

New Policies and Practices for European Sharing Cities

A cura di

Chiara Alvisi
Daniele Donati
Giorgia Pavani
Stefania Profeti
Claudia Tubertini



Questo volume è stato sottoposto a una procedura di valutazione anonima da parte di due *referees*.

Dipartimento di Scienze Politiche e Sociali
Università di Bologna – Alma Mater Studiorum 1088
Direttore: Filippo Andreatta
Strada Maggiore 45, 40125 Bologna

ISBN 9788854970106

DOI 10.6092/unibo/amsacta/6296

Prima edizione: fine dicembre 2019

New Policies and Practices for European Sharing Cities

A cura di:
Chiara Alvisi
Daniele Donati
Giorgia Pavani
Stefania Profeti
Claudia Tubertini

Coordinamento editoriale:
Pasquale Viola

Indice

<i>Giorgia Pavani</i> , Presentazione	1
---------------------------------------------	---

Parte prima Sharing cities

<i>Guido Smorto</i> , Autonomie locali e politiche pubbliche per l'economia digitale	17
<i>Fabio Giglioni</i> , Nuovi orizzonti negli studi giuridici delle città	47
<i>Daniele Donati</i> , Le città collaborative: forme, garanzie e limiti delle relazioni orizzontali	107
<i>Claudia Tubertini</i> , Sviluppare l'amministrazione condivisa attraverso i principi di sussidiarietà (verticale) e leale collaborazione: riflessioni e proposte	131
<i>Stefania Profeti, Valeria Tarditi</i> , Le pratiche collaborative per la co- produzione di beni e servizi: quale ruolo per gli enti locali?	155
<i>Francesca Martinelli, Francesca Tamascelli</i> , Cooperativismo di piattaforma: esperienze cooperative per uno sviluppo del territorio	185

Parte seconda Trasporti, turismo e politiche abitative nelle sharing cities

<i>Monica Bernardi, Giulia Mura</i> , Backpacking practices in the sharing economy era. An exploratory study of a changing urban scenario	213
<i>Chiara Alvisi, Alessio Claroni</i> , Analisi giuridica di alcune fattispecie della c.d. economia collaborativa nel settore dei trasporti e del turismo	239
<i>Mathilde Callet Dubost</i> , Le soluzioni del legislatore e delle Corti francesi con riguardo alle manifestazioni della <i>sharing economy</i> nel settore dei trasporti	297

Carlo Ugo de Girolamo, Uno sguardo alla XVIII Legislatura: proposte di legge su “Disciplina dell’uso condiviso, non professionale, di veicoli privati a titolo gratuito” (A.C. 859 e A.C. 930) 315

Andrés Boix Palop, Strategie di regolazione per la risoluzione dei conflitti di interesse generati dalla proliferazione dell’affitto breve attraverso l’intermediazione digitale 331

Maria Belén González Fernández, La realidad de las viviendas privadas de uso turístico. Economía colaborativa o digital. Problemas legislativos 357

Parte terza
Esperienze a confronto

Marc Vilalta Reixach, Instrumentos de gestión colaborativa de bienes comunes en la ciudad de Barcelona: la cesión de espacios vacíos y la gestión cívica de equipamientos 377

Valentina Orioli, Città collaborative e rigenerazione urbana. L'esperienza di Bologna 409

Gli Autori 431

*Backpacking practices in the sharing economy era.
An exploratory study of a changing urban scenario*

di Monica Bernardi, Giulia Mura

Titolo: “Pratiche di backpacking ai tempi della sharing economy. Studio esplorativo di uno scenario urbano in cambiamento”

Abstract: This paper intends to investigate the impact that the rise of the sharing economy is having in shaping the tourist experience (Ali and Frew, 2014), with a specific focus on the potential consequences of the habits and practices of “backpackers”, a specific category of tourist that literature has described as particularly interested in autonomously sought tailored and made-to-measure tours and travels that minimize the traditional problems associated with mass-tourism (social, economic and environmental impact) (Buhalis and Law, 2008).

From a theoretical point of view the paper analyses both the impact of the sharing economy in the tourist sector and the backpacking phenomenon, investigating their links and possible interactions. This analysis shows how, potentially, sharing platforms could provide the ideal tool for realizing the unique, authentic experience that is usually sought by backpackers. From the empirical side it poses a first attempt to outline the most interesting elements of tourist sharing practices and how they relate to the elements that have characterized backpacking practices until now, using an online questionnaire.

The data collected provides a description of the interviewees’ travel motivation, their use of peer-to-peer platforms and the factors impacting the satisfaction of the experience. The pull of economic reasons appears to be especially relevant between respondents and is not always associated with specific attention to more social motives of the travellers.

The paper represents an attempt to observe how the spreading of peer-to-peer platforms, and the increased facility of backpacking practices could shape the

profile of the backpacker. Overall the paper brings contributions to practitioners, urban planners and tourism governance coordinators, providing useful insights that could favour the debate with representatives of the sharing economy about the impact of these activities in the urban areas. The sharing economy gains popularity by the day and new segments of tourism, such as backpackers, are being attracted. Therefore, it is relevant to introduce this discussion within society.

1. Introduction

The present article seeks to contribute to the analysis of urban tourism and how it is being affected by the diffusion of sharing economy platforms, and their possible impacts on the experience of backpackers, a specific category of tourists known to be strong users of ICTs in travel organization and management¹.

Tourism is intrinsically linked to the development of the city and can support the improvement of both residents' and visitors' living conditions. From the early 2000s various studies have revealed that the spread of ICTs and the Internet is giving tourists and travellers new tools to be proactive protagonists in the shaping of the tourist experience (Ali & Frew, 2014), which is exactly what contemporary travellers look for (Richards and Wilson, 2004).

Backpackers in particular are described by the literature as interested in autonomously sought, tailored and made-to-measure tours and travels that minimize the impact of mass-tourism (social, economic and environmental impact) and favour connections with local communities (Buhalis and Law, 2008). According to Paris (2012, p. 1094), the recent convergence of information technology and physical travel has been embraced primarily by them. They rely on the Internet to maintain connections with home during their travels, to exchange travel advice and information with other backpackers and to

¹ L'impostazione generale e la collocazione delle note seguono uno stile diverso rispetto agli altri contributi presenti in volume; ciò è dovuto all'adozione di un differente schema metodologico.

stay connected with travellers met whilst travelling (Mascheroni 2007; Adkins and Grant 2007; Paris 2010b; Young and Hanley 2010).

Their specific features in the use of ICTs have been reinforced by the birth and development of the so-called sharing economy. New online platforms allow travellers to find information and services in a more easy, convenient and rapid way, connecting those who have with those who seek, matching peers (Botsman and Rogers, 2010) and expanding in this way the overall supply of travel options (Nadler, 2014). The preferences of backpackers seem to perfectly match with some narratives about the sharing economy, especially with the claims that this new economic model has the potential to drive economic development, strengthen social cohesion and reduce environmental impact (see, amongst others: Botsman and Rogers, 2010; Parsons, 2014). Nevertheless, numerous experts point out the risks associated with corporate forms of the phenomenon (Slee, 2015; Srnicek, 2016) from house shortages and the loss of identity of whole areas, to effects on the labour market and so on.

More specifically, in an urban context, researchers (among the others Pisciaccia et al., 2017) have already assessed the push of urban centres to processes of gentrification on the one hand and of disneyfication and hotelization on the other hand, with a very low redistribution of profits and benefits for local people. In this sense the ability of the sharing economy to favour local economic development is contradicted. In addition, as Susie Clage (2014) remembers “sharing economy doesn’t build trust – it trades on cultural homogeneity and established social networks both online and in real life. Where it builds new connections, it often replicates old patterns of privileged access for some, and denial for others” debunking the myth that the sharing economy can strengthen social cohesion and build social capital.

Starting from these considerations, the present article focuses both on the backpacking phenomenon (section 2.1) and on the relevance of the sharing economy in the tourist sector at city level (section 2.2). Section 3 describes the methodology and results of a survey intending to identify the main motivations to travel, what kind of platforms are mostly adopted while travelling and for which reasons, among an online sample of travellers.

The analysis in section 4 highlights how the spreading of peer-to-peer platforms favours the more profit-oriented, and what kind of impact this could have on backpacking practices.

2. Travel in a new urban scenario: sharing economy and backpacking

2.1. Backpackers' preferences and features

The contemporary traveller is described by the literature as (Richards and Wilson, 2004): a demanding and active traveller that puts emphasis on the emotional and cultural dimensions of the travel, and on the opportunity to experience an authentic connection with the destination (Richards, 2001). This description recalls closely that of a well-known city tourist: the backpacker.

In order to understand why the spread of sharing economy platforms in the urban context could impact the evolution of backpacking a short literature review about backpackers is necessary.

Cohen (1972, 1973, 1979) was the first in the 1970s to systematize this concept creating a theoretical foundation for this field. In his typology of tourist², the drifter, a “non-institutionalized” form of tourist, can be considered the prototype of the backpacker (Cohen, 2003): more a traveller than a tourist (Bowen and Clarke, 2009), featured by flexible itinerary, low budget, longer holidays, and in search of authenticity, adventure, local experiences and native encounters.

The term backpacker was officially adopted by Pearce in 1990, after Have's youth tourists (1974), Vogt's wanderers (1976), Mukerji's hitchhikers (1978), and Riley's long-term budget travellers (1988), all terms used to define the non-institutionalized tourists. The category of backpackers has evolved significantly over time, following the changes in socio-historical contexts (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2004; O'Reilly, 2006) and being affected by the nation and culture of origin; it is not a homogeneous group: characteristics and identity vary according to time, nationality and culture (Zhang et al., 2018; Enoch and Grossman, 2010; Maoz, 2007). As remembered by Richards

² Cohen identifies four types of tourist roles, based on different combinations of familiarity and novelty (Cohen, 1972). The “organized mass tourist” and the “individual mass tourist” embody forms of “institutionalized” tourists, dominated by familiarity, and relying on services offered by the tourism establishment (Zhang *et al.*, 2018); the “explorer” and the “drifter” are “non-institutionalized” forms of tourists, dominated by novelty and looking for alternative tourist services.

and Wilson (2004, p. 3) “they carry with them not only the emblematic physical baggage that gives them their name, but their cultural baggage as well”.

According to literature, backpackers are mainly young travellers (Richards and Wilson, 2004; Hannam and Ateljevic 2007), even if backpacking is increasingly attracting middle-aged tourists, (Smith *et al.*, 2010). They distance themselves from the concept of tourists, perceived as more negative. Tourists indeed use to stay in the so-called “environmental bubble” produced by the tourism industry (Cohen, 1972), fuelling the mass-tourism circuits, large-scale, highly focussed on popular destinations, often disrespectful towards local communities (Mosedale, 2016), with major impacts on the natural and built environments and on the wellbeing and culture of host populations (Howard, 2007). On the contrary, the backpacker assumes a completely different travel behaviour based on five key characteristics: “a preference for budget accommodation; an emphasis on meeting other people; an independently organized and flexible travel schedule; longer rather than brief holidays; and an emphasis on informal and participatory recreation activities” (Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995, pp. 830-31). Indeed, backpackers are generally described as self-organized travellers, with long-term and multiple destination journeys and flexible itineraries; they look for an authentic connection with local community to experience the real local lifestyle and reject the standardisation and commodification of tourism experience; they want to be more than spectators: active and creative actors, while preserving the local cultural heritage (Richards, 2011); they are focused on the research of meaningful personal experience, in which to be completely engaged and acquire new skills (Ibid.); having a low-budget and low-consuming style of travel they are also perceived as more environmentally friendly than mass tourism (Becken *et al.*, 2003)³.

In terms of motivation, Loker-Murphy (1997) identified four segments: escapers/relaxers, social/excitement-seekers, self-developers and achievers.

³ Other authors have a different position, underlining that backpacking practice is a temporary leave/escape from normal life (Sørensen, 2003), during which to gather in ghettos or enclaves made by people sharing the same interests (Muzaini, 2006:157); there is not a real interest in meeting with locals and learning about foreign cultures, but a clear disregard for social norms that can sometimes result in culturally and socially inappropriate patterns of behaviour (Maoz, 2007)

Murphy (2001) though his study found a specific ranking order of motivations: economic, social, a more real experience, longer trip length, independence, flexibility, ease and convenience, previous backpacking experience, and recommendations by other people (Paris and Teye, 2010)⁴. In fact, among other aspects literature has highlighted the desire of backpackers of being in touch with other travellers (Oliveira-Brochado and Gameiro, 2013) Moscardo in 2006 reported four main motivations built from previous research amongst backpackers (Elsrud, 1998; Newlands, 2004; Richards and Wilson, 2004; Ross, 1997): seeking for an authentic or genuine experience, novelty and action, social reasons, achievement or learning. Other motivations identified in the literature include personal growth, self-knowledge, self-improvement and the desire to make their travel a transformative experience (Chen, Bao, and Huang, 2014; Brzózka, 2012). In general, the literature suggests that backpackers' motivations are multiple and fluid and they can vary throughout their travel careers, even if an online study conducted on 2,300 respondents by the ATLAS Backpackers Research Group (BRG) in collaboration with the International Student Travel Confederation (Richards and Wilson, 2004) found four main motivations: experience seeking, relaxation seeking, sociability and contributing to destination (Paris and Teye, 2010)⁵.

Geographically backpackers can be found in every corner of the globe, from remote villages to big cities (Richards and Wilson, 2004); nevertheless, much of the backpacker research is focused on countries where the impact of backpackers is more evident, i.e. South-East Asia, Australia and New Zealand (see, amongst others, Elsrud, 1998; Hampton, 1998; Murphy, 2001). Indeed, according to the Travel Backpacker Price Index⁶, Pokhara in Nepal was the cheapest city for backpacking worldwide in January 2017, with an average

⁴ Authors like Elsrud (2001) and Cohen (2004) have identified another important motivation of backpacking: the desire to build a new temporary identity through the travel, since travelling creates the condition to be more courageous, relaxed and independent, favouring the accumulation of cultural capital, and in some ways it allows the shaping of a new identity (Desforges, 2000), a new sense of self (Urry, 1990).

⁵ The four most important motivations of the respondents to the survey were in ranking order: to explore other cultures, to experience excitement, to increase knowledge, and to relax mentally (Paris and Teye, 2010).

⁶ Source: Statista (see: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/537895/most-affordable-cities-for-backpacking-worldwide/>).

cost of 17.91 U.S. dollars per day. Looking at Europe, the most affordable city for backpackers in 2018 was Kiev in Ukraine with an average cost of 25.04 U.S. dollars per day⁷, while the most expensive was Zurich in Switzerland with an average cost of 118.46 U.S. dollars per day, followed by Venice in Italy (117.14 U.S. dollars)⁸. It should be emphasized that the increasing appeal of cities and city tourism is a relevant tendency with potential lasting effects on the tourist sector (Brauckmann, 2017) that also involves backpackers.

Over time some scholars noted a growth in short-term forms of backpacking (Sørensen, 2003) that makes backpackers a kind of “flashpackers” to use the Hammam and Diekmann definition (2010) (also in Paris, 2012). This form of backpacking is more frequent among older backpackers, is marked by higher travel budgets and a massive use of technological devices while traveling, and it is more common in urban contexts.

As a final remark, backpackers are characterised by a strong use of ICTs, before and during the travel, to keep a connection with home, to exchange travel advice and to stay connected with travellers met while travelling (Mascheroni 2007; Adkins and Grant 2007; Paris 2010b; Young and Hanley 2010). In addition, Internet use responds to their need to autonomously tailor their travels, minimizing mass-tourism impact (social, economic and environmental impacts) and favouring connections with local communities (Buhalis and Law, 2008). As noted by Buhalis and Law (2008) «the development of ICTs and particularly the Internet empowered the ‘new’ tourist who is becoming knowledgeable and who is increasingly seeking exceptional value for money and time. They are less interested in following the crowds on package tours and much keener to pursue their own preferences and schedules» (pp. 610–611). This tendency has been reinforced by the spread of the sharing economy: more and more backpackers are converging on digital platforms to access cheap services, to retrieve recommendations and information from other travellers and locals and to explore alternative experiences (Gyimothy and Dredge, 2017), which are more sustainable and friendlier towards the destination and local communities. The next section expands on the phenomenon of

⁷ Source: Statista (see: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/696725/most-affordable-cities-for-backpacking-europe/>).

⁸ Source: Statista (see: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/696870/most-expensive-cities-for-backpacking-europe/>).

the sharing economy revealing to what extent it can reply to the backpackers' travel expectations and with what impacts on city tourism.

2.2. Sharing economy platforms and urban tourism

ICTs are making possible new solutions and alternative services based on peer-to-peer exchanges that are also impacting the tourist market (OECD 2016; Vaughan and Daverio, 2016). In particular, the spread of the sharing economy at a touristic level is expanding the overall supply of travel options (Nadler, 2014) giving backpackers new answers to their travel requests. As for the general scenario, also at the tourist level the sharing economy seems to have three main benefits: economic savings, environmental care and socialization (Böckera & Meelen, 2017; Botsman & Roger, 2010; Hamari *et al.*, 2015; Schor, 2016). Indeed, in terms of economic savings the presence of online platforms that match demand and supply among peers allows the cashing in on dead capital, idling assets and latent expertise, increasing product diversity and fuelling entrepreneurialism: everybody can temporarily share other peoples' houses, spare rooms, cars, and knowledge, recirculating resources. In this way it is possible "to access a wide range of services and solutions more affordable than the traditional tourism businesses, more flexible, more customisable, more authentic and connected with locals too" (Borrelli and Bernardi, 2019). In addition, the interactive communication, the peer-to-peer feedback system and the transparency of the transactions reassure in terms of trust, favour visitor satisfaction, and satisfy contemporary tourism preferences allowing more direct, authentic and local-based experiences (Dredge and Gymothy, 2015). For some authors (see Strokes *et al.*, 2014) these kind of platforms are also able to create more resilient communities, revitalizing neighbourhoods and helping those in need through the redistribution of resources, and promoting sustainable consumption versus the impacting neoliberal tourism industry (Mosedale, 2012). Travellers can use these platforms to organize and manage the travel autonomously relying simply on peers' information and with several advantages: saving money, respecting the destination's local community, finding original experiences not normally provided by traditional tour operators (all motivations that recur in the profile of the backpacker).

Nevertheless, besides the widespread enthusiasm, the literature about the sharing economy highlights some critical issues, heavily impacting at urban level. A first critical element has a juridical nature: the sharing platforms, for their novelty, tend to develop inside a normative grey area difficult to manage by the traditional regulative system (Smorto, 2015). In terms of protection there is a lack of quality standards that protect from the “failure” of collaboration (see the issue of insurance for social eating, home restaurant and home sharing); in terms of inclusiveness some people may be excluded from the services or have more limited opportunities to take advantage of them; in ethical terms there are information asymmetries, lack of transparency on the user reputational coding algorithms, tax issues (think of the tax for hosting platforms), privacy issues, as well as confusion in the regulation of those transactions that occur occasionally or in an intermittent form (Uber Pop for example) (Arcidiacono, 2017). This last one is the most problematic due to the difficulties in defining if a service is offered in an occasionally form (like a hobby) or in a professional way (as a real job).

Other critical issues are related to the business model adopted by the platforms. It should be underlined that under the big umbrella of the sharing economy fall different kinds of sharing practices and platforms offering diverse services through different business models (Belk, 2014); some based on voluntarist effort of the members and some more profit-oriented. At the moment, the most popular are also the most profit-oriented, and some authors classified them as extractive and “netarchical” (Bauwens and Kostakis, 2014) since they rely on the users to make a profit. In their opinion, these platforms embody rental economies (Kallis, 2013), on-demand economies and gig economies, distancing from the original value of the sharing economy. There is today considerable debate about what is termed “platform capitalism” (Srnicek, 2016; Kenney and Zysman, 2016) and its negative effects on different fields. I.e. the labour exploitation generated by platforms of food delivery (such as Foodora), ride-sharing (e.g. Uber) and short-term contract or freelance work (such as Taskrabbit) that dump all the business risks on riders and workers without giving them any legal protection; or the impact of home sharing platforms (such as Airbnb) on house shortages and neighbourhood identity: the gentrification processes speeded up by these platforms are indeed fueling the so-called *disneyfication* and *hotelization* of city centres (Lee, 2016),

expelling residents and reinforcing the risk of social desertification of historic centers (Semi, 2015).

This last aspect is particularly interesting in our case, since the leading marketplace for those seeking and offering short-term housing solutions, Airbnb, is fuelling a heated debate and city protests against tourists. The platform has a network of over 3 million properties in over 200 countries worldwide (Econopoly, 2018) and a market value of 31 billion dollars (Statista, 2017), but it does not own the rooms or properties that appear in the listings; it simply operates as an intermediary amongst peers, those who offer spare rooms and houses (hosts) and those looking for them (guests); thus allowing private individuals to earn from short-term leases through secure transactions.

According to Germann Molz (2011) Airbnb exemplifies the so-called “network hospitality” that marks a new generation of travellers who prefer to rely on online network systems to find accommodation from peers, instead of using traditional hospitality services. According to the author this tendency is a reaction to the homogenization resulting from the globalization and “concomitant standardization” (Steylaerts and O’Dubhgall, 2011, p. 264) typical of the traditional tourist industry. Home sharing platforms indeed satisfy the demand of a more personalized and “presumably more authentic” form of travel (Steylaerts and O’Dubhgall, 2011, 261) matching backpackers’ travel expectations.

In fact, this approach has quite degenerated (Bernardi, 2018). Researchers highlight that the human-to-human interaction, and the encounters with locals promised by Airbnb is disappearing (Sans and Quagliari Domínguez, 2016); the market is not dominated by single private house tenants (Picascia *et al.*, 2017), but rather by a few multiple advertisers who rent many apartments, or by brokers and specialized real estate agencies⁹ that gain the greater part of their revenues from the platform. So, Airbnb is shown to be a mere channel to promote short-term rentals, especially in urban areas¹⁰ (Guttentag, 2013; Gant,

⁹ A clear example: the famous case of Bettina which represents the Halldis Italia society with 713 apartments (or villas) uploaded on the platform.

¹⁰ According to Picascia *et al.* (2017) in Florence hosts earn on average € 5,314 per year, but one has collected over 700 thousand; in Milan, over four thousand owners of rented apartments earn an average of 1,600 euros a year, but one gains more than half a million.

2016). In addition, as anticipated, this platform is reducing the affordable housing supply by distorting the housing market (Lee, 2016): from one side it reinforces processes of gentrification and segregation rejecting residents of the weaker classes and changing the neighbourhood's identity (Guttentag, 2013; Gant, 2016), on the other side it strengthens processes of *disneyfication* and *hotelization* commodifying the local life to sell it as an added value of the apartment rent (Sans and Quagliari Domínguez, 2016; Warren, 2016) and transforming neighbourhoods into tourist spaces and consumption citadels. Fang, Ye, Law (2015) claim that, in the urban context, Airbnb is forcing low-end hotels to shut down, with the consequent loss of jobs of their employees, while the platform, which does not need to hire any workers, do not create alternative workplaces. Even if Airbnb seemingly allows anyone to become a small "entrepreneur", it's also reproducing old schemes of deprivation for some and enrichment for others.

A last critical point: the existing literature on the sharing economy claims that sharing practices can foster communities (Belk, 2007, 2010), enhance social connectivity (Parigi and State, 2014) and, in general, contribute to the creation of social capital (Botsman & Rogers, 2010); nevertheless Schor *et al.* (2016) have found that repeated interaction in a sharing context does lead to the creation of reciprocated social relationships within a subset of the group and these results are confirmed in other research (see, amongst others, Andreotti *et al.*, 2017).

3. The appeal of tourist sharing platforms

The data collection allows a first, explorative analysis of the main pulls that sharing platforms have on travellers that may or may not identify themselves as backpackers but are social network users.

Considering the convergence that, on a theoretical level, sharing platform and backpacking practices seems to have in the attainment of a style of travel that is more "aware" of its context, we wanted to understand:

- How widespread is the motivation for a travel experience that is sustainable and respectful of local environment and communities?
- How widespread is the actual use of sharing platforms for tourist purposes, and what platforms are the most used?

- What are the main motivations and reasons of satisfaction in the use of such platforms?

The answers are analysed to clarify if the use of sharing platforms is more likely to create a positive reinforcement of travelling practices that are more sustainable, authentic and respectful, or instead promote a massification of the “backpacking” experience, modifying the original motivations that lead to the exit from traditional touristic schemes.

Based on the literature presented so far, we argue that backpackers seem to be the best target tourist to embrace the sharing economy’s potentialities; however, at a city tourism level, backpackers may use the sharing economy platforms mainly because they are useful, easy and offer cheap services, while other aspects are not so fully represented.

3.1 *Questionnaire and data collection*¹¹

In order to investigate and have a first glimpse at how the use of sharing platforms is being integrated into tourist practices, and which aspects could hold specific resonance to the usual aims of backpackers, we adopted a self-administered online questionnaire to collect data.

The questionnaire, prepared *ad hoc*, was composed of 11 closed and 1 open question, covering the following topics: travel motivations and preferences, preferences on the use of sharing platforms, evaluation of actual experiences of travel and of the sharing platform’s use. A descriptive analysis of the quantitative data was carried out using SPSS Statistic 25, whilst content analysis was applied to the open question.

The questionnaire was submitted online, via diffusion on different online travelling groups, providing an insight into travellers that are already recurring to the internet when planning and sharing their travelling experiences. Online surveys have the advantage of providing access to groups and individuals otherwise difficult or impossible to reach through other channels (Wright, 2005). This choice was driven by the intention to select a type of sample that is already “digitalized” at least at a basic level.

¹¹ Data collection was realized with the support of Laura Laurenzo.

The groups to which the questionnaire was submitted had various descriptions, some of them were more clearly addressed to backpackers, some others were more generally directed to travellers (Table 1). Answers were collected between July 2018 and January 2019. All groups are Italian, and the questionnaire was submitted in Italian. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

Table 1: list of Facebook groups included in the data collection

Group name	Link
Lonely Planet Italia	https://www.facebook.com/groups/1066876923463099/?notif_id=1540979041639122&notif_t=group_r2j_approved
Vacanze-Viaggi-Turismo	https://www.facebook.com/groups/112304368891767/?ref=br_rs
Cerco Compagni Di Viaggio (1)	https://www.facebook.com/groups/967426160054228/
Italia BACKPACKER	https://www.facebook.com/groups/349982935388180/
Viaggiare Insieme	https://www.facebook.com/groups/197386300745460/
Viaggi & Eventi, Travels & Events	https://www.facebook.com/groups/io.non.viaggio.da.sol.single.company.mondo/
Cerco Compagni di Viaggio (2)	https://www.facebook.com/groups/cercocompagnidiviaggio/
Reporter di Viaggio	https://www.facebook.com/groups/1625599951055048/?notif_id=1541188899139465&notif_t=group_r2j_approved
Geografando per il Mondo	https://www.facebook.com/groups/1297964500270485/?hc_location=group
Ho Sempre Voglia Di Partire	https://www.facebook.com/groups/hosemprevogliadiapartire/
Travel Hackers Italia	https://www.facebook.com/groups/travelhackersitalia/?ref=gsj
Viaggi con i Social... Italiani che VIAGGIANO in Italia e nel Mondo	https://www.facebook.com/groups/53216125930/
Fulltimers Italia - Vivere Viaggiando - Community	https://www.facebook.com/groups/fulltimersitacommunity/

3.1 *Description of the sample*

The sample is composed of 168 respondents, 74% women and 26% men. It's a relatively young sample, with ages from 18 to 67, and an average age of 31. The age of respondents is in line with the general description of backpackers offered by literature, while the preponderance of female responses could be attributed to the modality of data collection, as women tend to respond more than men to online questionnaires (Smith 2008).

35% of them have completed secondary studies, 32% have a junior degree and 20% have a master's degree, whilst 10% have not completed any secondary studies. A large part of the respondents (46%) work as employees, 20% are students, 11% are unemployed, 8% are executives or entrepreneurs and 3% are into commerce or artisans. Almost half of the respondents (48%) live in small cities (less than 50.000 inhabitants), while 24% live in medium size cities (between 50.000 and 250.000 inhabitants) and the remaining 28% live in big cities.

3.2 *The analysis of the answers*

What are the respondents seeking for when they travel? They want to see new places (79%), meet new cultures (73%) and try new experiences (62%). Other answers include escaping from daily life (29%), test one's own limits (18%), learn a new language (11%).

During their last trip, 44% of them used a sharing platform a few times, 34% used them often and 13% all the time, whilst only 10% did not use them (with 2% declaring not to know them and 1% not trusting them). The average age of users is slightly lower than non-users (31 the first group, 34 the second group).

The platforms were mainly used to find places to sleep (87%) and move around (71%), followed by visiting places (22%), meeting people (22%) and eating (15%). Coherently, Airbnb is by far the most popular platform, signalled by 80% of the respondents, followed by Uber (51%) and Blablacar (44%). Lower, but still relevant values are obtained by Couchsurfing (28%), Homeaway (14%) and Lyft (8%). Other platforms that are mentioned by respondents are: Eatwith, Grab, Work away, Gumtree, Amovens, Hostelword.

Mostly, the platforms were already known before the travel (92%), thanks to word of mouth (52%), blogs (22%) or advertising (15%). During the travel, 48% of respondents discovered new platforms, once again mostly by word of mouth (32%), advertising (8%) and blogs (6%).

The motivation of most of the respondents for using a platform was to save money (82%). Other reasons indicated are easy reservation system (38%), authenticity of the experience (33%), to be more eco-sustainable (16%) and out of curiosity (12%).

Basically, all platform users are satisfied by the experience (99%) and think that using them facilitated the fulfilment of their specific travel's demands (92%). Reasons for satisfaction are actual savings on travel costs (77%), facility of reservation (47%), meeting new people (42%); followed by visiting places off the beaten track (36%), participating in "typical" experiences that would otherwise have been out of reach (34%), tried local products (11%). The answers to the open question highlight how, using sharing platforms, it's possible to plan and carry out "a unique and personalized travel experience".

Only 47% of respondents think that the use of such platform contributes to the development of local communities, 43% don't know and 10% answered no to this question. In more detail, 67% believe that they helped create work for the locals, and 46% think they have carried out an eco-sustainable activity.

44% found that use of the platform helped develop human relationships with locals, 25% did not develop relationships and 31% didn't know.

Respondents were then asked to choose whether they would prefer to use a sharing platform or a traditional option to find: a place to sleep, a way to travel, a way to move around a city, a place to eat, experiences to carry out during the travel. The results are shown in Table 2. The results are somehow in discordance with the experiences recounted before: Uber and Airbnb retain a prominent position, but the distribution of the percentages show a much lower preference for Airbnb and Blablacar, and a considerably higher interest in platforms such as GuideMeRight/Rent a Local Friend or Gnammo, that registered zero use in previous travel experiences.

Table 2: propensity to use sharing platforms vs traditional options for different aspects of the travel

<i>platform</i>		<i>traditional options</i>	
Uber	82%	17%	Taxi
GuideMeRight	79%	21%	Travel Agency
Airbnb	66%	34%	Hostal
Gnammo	30%	70%	Restaurant
Blablacar	34%	66%	Public Transport

The open question gave the opportunity to recount significant experiences, and 27 answers were collected. The platforms are described, more than anything else, as a way to create human relationships with local people and with their help discover less touristic and more “authentic” aspects and places, and in a few cases the encounter evolved into long lasting friendships.

4. Discussion and conclusion: how urban backpacking may change in the sharing economy era

As emerged from the literature, peer-to-peer platforms and services appear relevant and suitable ways to bypass traditional tourist circuits, find local-based experiences, connect with dwellers and save money. In this sense, based on the literature, backpackers seem to be a target that could easily embrace the sharing economy platforms of the tourist sector. They should be able to fully exploit the potential that these platforms have (at least according to researchers) in terms of environmental and human sustainability. Backpackers, as described so far, usually reject the standardization and homogenization of travel created by globalization, looking for a more authentic form of travel (Steylaerts and O’Dubhgall, 2011). For this reason, in the organization and management of travel, they seek and are inclined to use alternative tools and solutions. Peer-to-peer platforms, and more general sharing economy services, are increasing the percentage of people swapping from traditional forms of mass tourism to more personalized and customized ones. This represents an opportunity for the promotion of more respectful and conscious forms of tourism,

but at the same time risks enhancing the pull of purely economic reasons for backpacking practices.

With regards to our research questions, the first interesting result of the survey concerns the motivations of our respondents: while the motivation to travel is close to that of the backpackers described by the literature (see new places, meet new cultures, try new experiences), the motivation to use sharing platforms are mainly connected with economy and practicality.

Concerning the second point of our investigation, among the different opportunities offered to travellers by the sharing platforms, the services mainly used related to accommodation and urban transport, while larger travels are still preferably carried out using traditional systems, and other aspects of the trip (such as the choice of where to eat, what to do or visit...) remain autonomously organized, without recurring to either platforms or traditional tourist services.

In their use, the sample polarize on a few, well known and publicized platforms, representatives of the so-called platform capitalist, that research indicates as having an increasingly negative impact on different dimensions of urban development (housing, neighbourhood identity, gentrification, disneyfication and hotelization, job conditions...).

As anticipated, when asked about the motivations for the use of sharing platforms, our target travellers choose them primarily because they are convenient, useful and easy to use, and not so much with the intention of directly creating new relations with local people or having a positive impact on the local ecosystem. The positive effect of facilitating local encounters or boosting the local economy in a sustainable manner is still mentioned as desirable by the respondents. The analysis of the reasons of satisfaction in the use of these platforms reinforce this picture, as the money saving aspect is more consistent than any other. The more ethical impact of sharing platforms, when perceived, seems to be mostly an indirect benefit, and reciprocity or long-lasting relations are not necessarily looked for. The interviewees themselves do not seem to associate the use of sharing platform with specific ethical choices, and only some of them believe that by their use they have had a positive impact on the local community or are more eco-sustainable. The only aspect that seems to be really sought for and actually supported by the experience is that of the creation of human relations. Otherwise, the sharing economy is mostly expe-

rienced as a way to spend less and facilitate the process of travelling, but not so much as an instrument of change and support for local communities.

Sharing platforms make the practice of urban backpacking easier, supporting travellers with tools and services that facilitate the autonomous organization of the travel, helping finding alternative solutions outside the traditional market system, and facilitating contact with local people and the local environment, although the positive effect of favouring local encounters is mainly indirect and rarely creates reciprocity or long-lasting relations.

This easier access may open the way to a less ethically concerned kind of backpacker. Moreover, the practice sees the dominance of the more famous and market-oriented platforms over other kind of platform. In the light of these findings, we think that the use of these platforms may transform the way we can identify backpackers since part of the practice assumes a more consumerist orientation, losing in some way its original connotation.

Considering the arising questions on the impact that the already famous platforms are having on the cities where they are most diffused, it could be interesting to investigate further how the relationship between backpackers and sharing platforms is evolving, and if, as suggested by this data, it is going in a less virtuous and more consumerist/market oriented direction than could have been expected.

The respondents of this study show interest in platforms that allow them to contact local people and spend time with them in specific local activities (see platforms such as GuideMeRight or Rent a Local Friend). However, it is not clear if there is the possibility of satisfying those instances of “unicity”, “connection with the environment” and “awareness” via sharing platforms that are selling a product, or if this commercialization will lead to a transformation of the core experience. For backpackers in particular and travellers/tourists in general it seems that the attitude of using these kind of platforms, extractive and “netarchical” as experts call it, is not combined with a real awareness of their impact. These considerations should be taken into account by policy makers in the development of strategies that could favour a really sustainable urban tourism in economic, social and environmental terms (Diamantini and Borrelli 2016).

5. Limitations and future research

Considering the reduced dimension of the sample, as well as the strategy of data collection, the present study does not allow a generalization of the findings, but only the suggestion of results that would need further investigation in order to be confirmed. Further research, with a larger sample, could investigate motivations and experiences of non-Italian speaking travellers.

We suggest the need to deepen the understanding of the cultural and social background of the different kind of platform users, to identify if those moved by a stronger ethical pull are actually finding resources in the sharing platforms.

Focusing on the case of backpackers, will the use of the platforms distinguish between “backpackers” that are more concerned with the unicity of their experiences and “backpackers” with more awareness of the impact of their tourist choices? What kind of platforms can better suit the request for ethical tourist behaviour? If one of the key backpacker’s motivation and behaviour is authenticity seeking, can it be satisfied by platforms such as Airbnb? And if backpackers no longer stay in hostels, are they still backpackers?

In conclusion, we suggest that further research should try to define strategies that would enable sharing platforms to support a more ethical form of tourism and promote a virtuous reinforcement of backpackers (and traditional tourists) sustainable practices.

References

- B.A. Adkins, E.L. Grant, *Backpackers as a Community of Strangers: The Interaction Order of an Online Backpacker Notice Board*, in *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 3, 2, 2007, pp. 188-200.
- A. Ali, J.A. Frew, *Technology innovation and applications in sustainable destination development*”, in *Information Technology & Tourism*, 14, 4, 2014, pp. 265-290.
- A. Andreotti, G. Anselmi, T. Eichhorn, C. P. Hoffmann, M. Micheli, *Participation in the Sharing Economy*, in *Report from the EU H2020 Research Project Ps2Share: Participation, Privacy, and Power in the Sharing Economy*,

- 2017, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2961745> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2961745>.
- D. Arcidiacono, *Economia collaborativa e startup: forme alternative di scambio economico o mito della disintermediazione?*, in *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 73, 2017, pp. 29-47.
- I. Ateljevic, S. Doorne, *Theoretical Encounters: A Review of Backpacker Literature*, in G. Richards, J. Wilson (a cura di), *The Global Nomad: Backpacker Travel in Theory and Practice*, Bristol, UK, Channel View, 2004, pp. 60–76.
- M. Bauwens, V. Kostakis, *Network Society and Future Scenarios for a Collaborative Economy*, New York, Palgrave Pivot Macmillan, 2014.
- S., Becken, D., Simmons, C., Frampton, *Segmenting tourists by their travel pattern for insights into achieving energy efficiency*, in *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 1, 2003, pp. 48-56.
- R. Belk, *Why not share rather than own?*, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611, , 2007, pp. 126–140.
- R. Belk, *Sharing*, in *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, 5, 2010, pp. 715–734.
- R. Belk, *You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online*, in *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 2014.
- M. Bernardi, *The impact of AirBnB on our cities: Gentrification and ‘disneyfication’ 2.0*, in *LabGov*, *UrbanMediaLab*, 2018, <https://labgov.city/thecommonspost/the-impact-of-airbnb-on-our-cities-gentrification-and-disneyfication-2-0/>.
- L. Böckera, T. Meelenb, *Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for intended sharing economy participation*, in *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 2017, pp. 28-39.
- N. Borrelli, M. Bernardi, *Sharing economy and sustainability in tourism. New challenges for the tour operators*, in M.C. Dhiman, V. Chauhan (a cura di), *International Travel Agency and Tour Operation Management*, Hershey, IGI Global publisher USA, 2019.
- R. Botsman, R. Rogers, *What's Mine Is Yours: the Rise of Collaborative Consumption*, New York HarperBusiness, 2010.
- D. Bowen, J. Clarke, *Contemporary Tourist Behaviour: Yourself and Others as Tourists*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- S. Brauckmann, *City tourism and the sharing economy – potential effects of online peer-to-peer marketplaces on urban property markets*”, in *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3, 2, 2017, pp.114-126.
- M. Brzózka, *Description and course of backpacking trips depending on the nationality of the tourists*, in *Miscellanea geographica-Regional studies on development*, 16(1), 2012, pp. 36-42.
- D. Buhalis, R. Law, *Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the Internet—the state of eTourism research*, in *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 2008, pp. 609–623.
- S. Cagle, *To Get a Fair Share, Sharing-economy Workers Must Unionize*, in *Al Jazeera America*, 2014, Accessed February 2019. <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/6/uber-sharing-economyunionstaxis.html>.
- G. Chen, J. Bao, S. Huang, *Segmenting Chinese Backpackers by Travel Motivations*, in *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16, 2014, pp. 355–67.
- E. Cohen, *Toward a Sociology of International Tourism*, in *Social Research*, 39(1), 1972, pp.164-82.
- E. Cohen, *Nomads from Affluence: Notes on the Phenomenon of Drifter-Tourism*, in *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 14(1/2), 1973, pp.89-103.
- E. Cohen, *A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences*, in *Sociology*, 13(21979), pp.179-201.
- E. Cohen, *Backpacking: Diversity and Change*, in *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 1(2), 2003, pp.95-110.
- L. Desforges, *Travelling the World: Identity and Travel Biography*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, 2000, pp. 926-945.
- D. Dredge, S. Gyimóthy, *The collaborative Economy and Tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices*, in *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(3), 2015, pp. 286-302.
- D. Diamantini, N. Borrelli, *Approccio human-centred per una governance inclusiva delle città contemporanee. I principi slow nella città smart*, in *Sociologia urbana e rurale*, 109, 2016, pp. 113-128.
- Econopoly, *Mi ospiti nel tuo appartamento? Gli effetti di AirBnB sulla città turistica*, in *Il Sole24ore*, 2018 <http://www.econopoly.ilsole24ore.com/2018/03/29/airbnb-effetti-citta-turistica>.

- T. Elsrud, *Risk Creation in Travelling: Backpacker Adventure Narration*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28, 2001, pp. 597-617.
- T. Elsrud, *Time Creation in Travelling: The Taking and Making of Time among Women Backpackers*, in *Time and Society*, 7, 1998, pp. 309-334.
- Y. Enoch, R. Grossman, *Blogs of Israeli and Danish Backpackers to India*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(2), 2010, pp. 520–536.
- B. Fang, Q. Ye, R. Law, *Effect of sharing economy on tourism industry employment*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57(3), 2016, pp. 264-267.
- A. C. Gant, *Holiday Rentals: The New Gentrification Battlefield*, in *Sociological Research Online*, 21(3), 2016, pp. 1-9.
- J. Germann Molz, *CouchSurfing and network hospitality: 'It's not just about the furniture'*, in *Hospitality & Society*, 1(3), 2011, pp. 215–225.
- D. Guttentag, *Airbnb: disruptive innovation and the rise of an informal tourism accommodation sector*, in *Current Issue on Tourism*, 18(12), 2013, pp. 1192-1217.
- J. Hamari, M. Sjöklint, A. Ukkonen, *The sharing economy: why people participate in collaborative consumption*, in *J. Assoc. Inform. Sci. Technol.*, 67(9), 2015, pp. 2047-2059.
- M. P. Hampton, *Backpacker tourism and economic development*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(3) 1998, pp. 639-660.
- K. Hannam, I. Ateljevic, (a cura di) (2007), *Backpacking Tourism: Concepts and Profiles*, Clevedon, Channel View.
- K. Hannam, A. Diekmann, *From Backpacking to Flashpacking: Developments in Backpacker Tourism Research*, in K. Hannam, A. Diekmann. (a cura di), *Beyond Backpacker Tourism: Mobilities and Experiences*, Bristol, UK, Channel View, 2010, pp. 1-7.
- R. W. Howard, *Five Backpacker Tourist Enclaves*, in *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 2007, pp. 73-86.
- G. Kallis, *AirBnb Is a Rental Economy, Not a Sharing Economy*, in *The PressProject*, 2013 <http://www.thepressproject.net/article/68073/AirBnb-is-a-rentaleconomy-not-a-sharing-economy>.
- M. Kenney, J. Zysman, *The rise of the platform economy*, in *Science and Technology*, 33(3), 2016, <https://issues.org/the-rise-of-the-platform-economy/>.
- D. Lee, *How Airbnb Short-Term Rentals Exacerbate Los Angeles's Affordable Housing Crisis: Analysis and Policy Recommendations*, in *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 10, 2016, pp. 229-255.

- L. Loker-Murphy, P. L. Pearce, *Young Budget Travelers: Backpackers in Australia*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(4), 1995, pp. 819-43.
- G. Mascheroni, *Global Nomads' Network and Mobile Sociality: Exploring New Media Uses on the Move*, in *Information, Communication & Society*, 10(42007), pp. 527-546.
- D. Maoz, *Backpackers' Motivations: The Role of Culture and Nationality*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), 2007, pp. 122-140.
- J. Mosedale, *Diverse economies and alternative economic practices in tourism*, in I. Atelvecic, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, (a cura di.), *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Creating an Academy of Hope* Abingdon, Routledge, 2012, pp.194-207.
- J. Mosedale, *Conclusion: Tourism and Neoliberalism: States, the Economy and Society*, in Mosedale J. (a cura di), *Neoliberalism and the political economy of tourism*, Farnham, UK, Ashgate, 2016.
- L. Murphy, *Exploring social interactions of backpackers*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), 2001, pp. 50-67.
- H. Muzaini, *Backpacking Southeast Asia. Strategies of «Looking Local»* in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33, 2006, pp. 144-161.
- S. Nadler, *The sharing economy: what is it and where is it going?*, Boston, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2014. <http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/90223>.
- K. Newlands, *Setting out on the road less travelled: A study of backpacker travel in New Zealand*, in G. Richards, J. Wilson (a cura di), *The global nomad: Backpacker travel in theory and practice*, Clevedon, England, Channel View Publications, 2004, pp. 217-236.
- A. Oliveira-Brochado, C. Gameiro, *Toward a better understanding of backpackers' motivations*, in *Tékhne*, 11.2, 2013, pp. 92-99.
- C. C. O'Reilly, *From Drifter to Gap Year Tourist: Mainstreaming Backpacker Travel*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 2006, pp. 998-1017.
- P. Parigi, B. State, *Disenchanted world: The Impact of technology on relationships*, in L.M. Aiello, D. McFarland (a cura di) *International Conference on Social Informatics*, Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp.166-182,
- C. M. Paris, *Flashpackers: An Emerging Subculture?*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 2012, pp. 1094-1115.

- C. D. Paris, *The Virtualization of Backpacker Culture: Virtual Mooring, Sustained Interactions and Enhanced Mobilities*, in K. Hannam, A. Diekmann, (a cura di) *Beyond Backpacker Tourism: Mobilities and Experiences*, Bristol, Channel View, , 2010, pp. 40-63.
- C.D. Paris,. V. Teye, *Backpacker Motivations: A Travel Career Approach*, in *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 19(3), 2010, pp. 244-59.
- P.L. Pearce, *The Backpacker phenomenon – Preliminary Answers to Basic Questions*, Australia, Department of Tourism, James Cook University of North Queensland, 1990.
- A. Parsons, *The Sharing Economy: a Short Introduction to its Political Evolution*, in *Sharing.org*, 2014, <http://www.sharing.org/information-centre/articles/sharing-economy-short-introduction-its-political-evolution>
- C. Petr, *E-Tourist Behavior: The Influence of IT on Consumers*, in M. Kozak, A. Decrop, (a cura di) *Handbook of Tourist Behavior: Theory and Practice*, New York, Routledge, 2009, pp. 211-225.
- S. Picascia, A. Romano, M. Teobaldi, *The airification of cities: making sense of the impact of peer to peer short term letting on urban functions and economy*, in *Proceedings of the Annual Congress of the Association of European Schools of Planning*, Lisbon July 11-14, 2017.
- G. Richards, *The development of cultural tourism in Europe*. In G. Richards (a cura di), *Cultural attractions and European tourism*, Oxon, CABI Publishing, 2001, pp. 3-30.
- G. Richards, J. Wilson, *Drifting towards the global nomad*, in G. Richards, J. Wilson, (a cura di) *The Global Nomad: Backpacker Travel in Theory and Practice*, Bristol, UK, Channel View Publications, 2004, pp. 3-13.
- G. F. Ross, *Backpacker achievement and environment controllability as visitor motivators*, in *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 6(2), 1997, pp. 69-82.
- A.A. Sans, A. Quagliari Domínguez, *Unravelling Airbnb: Urban Perspectives from Barcelona*, in A.P. Russo, G. Richards (a cura di), *Reinventing the Local in Tourism: Producing, Consuming and Negotiating Place*, Bristol, Channel View Publications, 2016, pp. 209-228.
- J. Schor, *Debating the Sharing Economy*, in *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics*, 4(3), 2016, pp. 7-22.

- J. B. Schor, C. Fitzmaurice, L. B. Carfagna, W. Attwood-Charles, E. D. Po-teat, *Paradoxes of openness and distinction in the sharing economy*, in *Poet-ics*, 54, 2016, pp. 66–81.
- G. Semi, *Tutte le città come Disneyland?*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2015.
- T. Slee, *What's Yours Is Mine: against the Sharing Economy*, London, New York, OR Books, 2015.
- G. Smith, *Does gender influence online survey participation?: A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online survey response behaviour*, in *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 501717*, 2008
- M. Smith, N. MacLeod, M.H. Robertson, *Key Concepts in Tourist Studies*, London, Sage, 2010
- G. Smorto, *Verso la disciplina giuridica della sharing economy*, in *Mercato concorrenza regole*, 27(2), 2015, pp. 245-277.
- A. Sørensen, *Backpacker Ethnography*, in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(4), 2003, pp. 847-67.
- N. Srnicek, *Platform Capitalism (Theory Redux)*, New York, Wiley, 2016.
- Statista, *Airbnb*, New York, Statista, 2017.
<https://www.statista.com/study/24578/airbnb-statista-dossier>.
- S. Steylaerts, S. O'Dubhghaill, *CouchSurfing and authenticity: Notes towards an understanding of an emerging phenomenon*, in *Hospitality & Society*, 1(3), 2011, pp. 261–278.
- W-K. Tan, T-H. Chen, *The Usage of Online Tourist Information Sources in Tourist Information Search: An Exploratory Study*, *The Service Industries Journal*, 32(3), 2012, pp. 451-476.
- J. Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, London, Sage, 1990.
- R. Vaughan, R. Daverio, *Assessing the size and presence of the collaborative economy in Europe*, PwC UK, PwC Analysis, 2016.
- Z. Xiang, U. Gretzel, *Role of Social Media in Online Travel Information Search*, in *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 2010, pp. 179-188.
- T. Young, J. Hanley, *Virtual Mobilities: Backpackers, New Media and Online Travel Communities. Social Causes, Private Lives*, paper presented at the Australian Sociological Association Annual Conference 2010, Sydney, New South Wales.
- K. B. Wright, *Researching Internet-Based Populations: Advantages and Dis-advantages of Online Survey Research*, *Online Questionnaire Authoring*

Software Packages, and Web Survey Services, in *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3), 2005.

J. Zhang, A.M. Morrison, H. Tucker, B. Wu, *Am I a Backpacker? Factors Indicating the Social Identity of Chinese Backpackers*, in *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(4), 2018, pp. 525-539.