reference and the object number intended as the identification number of the property within the referred agency. The questions are in most part multiple choices, with few free typing questions. The typology of question varies from open to close multiple answers:

- Questions 1, 2, 11-14 are related to the rented property and investigate the type of rental (house/apartment/rustico), the location within Ticino, the composition and size of the house, how many guests it can host and which kind of amenities are present.
- Questions 3 and 4 are related to the nationality of the owner and his/her motivation to rent the house.
- Questions 5-10, 17, 18 are related to the rental activity itself, investigating the minimum and average length of stay, the average daily rate and periodic occupancy and if the property is used personally by the owner or during holidays (Easter and Christmas).
- Questions 15 and 16 are related to the nationality and type of guests.
- Questions 19-21 are related to the knowledge and use of different types of online vacation rental platforms (Airbnb, Booking.com/Villas.com, Fewo-Direkt, Wimdu, Roomorama, VRBO, Flipkey).
- Questions 22-24 are related to the use of regional organizations’ tourism services and related satisfaction; the results of these questions will be presented but not taken into consideration in the findings.

Distribution
As formerly mentioned, the questionnaire was distributed to the owners of vacation rentals who are subscribed to the services of agencies and platforms members of ACAV Ticino. The distribution started after the second half of July 2016 (22.07.16) and the collection of data lasted for two months, until the end of September 2016 (25.09.2016). The questionnaire
was created in Italian and German, the official language of Ticino and the language that was mostly spoken by the owners of vacation rentals. It was then uploaded to Qualtrics platform, in order to have an online version accessible through a link, and then sent by e-mail to the sample representatives by the members of the association.

2.3 Data analysis

The analysis on data resulting from the literature review and the fieldwork was made through mathematical calculations and the comparison and combination of the results in order to provide an answer to the research question. In the last chapter related to the findings, the results will be explained.
Chapter 3

Results and Findings

The third chapter comprehends three parts: first, the results and findings of the research; second, an assessment of the limitations for methodology applied; third, personal considerations and suggestions for future research and development.

The scope of the present research is to provide a realistic overview of the market of non-traditional accommodation in the canton of Ticino, a region in which traditional hospitality has a long and consolidated establishment. **The research question moves from the need to identify a market potential to demonstrate that, after the rising of the phenomenon of sharing economy, the sector of non-traditional accommodation, comprehending vacation rentals and/or secondary home rentals, has reached a level of development able to compete with the oldest traditional hospitality players in the market.** For this reason a first analysis on literature about sharing economy, traditional and non-traditional tourism service providers in the field of hospitality was important to explain the context in which vacation rentals were studied.

3.1 Literature findings

From the analysis of the theories explained in the first chapter, it is clear to understand that the phenomenon of sharing economy, known as a form of economy based on the sharing of resources among people defined as peers, has emerged through online platforms that were able to engage users in sharing activities. Many researchers (Albinsson & Yasanthi Perera, 2012; Belk, 2014; Botsman & Rogers, 2010a; Dervojeda et al., 2013; Gansky, 2010; Hamari et al., 2015; Owyang, Tran, & Silva, 2013; Sundararajan, 2013) have demonstrated how disruptive the business models of the sharing economy were since their creation, thanks to Internet that accelerated and fostered human contact through online communication. Tourism is a sector that was profoundly affected by the sharing economy, since it is a service sector; therefore many services like transportation and accommodation changed and evolved following the trend and the choices of travellers. The objective of the study is to show the correlation between sharing economy, tourism and non-traditional forms of accommodation in order to draw a logical path towards the focus of this research. The most important findings of the analysis of literature will be described below.
Vacation rentals are a form of peer-to-peer accommodation, thus are part of the sharing economy.

As highlighted in the first part of chapter one, sharing economy emerged in an era in which common denominators were the economic crisis and an increased concern about the environment and the scarcity of resources connected to overpopulation. The reaction of people to these issues brought to the development of collaborative networks in which the exchange of assets with idling capacity fostered the emergence of new business models not based on production but on the repeated utilization of resources, prolonging the products’ life cycle and reducing pollution and waste connected to mass production. These collaborative networks and online platforms contributed to provide access to shareable resources among peers. Space is one of the most shared resources for its peculiarities. Vacation rentals can be included in the category of space sharing because they are mostly structures with idling capacity, which are used by owners for a limited time of the year. Space is an easily shareable resource since people travel always more and need places to stay out of their homes. Vacation rentals have become an alternative to traditional accommodation providers thanks to brand new online platforms that increased the level of trust and validity among strangers. **Vacation rentals can be defined as a form of peer-to-peer accommodation if the exchange happens between the owner and the guest.** Being present in a listing website and receiving inquiries directly from a customer, without passing from the services of property managers, is a pure form of peer-to-peer exchange.

There is a correlation between the rising of the phenomenon of sharing economy and the increase of non-traditional forms of lodging.

Globally, the figures related to the sharing economy indicate a constant growth in generated value. As highlighted above, numerous authors (Hawksworth & Vaughan, 2014; Koetsier, 2015; Rosemary & Vanessa, 2015) mention the growing trend of revenues and economic value generated by different sectors of the sharing economy. They estimate a value of potential revenue of $335 billion by 2025 in peer-to-peer services as well as a constant increase in the number of users of sharing economy platforms (Couchsurfing has reached 10 million members worldwide, Netflix has 20 million subscribers globally). The accommodation sector in the sharing economy is also part of the estimated growth trend.
Euromonitor (2014) indicates a global market growth of 19% for peer-to-peer accommodation and private rentals between 2013 and 2018 (Euromonitor International, 2014). Two companies of the vacation rental sector are leading the market of sharing economy businesses, Airbnb and Homeaway, valued respectively $30B and $3B on the market.

According to literature about the hospitality sector in Ticino, there is a demonstrated decreasing trend in the number of traditional operating accommodation establishments since at least ten years (Figure 23) (O-Tur, 2016a). The year 2015 closed with a number of 347 operating structures. Data from 2016 has been elaborated only until the month of May, with an average number of 312.4 operating establishments, confirming the decreasing trend. The statistic is referred only to traditional accommodation providers of the hotel and para-hotel sector. If we make a comparison with the study of Roland Schegg (Schegg et al., 2016) from the Valaisan Tourism Observatory, we can notice that in the sector of shared accommodation (only referred to Airbnb platform) the trend of operating and listed establishments for vacation rental is constantly growing, both in the whole Switzerland and in Ticino. In just two years (2014-2016) the number of listings in the platforms has grown more than three times: from 6,033 listings in 2014 to 18,494 in June 2016. The number of beds in Switzerland passed from 20,841 of October 2014 to 48,198 of June 2016, with an increase of +131%. Ticino is ranked 8th in the list of most active regions by number of structures, since it is a traditional holiday destination. With 897 listings and 2,462 beds at the end of June 2016, the % change from 2014 to 2016 in the number of beds has been of +249%, a growth that is supposed to continue exponentially.

| Sharing economy forms of accommodation have caused an impact on traditional accommodation providers |

From Psarros et al. (Psarros et al., 2015) we know that nearly 4 out of 5 traditional travel businesses surveyed by World Travel Market 2014 Report have sustained to have been affected negatively by the rise of online platforms of the sharing economy. From the same research, a statement from the CEO of HOTREC (the association of hotels, restaurants and cafés in Europe) reveals that the explosion of these platforms has modified the traditional tourism business models, especially that of hospitality. Indeed, there is evidence of the effort of traditional hospitality providers to follow the trend of shared accommodation differentiating their supply towards rental-like and shared models: from Marriot offering
the use of vacant areas as meeting and work spaces to Hilton Homewood Suites with enhanced amenities for guests staying for many days (Psarros et al., 2015). The study from Zervas et al. (2014) highlighted that the entrance of Airbnb in the market of short-term accommodation in Texas, US, had a relevant impact on the hotel sector in terms of affected price and revenue. In particular the study reveals that where the supply of Airbnb is higher, the higher is also the impact on hotel revenue. Those especially suffering are low-priced hotels and those not frequented by business travelers. The study eventually reveals that Airbnb has the power to limit the hotel’s decision to raise prices during peak seasons due to lower ADRs in the peer-to-peer accommodation resulting to be competitive against the traditional accommodation (Zervas et al., 2014). Nonetheless, the sector is still too small compared to hotels and other traditional providers who account for a major share of accommodation market. Euromonitor (2014) highlighted that, in 2013 in the U.S., private rentals accounted for just 6% of global accommodation value while hotels accounted for 72%. Moreover, the value of private rental, US$38.7 billion in 2013, is expected to grow up to 19% by the end of 2018, a lower growth compared to other competing categories such as budget hotels and guesthouses. In some Swiss regions like Valais, the supply of private accommodation through Airbnb is equal to the 42% of hotel supply, which can be seen as a competitor of the hotel market. Switzerland has an average market share of 19% in the accommodation sector. In Ticino, the supply is only 14% compared to hotels, but given the stable decrease in number of traditional establishments, it is likely that in the future the percentage of shared accommodation will rise.

What is missing from literature is a measure of total revenues or the economic valuation of the sector of vacation rentals (peer-to-peer accommodation) in Ticino. Nevertheless, the findings of the literature review revealed important facts and numbers connected to the number of listings present in the Airbnb platform. What emerged from the analysis of the study carried out by the Valaisan Tourism Observatory (Schegg et al., 2016) is that from the estimation of the global number of sold nights in 2016, equal to 135 million, a prediction sees a number of 1.9 million nights sold in Switzerland in 2016, representing only 5.4% of hotels’ nights. In Ticino, with a market share of 5.1% of the total listings of
Switzerland, the average price per listing is CHF134.42 (AVG price per bed CHF62.87). The average price for Switzerland for an entire apartment is CHF206.81 (CHF82.41 per bed) with an average stay per guest per lodging of 4.5 nights.

From this data it is possible to provide a first estimation of the revenues generated through the rental of apartments/houses through the Airbnb platform both in Switzerland and in Ticino.

Multiplying the average Swiss daily price per listing and the total number of nights sold we can have a measure of the total estimated revenues generated in 2016 in Switzerland:

\[
\text{CHF 206.81 x 1.900.000 nights sold = CHF 393.000.000}^{14}
\]

If we consider that Ticino has a market share of 5.1%, the nights sold in 2016 are likely to be 96,900, with an expected total annual revenue of

\[
96,900 \times \text{CHF 134,42 (average price per listing)} = \text{CHF 13.025.298}
\]

Another possible estimation would be the potential daily revenues\(^{15}\), calculated multiplying the average price per listing by the total number of listings in Ticino:

\[
\text{CHF 134.42 x 897 = CHF 120.575}
\]

3.2 Results of the empirical research

The questionnaire for the owners of vacation rentals in Ticino has seen a total of 118 responses over a sample of 685 owners, with a response rate of 17%\(^{16}\). In the introduction each owner has indicated its agency/platform of reference and the identification number of object. Of the 118 answers collected, 53% are renters of casafile.ch, 21% of VillaService Kägi, 16% of My House Somaini, 6% of HolAp, 5% are private renters or did not specify the agency/portal. Below, the results of the questionnaire will be shown descriptively and graphically.

Questions 1, 2, 11-14: Typology, location and composition of the rented objects

The majority of rented objects are apartments (53%), with 32% single houses and 15% farmhouses, also called “Rustico”. Regarding the location in which the rented objects are

\(^{14}\) The result is rounded up or down to the next/previous integer.

\(^{15}\) Estimation made on the hypothesis of 100% active and operating listings every day.

\(^{16}\) The percentage results of the research have been rounded up or down to the next/previous integer.
located, 28.6% are in Gambarogno, 22% in Ascona-Locarno, 15.4% in Vallemaggia, 14.3% in Malcantone, 7.7% in Tenero e Valle Verzasca, 6.6% in Lugano, 2.2% in Mendrisiotto and 1.1% respectively in Biasca, Bellinzona and Blenio. On average, each property can host up to 4,55 people (Median 5, Mode 4). The houses on average have a parking space available for guests (84.3%) and are composed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOUBLE ROOM</th>
<th>SINGLE ROOM</th>
<th>BEDS</th>
<th>BATHROOMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWIM. POOL</th>
<th>LAUNDRY</th>
<th>DISHWASHER</th>
<th>INTERNET</th>
<th>AIR COND.</th>
<th>PET FRIENDLY</th>
<th>GARDEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 and Table 11: Composition of the object and presence of amenities emerged from the results of the questionnaire

**Questions 3 and 4: nationality of the owner and motivation to rent the house**

The owners of vacation rentals are in major part of Swiss nationality divided as follows: 49.5% from German-speaking Switzerland, 40.7% from Italian-speaking Switzerland, 3.3% respectively from French-speaking Switzerland and Germany, 1.1% from Italy and other countries (Holland, South Africa). Regarding the motivation to rent the house, 47.1% answered “to cover the expenses”, 23.5% “to generate revenues”, 15.3% “I inherited the property” and 14.1% answered other motivations. Among the other motivations, some did not find the right motivation among the multiple choices, others describe a type of rental consisting of a property formed by many apartments, therefore the owners live in the property but also rent the apartments left free.
Questions 5-10, 17, 18: rental activity (length of stay, ADR, occupancy)

The average minimum length of stay in order to rent the house is 5.4 days (Median: 4.5), although the majority of respondents ask for a minimum of 7 days (Mode: 7). Regarding the usual length of stay for each reservation, 77.6% rents the property for one week, 9.4% for two weeks, 8.2% for up to one month and 2.4% respectively for two/three days or over one month.

![Usual length of stay per reservation](image)

The properties appeared to be used by the owner on average for 32.5 days per year (Q7), which is little more than one month in total. Many owners nonetheless (31 out of 86), reported a value equal to 0, meaning that the rented property is always at disposal of guests. Three owners, instead, stated they live in the property for 365 days per year: we assume these owners live in a property composed of many rented apartments.

Two questions (Q8, Q9) were related to the rental of the property during festive days. The 77.6% rents their property during Easter holidays, while 52.9% rents the property during Christmas holidays.

The motivation for the rental of the property in the form of short-term (Q10), is mainly (45.3%) due to the fact that if the rental had a fixed tenant the owner would not have the possibility to use the house. 34.9% of responders indicated other motivations such as less flexibility in having a fixed lodger or the existence of returning customers. 11.6% said the house is not equipped for a fixed lodger while 8.1% said fixed contracts have restrictive clauses.

The questionnaire revealed information about the average daily rate and occupancy of secondary homes, a type of information that is normally difficult to find in statistics. Q17 and Q18 revealed the ADR of the respondents’ properties as well as the average occupancy expressed in number of days per defined period. The queries were divided in four periods of the year, statistically subjected to price and occupancy change, namely “April-June”, “July-August”, “September-October” and “Other” representing the rest of the year. Since
each response refers to one rented object, the occupancy was not calculated through the traditional formula\textsuperscript{17}, but it was based on the amount of days the property is rented each defined period in percentage value.

<p>| Table 12: Average daily price for the whole object rented divided by period; average occupancy by period |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April-June</th>
<th>July-August</th>
<th>Sept-October</th>
<th>Other months</th>
<th>Annual average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Price</td>
<td>CHF 142</td>
<td>CHF 172</td>
<td>CHF 142</td>
<td>CHF 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Occupancy</td>
<td>26 days</td>
<td>44 days</td>
<td>23 days</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27, Figure 28, Figure 29 and Figure 30: Graph of ADR and occupancy by period

**Questions 15 and 16: nationality and type of guests**
The guests of the described vacation rentals appear to be 45% couples, 22% families with children below 15 years old, 15% families with children below 3 years old, 13% families with children over 15 years old, 4% single travellers and 2% groups. The nations of provenience of vacation rental guests appeared to be: 75.3% German-speaking Switzerland, 14.5% Germany, 4.8% Swiss French-speaking, 2.70% other European countries, 1.3% Italian-speaking Switzerland, 0.60% other non-European countries, 0.5% Italy, 0.3% Austria.

\textsuperscript{17} Occupancy rate in the hospitality sector is defined as the n° of occupied rooms divided the total n° of available rooms of the establishment, expressed in percentage value.
Questions 19-21: knowledge and use of online vacation rental platforms

The majority of respondents (59%) stated they use more than one online platform to advertise their property as vacation rental. 41% instead is using only one agency or website. Those who stated “Yes” in Q19, were asked in Q20 which of the platforms they use. The majority of owners (41.3%) stated they use 2 platforms for vacation rental listing, while 21.7% use 3 platforms and the rest use 1 or more than 3 platforms for listing. 64% of collected answers stated they use one or more platforms from the multiple choices of the list (Casafari.ch, E-Domizil, OTR website, Airbnb, Booking.com/Villas.com, Fewo-Direkt, Wimdu, VRBO, Flipkey). 36% of answers, instead, indicated other online platforms or agencies (immohohler.ch, verzascatal.ch, interhome.ch, tutti.ch, happyholiday.ch, VillaServiceKägi, Holiday Home, Traum Ferienwohnungen, HolAp or their own website). With 36.3% Casafari.ch is the most used website for vacation rental listing, while 12.4% the second channel used appear to be either the regional OTR website or the private personal website.
In Q21, the owners of rentals were also questioned about the **level of knowledge of defined online vacation rental platforms**. The multiple choices were based on the most internationally renowned companies of short-term rental as well as the most used in Switzerland. The platform resulting the **most well-known is Booking.com**, while Airbnb is second and Fewo-Direkt is third. The platform that is least known is Roomorama.

![Figure 33: Level of knowledge of the most renowned vacation rental platforms](image)

**Questions 21-24: level of satisfaction of the OTR services**

The three final questions of the survey, related to the use of regional tourism organizations’ services, were not taken into consideration for the thesis’ findings. Nonetheless the results are shown as follows. **56.4% of respondents stated they do not make use of the OTR services.** The 43.6% who answered yes stated they mostly use the **OTR prospects (40%), the Welcome Card 2016 (20%), the newsletter (17%) and website of the OTR (15%).** The Net Promoter Score (1 to 7) revealed the level of satisfaction for the services of the OTR in the sector of vacation rentals/holiday houses: **the average level of satisfaction appears to be 3 out of 7**, which means the respondents are **not satisfied**. Nonetheless, the value that appeared most times in the results was 1, meaning that **the majority of respondents are not satisfied at all.**
3.3 Findings of the empirical research

The sector of vacation rentals has never been officially included in tourism supply statistics for the fact that there is no standard categorization of lodging and because vacation rentals are part of private accommodation used for commercial purposes for some periods of the year. This empirical research proved to be effective in finding data about the composition and price of the investigated establishments, as well as providing an overview about the generated revenues and a measure of the revenue market value. The discussion of the survey’s findings will be shown below.

- Regarding the respondents’ sample, a consideration must be done: the number of respondents (118) is not equal to the actual number of answers collected for each question. Out of 118 people who filled the questionnaire, on average only 80 gave a response for each question. Nevertheless, the results were calculated as a percentage of the total.

- The introduction of the questionnaire was able to identify the number of object and platform/agency of provenience of the respondent. The majority of respondents were referred to the questionnaire from Casafille.ch, which is also the platform with the highest number of active users and listings. The answer was therefore predictable.

- Gambarogno is the area with the highest number of rented properties: it is a traditional holiday region in which many people have their holiday homes.

- The owner’s nationality is predominantly Swiss; renters come especially from the German-speaking part of the country, confirming the fact that Ticino is a traditional holiday destination for those coming from the Swiss hinterland.

- Owners of secondary homes rent their property mostly to cover the expenses of the house, which is used by them on average for 32.5 days per year, as revealed by Q7.

- The average length of stay equals the minimum number of days to rent the house, one week. Sometimes the length is longer and takes two weeks or up to one month.

- The majority of respondents rent the property for Easter holidays but not for Christmas holidays. This means on Christmas more properties are used for private use or left unrented.

- Q10 revealed that the owners prefer to have a short-term rental activity rather than a fixed contracted tenant because they want to use the house during the year. This is confirming the fact that the properties are holiday homes which are being rented when not used personally.

- The respondents’ properties on average are composed of 1.5 double rooms, 0.5 single rooms, 4 beds and 1 bathroom and can accommodate up to 5 people. They feature a garden, a parking space, laundry, dishwasher and Internet Wi-Fi.

- Guests are mainly couples and families with children under-15 coming from the German speaking part of Switzerland.
- Regarding the platforms used to advertise the properties, the question was incorporated in the questionnaire to prove or dismiss the theory that being sharing economy forms of accommodation the owners published their listing in the most famous global websites such as Airbnb, Wimdu or Flipkey. The answers proved the opposite: the owners dismissed the choices on the most famous platforms of holiday rentals and instead indicated they use local agencies/platforms and the websites of OTRs as main source of promotion of their rental activity. Among the global companies only Airbnb, Booking.com and Flipkey appeared to be recognized.

- The most important questions of the survey were Q17 and Q18 related to the price of the lodging and the occupancy rate. The most interesting fact is that for this type of accommodation the trend of price and occupancy is the same as for traditional forms of lodging, with price directly sensitive to demand. In traditional hospitality, July and August appear to be the months with most arrivals, highest prices and occupancy. The trend is the same also for vacation rentals. In the below chart it is possible to see the peak of daily price per object in the months of July and August.

![Figure 34: Chart of price levels per month](image)

- The discovery of prices and occupancy per lodging was very important to estimate the potential value of revenues for the sector of vacation rentals in Ticino. The table below shows the results of the average daily price and rental days divided by period with elaborated value of revenues, which was calculated as a multiplication of the first two values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April-June</th>
<th>July-August</th>
<th>September-October</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>CHF142,00</td>
<td>CHF172,00</td>
<td>CHF142,00</td>
<td>CHF105,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental days</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>CHF3,692,00</td>
<td>CHF7,568,00</td>
<td>CHF3,266,00</td>
<td>CHF945,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: Average daily price, average n° of rental days, revenues per period and monthly*
In order to provide a measure of the total potential revenues generated by the rental activity, a calculation was made on the realistic data discovered through the survey. Total annual revenues per listing were calculated with the sum of each period’s revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APR-MAY-JUN</th>
<th>JUL-AUG</th>
<th>SEP-OCT</th>
<th>NOV-DEC-JAN-FEB-MAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHF 3.692</td>
<td>CHF 7.568</td>
<td>CHF 3.266</td>
<td>CHF 945</td>
<td>CHF 15.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Total revenues per period per listing

The potential market annual revenue can be then calculated multiplying the annual revenues of the single object, based on average realistic values of occupancy provided by the survey’s respondents, by the total number of vacation rental objects in Ticino, as expressed in Table 10 par. 1.10.2. From the data provided by ACAV Ticino, we know that there are at least 1,000 private accommodation properties being rented for tourism purposed in the region. Therefore, if we take this number as realistic, the potential annual market revenues would be

CHF 15.471 x 1.000 = CHF 15,471,000

3.3.1 Comparing literature and empirical research findings

The table shown below provides a summary of the findings related to the value of revenues of vacation rentals in Ticino according to the research of the Valaisan Tourism Observatory, data collected from ACAV and through the questionnaire. The cells of the table marked in green are the result of personal calculations. The cells marked in orange are the estimations of annual revenues related to OTV’s and the questionnaire’s data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OTV study on Airbnb listings - Switzerland</th>
<th>OTV study on Airbnb listings - Ticino</th>
<th>Information collected from ACAV Ticino</th>
<th>Questionnaire Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n° objects</td>
<td>18,494 listings</td>
<td>897 listings</td>
<td>1,000 objects</td>
<td>118 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n° beds</td>
<td>48,198 beds</td>
<td>2,462 beds</td>
<td>3,760 beds</td>
<td>118 objects x 4,9 beds per object = 578 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG Daily price per object</td>
<td>CHF 206.81</td>
<td>CHF 134.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CHF 105~172 (avg. CHF 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N° nights sold - 2016</td>
<td>1,900,000 nights</td>
<td>5,1% market share of Ticino x 1,9M sold nights = 96,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 sold nights x 118 objects = 11,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total daily market revenues</td>
<td>CHF 3,824,744</td>
<td>CHF 120,575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CHF 12,290~20,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual market revenues</td>
<td>CHF 393,000,000</td>
<td>CHF 13,025.298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CHF 15,471 x 118 objects = CHF 1,825,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential annual market revenues</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CHF 15,471 x 1,000 objects = CHF 15,471,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is visible from the comparison of results in the table above is that there are different values for the number of objects/vacation rentals in Ticino. This differentiation is due to the fact that a value comes from the listings only present in the Airbnb platform, while the other value was given by ACAV Ticino and is a realistic number of secondary home rentals.

Nevertheless, if we compare the total value of annual revenues generated by vacation rentals in Ticino, we can see that the two values are similar:

1. The total annual revenue generated by listings of the Airbnb platform in Ticino was calculated taking into account the market share of Ticino’s listings compared to the total Swiss (5.1% of 18,494 listings). The value of market share was then applied to the number of sold nights (1.9 million) in order to estimate a number of sold nights in Ticino in 2016, which is still a rough estimation. The result is 96,900 nights sold, that multiplied by the average price per listing in Ticino provides a value of total annual revenues equal to CHF 13,025,298 (rounded down 13 millions).

2. The total annual revenue generated by the objects of the questionnaire’s respondents was calculated multiplying the real number of nights sold annually per object by the average price per object (making the average of the provided prices per period -CHF 147-). The result, a single object annual revenue value, can be used to find the annual revenues for the sum of 118 respondents of the questionnaire (CHF 1,825,578) and for the potential number of vacation rentals provided by ACAV Ticino, 1,000 objects (CHF 15,471,000).

**What is the estimation of the potential market value of sharing-economy accommodation forms in Ticino?**

Given the results of the analysis on literature review, especially on the study carried out by the Valaisan Tourism Observatory (Schegg et al., 2016, 2015), and on the empirical research, the table above summarizes the data which is fundamental to provide an answer to the research question. The estimation of the revenue market value of sharing economy accommodation forms in Ticino was possible analyzing the sector of vacation rentals from two perspectives: the first from the sharing economy accommodation company per excellence, Airbnb; the second from realistic data collected through the association of holiday homes and apartments of Ticino, ACAV. The result of the estimation takes into account only the measure of revenues generated through sales of vacation rentals for tourism purposes in the year 2016, which is still a rough estimation, but useful to have a measure of the market.

From the data collected by OTV, it emerges that the potential value of total annual revenues generated by Airbnb listings in Ticino is equal to 13 million Swiss francs.
From the data collected through the survey and elaborated, the potential value of total annual revenues for the market of vacation rentals in Ticino represented by ACAV is 15.5 million Swiss francs.

According to the results of Question 20 ("Which of these platforms do you normally use?") only 7 respondents out of 46 said that they use Airbnb platform to rent their property. This means that the majority of ACAV members do not use Airbnb platform and thus are not part of the segment of 897 listings found by Professor Roland Schegg. This information is important to understand that the representatives of Airbnb listings are not the same owners of apartment rentals representative of ACAV Ticino. Consequently, since the evaluation on Airbnb listings is based on the number of nights sold multiplied by the average price per listing and does not change excluding the 7 respondents who are part both of Airbnb and ACAV, the potential estimation made on those 897 listings can be summed to the estimation on the 1,000 objects represented by ACAV. Thus, a third estimation of the two results combined would equal an annual revenues value of 28,496,298, rounded up, 28.5 million Swiss francs.

3.4 Limitations

The results are based on the collection and elaboration of data from literature and from the empirical research. In order to define the market value of a sector or a company it is necessary to know data about prices, production, sales and costs. Given the sector of vacation rentals is fragmented and represented by private entrepreneurs, the data about costs and other leakages are difficult to investigate through a survey; a deeper economic analysis on the owners’ activity would be necessary in the form of structured interviews to create a dataset with information collected personally from the respondent. In absence of this kind of information, the calculation of the estimated potential market value was done on the revenues generated by the selling of accommodation services to consumers, but the exclusion of information related to operating and fixed costs, taxes, etc. from the calculation make it an imperfect valuation.

The sum of the values related to the OTV estimation of Airbnb listings and the number of objects represented by ACAV, does not take into consideration the potential answers to Question 20 by the missing respondents of the survey (639 owners) who might be part of Airbnb platform with their listings. In order to be more accurate, the estimation of the total value should be made excluding 15.2% (7/46 answers of Q20) of respondents from the ACAV owners, bringing the number of objects to a realistic 848. The new value of annual
revenues for ACAV representatives would shift to CHF 13.119.408 and the consequent sum with the revenues generated by Airbnb listings (CHF 13.025.298) would be equal to CHF 26.144.706, rounded down, 26 million Swiss francs.

Related to the study of Roland Schegg and the Valaisan Tourism Observatory (OTV), the results about the number of annual sold nights cannot be defined as 100% reliable since they are based on data found in the press and adapted through an estimation (Schegg et al., 2016, p. 34).

Related to the questionnaire, some information is missing because it was not asked. For example the typology of house in terms of structure was not investigated and neither if the rented object is entire or shared with the owner. In the questions related to the number of days of personal use and for the rental activity some respondents answered 0 or 365, meaning they never live in the house or they live in the house all year round; without the right information about the structure of the house or if it is a shared accommodation these answers cannot be interpreted. Nonetheless, the majority of members of ACAV Ticino are owners of secondary/holiday homes, thus we can assume that the listed and rented properties are not the main living establishment of the owners.

### 3.5 Personal considerations

The private rental accommodation sector is not as big as the hotel industry, but sharing economy has changed the accessibility to it, providing a new meaning and attractiveness thanks to the shift in travellers’ choices. More unique experiences mean more social and local encounter, making it more attractive to prefer a private accommodation instead of a collective one. Many hotel chains are trying to ride the wave of shared accommodation providing housing and short-term apartment rental, but what they miss is the social element, which is preferred by travellers staying at private apartments. The sector of private accommodation is still at an early stage or it represents a niche for travellers who have preferences for its characteristics, and it is still difficult to provide a comparison between hotel and shared accommodation. The former is controlled, economically tangible and publicly declared; the latter is often still in the grey area of the market thus difficult to be included in statistics. The only instrument to control the volume of arrivals in private accommodation is the collection of a tourist tax, already present in Ticino, but it is not enough to provide a realistic measure of the market. For this reason the national statistics include partial data about vacation rentals, still not enough to create a statistic only for this segment of supply. The present investigation was carried out in the attempt to provide an
estimation of this market and to demonstrate it has fundamentals to be considered in official statistics as a form of tourism supply. In my opinion, the market of vacation rentals can be seen as a threat or an opportunity: a threat if the economic activity is made without declaration but also an opportunity if the market is correctly controlled by the state. The traditional hospitality market in Ticino shows signs of stagnation and has reached a maturity level that does not foster any innovation. Many hotels are kept in the same conditions as they were born, others do not even have a star-categorization. This in the long term might cause a decline in overnights since travellers of today are much more aware of service quality and feel able to determine the survival of supply structures through online reviews systems. The market of vacation rental, thanks to the sharing economy, has instead contributed to the rejuvenation and innovation of a mature sector in order to meet the needs of today’s travellers, who look always more for authentic experiences and local encounters. Therefore, the vacation rental sector of Ticino, if controlled and included in official statistics after thorough investigation, might represent the driver of change for the hospitality of Ticino. As highlighted in the Airbnb case, as well as in the study from Zervas et al. (2014) about the impact of Airbnb vacation rentals on hotel prices, it is especially during big events in major cities that the rental market has an impact on traditional accommodation: the supply is larger, with a higher number of beds, and thus able to accommodate more visitors; at the same time the prices of vacation rentals contribute to keep hotel fares lower than they would be if traditional hospitality was the only alternative for overnight. Two positive aspects in a situation that fits the vision of the city of Lugano, for example, which foresees in cultural and business events the key innovation factor in order to rejuvenate the canton’s tourism health and maturity. For all these reasons, it is time to reconsider the sector of vacation rentals as a valid alternative and competitor to traditional accommodation suppliers.

3.6 Future research and developments

The methodology used to define the estimated potential market value of peer-to-peer accommodation forms in Ticino, as already mentioned, did not include in the calculation of the value the operational and fixed costs of the private accommodation business. Moreover, in the estimation of the market value of a company or business it is necessary to include many other valuations such as the shares and stock market value. The standard market value evaluation therefore is not indicated for the sector of peer-to-peer private accommodation. Nonetheless, in future research a deeper analysis of costs for private
renters will be needed to provide a more accurate quantification of the rental sector market value. Future research should also include investigations about the impact of vacation rentals on traditional accommodation/hotel industry, especially on prices, revenues and occupancy; the impact of rentals on local housing markets, related to rental contracts and prices; the issue of tax declaration; the issue of security, safety and compliance with hospitality laws.
Conclusion

The Sharing economy, also called collaborative economy, is a socio-economical phenomenon born at the beginning of the 21st century based on business models in which there is reciprocal exchange and sharing of resources, products, time, space and skills among private users, defined as peers, belonging to a horizontal network in which the absence of hierarchy and the presence of Internet and social platforms enable communication and trust. Economic crisis, global overpopulation, scarcity of resources, environmental concern and new technologies are all drivers of a new model of commerce based on repeated utilization of resources with idling capacity, fostered by an emerging need to overhaul industrial capitalism and old production models. With this concept at its basis, the present work aimed at demonstrating the correlation between sharing economy and the vacation rental sector in Ticino, in order to estimate its economic potential market value in terms of revenues as a proof of the importance it plays on the region’s tourism.

Chapter one highlighted the literature review about the concept, typologies, drivers and motivations of the collaborative economy (part 1) and moved towards the business models that most influenced the industries related to tourism (part 2). The sector of accommodation appeared to be one of the most influenced by the sharing economy, since space is regarded as one of the easiest resources to share. The chapter then continued with the definition of traditional and non-traditional accommodation forms and provided an overview of the most famous online vacation rental platforms. In part 3, the focus of the research was put on the specific case of vacation rentals in Ticino, with an overview of the statistics about accommodation supply in the region and the description of a study made by the Valaisan Tourism Observatory (OTV) on the listings of Airbnb in Switzerland. The research counted a number of 18,894 private rental establishments in Switzerland, of which 897 in Ticino (updated: end July 2016). The association of vacation rentals of Ticino –ACAV– was also presented since it is the official representative organization of home rentals in the region, with an estimated number of 1,000 objects and 3,760 beds in the whole Canton.

Chapter two presented the methodology of the research in order to provide an answer to the research question of the thesis: what is the estimation of the potential market value of sharing-economy accommodation forms in Ticino in terms of revenues. The analysis of literature and of the study of the Valaisan Tourism Observatory represented the first method. An empirical research conducted in form of a questionnaire sent to a sample of 685 owners of rental properties in Ticino, members of ACAV, represented the second
method with the aim to investigate the rental activity and the owners’ behavior and motivations.

Chapter three presented the results of the analysis on literature and the empirical research. In order to provide an estimation of the market value of sharing economy accommodation forms in Ticino a calculation on the generated annual revenues was made. A first estimation was carried out from the data of the Valaisan Tourism Observatory, providing a potential value of total annual revenues of 13 million Swiss francs. A second estimation was carried out on the data collected through the survey, providing a potential value of total annual revenues of 15.5 million Swiss francs. Since the questionnaire revealed that the most part of respondents does not use Airbnb platform to promote the rental activity, we assumed that the owners of apartment rentals representative of ACAV and Airbnb are not the same people. Therefore, the estimation of the potential market value was calculated as the sum of the respective annual revenues, for a total of 28.5 million Swiss francs.
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Appendix 1

Table 16: Findings of the study of ShareNL about the motivation of people to participate in collaborative consumption: the results in the table show the motivation for example categories of goods/services. (Van de Glind, 2013b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Taker (Very) likely</th>
<th>Taker neutral</th>
<th>Provider (Very) likely</th>
<th>Provider neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: results of the study of ShareNL on the willingness of current users of CC platforms to participate in collaborative consumption (Van de Glind, 2013a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>-Need of a meal tool or skill, Knowing what’s available nearby, Space at home, Saving time, Get professional experience, Learning to become a cook, Test if there is a market for your future restaurant</td>
<td>-Receiving compliments, Forward reciprocity</td>
<td>-Boost social cohesion, Getting to know other cultures, Conflict prevention, Not looking for new friends but more a 'like knows like' connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-Helping someone satisfies, Being helped satisfies, Sharing brings enjoyment, Meeting people from one’s Neighbourhood brings enjoyment</td>
<td>-Receiving compliments, Forward reciprocity</td>
<td>-Boost social cohesion, Getting to know other cultures, Conflict prevention, Not looking for new friends but more a 'like knows like' connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>-Avoid unnecessary environmental burden, Avoid throwing food and stuff away</td>
<td>-Makes sense to share products that are sitting Idle, Earth has reached its limits and things have to be done differently</td>
<td>-Makes sense to share products that are sitting Idle, Earth has reached its limits and things have to be done differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>-Financial gain, Make money, Avoid costs, Higher quality food for less money</td>
<td>-Income, Entrepreneurship, Filling market gaps</td>
<td>-Income, Entrepreneurship, Filling market gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiousness</td>
<td>-Enjoyment of finding</td>
<td>-Possible tangible rewards and testing new things</td>
<td>-Possible tangible rewards and testing new things</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Overview of social media and network elements influencing the willingness of existing users of CC to participate in collaborative consumption (Van de Glind, 2013a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks summary</th>
<th>Social media summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents got to know about their platforms mainly through: &gt;Media (both local and national) &gt;Recommendation</td>
<td>Nearly all respondents are also using Facebook or Marktplatz. Nearly all respondents are familiar with at least one other CC platform. Being familiar with another CC platform, Facebook or Marktplatz helps to start using a new CC platform. Being familiar with offline ways of sharing helps to start using a new CC platform. The use of online to go (and meet) offline is an important motive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current early adopter characteristics that are using CC platforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2

Structure and questions of the survey used for the empirical research, Italian and German.

Table 19: Italian version of the questionnaire for members of ACAV and owners of vacation rentals in Ticino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITALIAN</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Indicare la tipologia di oggetto</td>
<td>Q1 Art der Liegenschaft:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Casa singola</td>
<td>• Einfamilienhaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appartamento</td>
<td>• Wohnung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rustico</td>
<td>• Rustico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 In quale comprensorio si trova la sua proprietà?</td>
<td>Q2 In welcher Region befindet sich Ihr Ferienobjekt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biasca</td>
<td>• Biasca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bellinzona</td>
<td>• Bellinzona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blenio</td>
<td>• Blenio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leventina</td>
<td>• Leventina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mendrisiotto</td>
<td>• Mendrisiotto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vallemaggia</td>
<td>• Maggiatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gambarogno</td>
<td>• Gambarogno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malcantone</td>
<td>• Malcantone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenero e Valle Verzasca</td>
<td>• Tenero und Verzascatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lugano</td>
<td>• Lugano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lago Maggiore</td>
<td>• Lago Maggiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Qual è il suo paese di residenza?</td>
<td>Q3 Wo ist Ihr Wohnsitz?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Svizzera italiana</td>
<td>• Italienische Schweiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Svizzera tedesca</td>
<td>• Deutsche Schweiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Qual è la motivazione principale che la spinge ad affittare le sue proprietà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ho ereditato le proprietà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E’ la mia prima fonte di reddito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per ricavare profitti aggiuntivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per coprire i costi di gestione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perché ho intenzione di stabilirmi dopo la pensione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Di quanti giorni è la durata minima del soggiorno?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Lei in genere affitta le sue proprietà ai turisti per:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due / tre giorni, weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Una settimana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due settimane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fino a un mese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oltre un mese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Lei in genere quanti giorni all’anno soggiorna nella sua residenza (utilizzo proprio)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Lei affitta normalmente le sue proprietà durante le vacanze pasquali?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Si  • No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Lei affitta normalmente le sue proprietà durante le vacanze natalizie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Si  • No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Perché non affitta la sua residenza con un inquilino fisso/contratto d’affitto indeterminato?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perché altrimenti non potrei più soggiornare io stesso (utilizzo proprio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contratti fissi hanno clausole restrittive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• L’oggetto in questione non è adatto per un inquilino fisso (es. riscaldamento)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Was ist der Hauptgrund weshalb Sie Ihr Ferienobjekt vermieten?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ich habe die Liegenschaft geerbt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Es ist meine Haupteinkommensquelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Als zusätzliche Einkommensquelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Um die Liegenschaftskosten zu decken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nach meiner Pensionierung möchte ich mich hier niederlassen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andere Gründe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Wie viele Tage beträgt die Mindestmietdauer Ihres Ferienobjektes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>In der Regel vermieten Sie Ihre Liegenschaft an Touristen für:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zwei / drei Tage, Wochenende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Eine Woche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zwei Wochen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bis zu einen Monat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Über einen Monat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Wie viele Tage im Jahr wohnen Sie normalerweise selber in dieser Liegenschaft (Eigenbelegung)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Vermieten Sie normalerweise Ihr Feriendomizil während der Osterferien?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ja  • Nein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Vermieten Sie normalerweise Ihr Feriendomizil während der Weihnachtsferien?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ja  • Nein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Weshalb vermieten Sie Ihre Liegenschaft nicht an einem Dauermieter/ unbefristeten Mietvertrag?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weil ich sonst nicht mehr selber die Liegenschaft nützen könnte (Eigenbelegung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dauer oder unbefristete Mietverträge sehen restriktive Klausel vor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ci sono posti auto privati a disposizione dei clienti?</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Si • No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Come è composta la sua proprietà?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Numero delle stanze matrimoniali: __________&lt;br&gt;Numero delle stanze singole: __________&lt;br&gt;Numero totale di letti: __________&lt;br&gt;Numero di bagni: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ci sono i seguenti servizi?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Piscina: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Lavatrice: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Lavastoviglie: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Connessione WiFi/Internet: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Climatizzatore: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Possibilità di ospitare animali: • Si • No&lt;br&gt;Giardino: • Si • No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quante persone può ospitare complessivamente nelle sue proprietà?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q15</strong></td>
<td><strong>In base al tipo di economia domestica, come classificherebbe, in termini percentuali, la sua clientela? (0 -100%, Totale 100%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Viaggiatore singolo _____%&lt;br&gt;• Coppie _____%&lt;br&gt;• Famiglie e/o coppie con bebê/figli di età inferiore a 3 anni _____%&lt;br&gt;• Famiglie e/o coppie con figli di età inferiore a 15 anni _____%&lt;br&gt;• Famiglie e/o coppie con figli di età superiore a 15 anni _____%&lt;br&gt;• Gruppi _____%&lt;br&gt;• Scolaresche _____%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q16</strong></td>
<td><strong>In base al paese di residenza, come classificherebbe, in termini percentuali, la sua clientela (0 – 100%, Totale 100%)?</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Svizzera italiana_____%&lt;br&gt;• Svizzera tedesca_____%&lt;br&gt;• Svizzera francese_____%&lt;br&gt;• Germania_____%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Qual è il prezzo di affitto al giorno medio per le sue proprietà durante i seguenti mesi (in CHF)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aprile – Giugno _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luglio – Agosto _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settembre – Ottobre _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altri mesi _______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Quanti giorni, in media, affitta le sue proprietà durante i seguenti mesi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aprile – Giugno _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luglio – Agosto _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settembre – Ottobre _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altri mesi _______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Lei pubblicizza le sue proprietà in diverse piattaforme online oppure sono una?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sì, diverse piattaforme/portali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No, solo una piattaforma/la mia agenzia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Se Sì. Quale di queste piattaforme utilizza normalmente?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• casafile.ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• e-domizil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sito internet OTR (es. <a href="http://www.ascona-locarno.com">www.ascona-locarno.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airbnb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• booking.com / villas.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fewo-direkt (gruppo HomeAway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wimdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roomrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• VRBO (gruppo HomeAway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flipkey (TripAdvisor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Ha già sentito parlare delle seguenti piattaforme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Mai sentita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Ne ho sentito parlare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>La conosco bene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airbnb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• booking.com / villas.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fewo-direkt (gruppo HomeAway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wimdu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Haben Sie schon von diesen Plattformen gehört?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Noch nie gehört</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Schon gehört</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Kenne Ich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airbnb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• booking.com / villas.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fewo-direkt (gruppo HomeAway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wimdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Utilizza i servizi delle Organizzazione Turistiche Regionali (Ente Turistico) di riferimento (es. OTR Ascona-Locarno)? • Si • No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>Se Sì. Quale di questi servizi utilizza?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prospetti dell’ente turistico (es. prospetto Apartments, Guida officiale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome Card 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sito internet OTR (es. <a href="http://www.ascona-locarno.com">www.ascona-locarno.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consulenza (anche telefonica) presso sportelli OTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apps per smartphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>È soddisfatto del servizio delle Organizzazioni Turistiche Regionali (Ente Turistico)? (1 = per niente / 7 = moltissimo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Nützen Sie die Dienstleistungen Ihres Regionalen Tourismusbüro (z.B. OTR Ascona-Locarno)? • Ja • Nein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>Falls ja, was nützen Sie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prospekte des Tourismus Büros (z.B. Prospekt der Ferienwohnungen, Info-Broschüren)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome Card 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newsletter / Aktuelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internetseite OTR (es. <a href="http://www.ascona-locarno.com">www.ascona-locarno.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Auskünfte (auch telefonisch) im Tourismus Büro OTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apps für Smartphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Sind Sie von dem Service Ihres zuständigen Tourismus Büros zufrieden? (1=gar nicht / 7 = sehr zufrieden)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>