

Studying of Sharing Economy in Egypt as a Destination for Tourism and Hospitality

Salama Ammar¹ **Hany Kozmal²**
^{1,2}Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotels
Luxor (EGOTH), Egypt

Tamer Ahmed Abdulaziz³
³High Institute for Tourism and Hotels,
6 of October City

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Sharing Economy, Platforms, Peer-to-Peer Accommodation (P2PA); Tourism and Hospitality; Accommodation; Customer Satisfaction.

(JAAUTH)
Vol. 18, No. 2,
(2020),
PP.96-120.

Abstract

Tourism and hospitality in the age of the sharing economy follow a model based on a global concept with a local practice. The traditional tourist supply is based on the tourist attractions of a destination, expressed by the characteristics of the destination itself and a range of services related to accommodation, transport, and food. For the last five years, almost 500 sharing economy platforms, related to tourism services, have been developed; 50% of these are related to the transport sector, 39% leisure and 11% for accommodation (Peeters et al., 2015). The evolution of sharing economy technologies in the tourism and hospitality industry has facilitated the communication process between the tourists and service providers, which has led to the disappearing of the intermediates. This paper aims at studying the sharing economy in Egypt as destination for tourism and hospitality, discussing how the sharing economy affects travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, and illustrating how to develop the peer 2 peer accommodation (P2PA) in Egypt as being one of the sharing economy tools in Tourism and Hospitality Industry globally. A pilot study was conducted during September 2019. The study found that applying the sharing economy in the Egyptian tourist destination still needs more development. On the other hand, the study assured that sharing economy has effects on travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation. More efforts should be exerted by the Egyptian tourism and hospitality managers to motivate the potential of the P2PA market.

Introduction

Due to the emergence of the sharing economy platforms, In parallel with the growth of Smartphone companies, besides the reduction of its price, which has affecting positively on the increasing number of Internet users at the global level the world has become a small village (Varma et al., 2016; Gusso, 2016; Hira & Reilly, 2017). People could communicate with each other's at any time and everywhere to make friends with others without obstacles. In addition, they can also obtain information or reach to those basic needs like food, shelter and clothing by using different platforms that have specified for these purposes (Hira &

¹Tourism Studies Department, Email: salamalogly@gmail.com

²Hotel Studies Department, Email: hany_atef2000@yahoo.com

³Tourism Studies Department, Email: dr.tamer@hith.edu.eg

Reilly, 2017). Orabi (2019) has illustrated that the spread of tourism platforms, which facilitated the direct communication process between the client and the tourism service provider, has contributed to entry the concept of the sharing economy in the tourism field.

The sharing economy and its potential are still an “under-researched area and relatively little is known about its true impact on tourism, society, the economy and the environment” (Lorange and Oksanen, 2016). Given the collaborative economy rapid growth all over the world.

The sharing economy has penetrated the accommodation and hospitality. Facilitated by online social platforms, customers coordinate the accommodation, hospitality, and tourism among their peers through services such as Airbnb and 9flats, a phenomenon known as collaborative consumption (Belk, 2014; Jermsittiparsert et al., 2019). The sharing economy is all about customers granting each other temporary access to under-utilized physical assets, possibly for money (Frenken et al., 2015). The sharing economy is potentially fast-growing, estimating growth “exceeding 25%; in some areas, it could reach 63% by 2025” (Goudin et al. 2016).

The peer to peer (P2P) economy or collaborative consumption is an emerging socio-economic model based on sharing, bartering, renting, gifting, swapping, lending, and borrowing (Piscicelli et al., 2015). Moreover, Botsman and Rogers (2011) added trading, and emphasized the profits guests gain through access over ownership, which is monetary, practical, and social, such as saving time and space, social interaction, and allowing people to become active citizens (Jermsittiparsert et al., 2019).

In this paper, we focused on the sharing economy in the tourism industry, studying how sharing economy affects travelers’ destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, and highlighted how to develop the peer 2 peer accommodation (P2PA) in Egypt as being one of the sharing economy tools in Tourism Industry.

Research aims and objectives

The paper aims at studying the sharing economy in Egypt as a tourist destination, discussing how sharing economy affects travelers’ destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, and illustrating how to develop the peer 2 peer accommodation (P2PA) in Egypt as being one of the sharing economy tools in Tourism Industry globally. This was done by exploring the P2PAs compared to hotels through extracting key content and themes from online reviews of social travel sites such as “Airbnb, 9 flats, VRBO, Homeaway, Flipkey and Wimdu”, and customer questionnaire to explain the key service attributes required.

Literature Review

In this section, the study highlights some concepts such as Sharing Economy, Sharing Economy and Tourism, and Peer 2 Peer Accommodation as one of Sharing Economy Tools.

The Sharing Economy

Sharing is an old phenomenon as humankind is, while collaborative consumption and the ‘sharing economy’ are born in the era of the Internet (Belk, 2014). Several definitions of the sharing economy have been given, both from academics and from practitioners. A very broad definition is suggested by "The People Who Share", a campaigning group promoting the sharing economy: “The sharing economy is a socio-economic ecosystem built around the sharing of human and physical resources. It includes the sharing of production, distribution, trade and consumption of goods and services by different people and organizations”.

Whereas academics define this concept as that it should only include consumer-to-consumer transactions, not business-to-consumer transactions, (Frenken et al, 2015). Weston (2015) has illustrated a more specific definition of the sharing economy. He describes it as a set of practices, models and platforms that, through technology and community, allows individuals and businesses to, share access to products, services and experiences. It includes non-profit and for-profit platforms that have emerged from an originally pure sharing economy, peer-to-peer and/ or non-profit organizations.

It is, therefore, possible to identify four main aspects characterizing the sharing economy, and these could be concentrated in the 4 Ts of the sharing economy. These elements are as follows: Trust for sharing of human and physical resources, Togetherness created through peer-to-peer relationship, Technology platform, Transformation of the traditional producer, and consumer relationship/roles.

The first element, the sharing of human and physical resources, tangible and intangible assets are put together in a common and shared network. All these could happen because of new mechanisms of building trust between the members of the shared network. Those members created together a new form of capital, reputational capital, where the currency of the new economy is the trust (Botsman, 2012). For example, Airbnb requires photo identification, and access to the platform has to be made using Facebook or Google+ accounts or the email.

The second element that regulates relations among the actors involved in the system is togetherness created through the peer-to-peer relation; an equal relationship where all the actors have the same possibilities to access the good/services, and the value is created with a common effort. The concept of equal relationship can be seen, as first, in the interactions among the users of the good/service, which are not segmented based on socio-demographic variables or depending on the purchasing power, but they are only considered with regard to their same chance to access the shared resources. In the case of 'pure' sharing economy, the actors detaining the products are at the same time the users of the same products, involved altogether in mutual relation. The hosts and guests' interaction, followed by sharing their experience through the systems of mutual reviews, manages to create a brand and its identity (Yannopoulou et al., 2013).

The third element is the existence of a technological platform that allows the relationship within the system. From a classical point of view, the platform represents the meeting point of demand and supply, overcoming the traditional distinction that sees the demand side related to the consumer and the supply side linked with the firms. In a peer-to-peer system, based on the sharing of goods and services, the role of the firm is modified: it no longer represents the supplier of the good/service but rather represents the medium that put together, through a platform, many private citizens, holders, and users at the same time of a specific product. According to Tauscher and Laudien (2017), as a business model, Airbnb represent a peer-to-peer offline service that aims to connect people to list, discover, and book private accommodation.

The fourth element of the sharing economy resides in the way that newly created relationships in this new form of the economy transform both producers and consumers. For example, the roles of host and guests, producer and consumer, become blurred and platforms like Airbnb can be viewed not just as hospitality companies, but as new "sectors" creating demand for niche services (J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, 2015). At the same time, both guests and hosts are encouraged to continuously improve their behavior or product/service, respectively to become better rated in the network. (Airbnb, 2017).

The Sharing Economy and Tourism

The reasons that influenced a person's decision to plan a holiday have remained essentially the same: a desire to visit new places, to relax, and to get away from daily and working routines. Up till now, mass tourism has satisfied this need, offering tourists opportunities for enjoying new experiences. In time, however, tourists have greatly refined their taste and their expectations, and their reasons for traveling have changed accordingly. The 'new' tourist is increasingly looking for a meaningful personal experience and is therefore striving to be engrossed by his/her trip, to feel completely engaged, aiming for memorable and unique experiences (Forno & Garibaldi, 2015).

Together with this shift in the traditional reasons for traveling, some main catalyst that support the development of the sharing economy in the field of tourism emerge as follows; The Great Recession, Digital Payments, Smartphone Adoption, Community Culture, and Airbnb's Success.

The Great Recession represents the first catalyst that pushed sharing economy alternatives, especially in the field of tourism. The financial crisis and economic recession forced households to think about how to better use their physical assets and how to reduce personal consumption. On the other hand, consumers began being more attentive with their expenses and looking for cheaper alternatives, not only in terms of transport and holidays but also to grocery shopping and restaurants.

Smartphone Adoption, the ever-growing spread of smartphones, not only among young people, but also across different ages of consumers surely pushed and keeps on pushing the diffusion of sharing economy businesses and platforms. The continued growth in smartphone adoption creates indeed a fertile ecosystem for the creation and growth of new business models that usually choose a 'mobile-first' approach. This solution is quite frequent when talking about sharing economy firms, especially concerning transport and leisure. The use of an app rather than a website as the primary point of access for service has become nowadays a norm rather than an exception.

Digital Payment, the introduction of digital payment is relatively old in many industries. What has recently emerged as an evolution of this system are digital peer-to-peer payments, which allow the digital transfer of funds between two people following the completion of a service or the exchange of goods. This new form of digital payment is rooted quite easily thanks to a good diffusion of digital payment between consumers and firms, which consumers have already been used to in recent years. Digital peer-to-peer payments represent a vital component of the sharing economy. They are considered a quick and safe way to transfer funds between sharing economy participants (Olson & Connor, 2013).

Community Culture, to boost the development of sharing platforms, is very important to build a sense of belonging among users. Reaching this goal is made easy by the diffusion of social networks, which are based on the same idea of community. Nevertheless, this community-driven culture must be based on a reputation system, where all users are evaluated by other users and build up their reliability. This system seems to be strong because the same participant of the platform generates it after they tried the service.

Airbnb's Success, the early success of Airbnb served as a real propeller for several platforms, not only in the industry of accommodation but also in other various industries. In fact, Airbnb can be identified as the first truly successful experience of a worldwide sharing platform, which arise trustfulness and reliability for these kinds of services, stimulating the birth and development of other sharing platforms.

Peer 2 Peer Accommodation as one of Sharing Economy Tools

Definition of peer-to-peer accommodations

Peer-to-peer is a relatively new, fast-growing part of the sharing economy, this is especially important because of these types of initiatives often act in an institutional void and can cause regulatory challenges (Codagnone et al., 2016). P2PA is a potential alternative for hotels, especially in the cheaper market segment (Zervas et al., 2015). P2PAs are a relatively novel concept. Because these enterprises are new, tourism and hospitality in Egypt have yet to take clear stances on them, and more often than not clear policy concerning these platforms is lacking (Langeslag, 2018). P2PAs also known as crowd shipping started just like the sharing economy on a small scale (Merckx et al., 2017). P2PA is consumers granting each other temporary access to under-utilized physical assets possible for the money. Typically, the goods are homes (Frenken and Schor, 2017). Similar to personal accommodations and housing, this idea has been incorporated and formalized by the industry. In its original form, P2PAs did not change significantly (Sampaio et al., 2017).

P2PAs revenues

Revenues from peer-to-peer accommodations have exceeded US\$3.5 billion in 2013 with growth exceeding 25% making it a disruptive economic force (Geron 2013). The rapid rise of P2PAs presents opportunities (e.g., generates local income, provides alternative employment) and challenges (e.g., controlling issues) for tourism destinations. P2PAs rentals affect the competitive landscape of accommodations services as “regular people” host tourists and, by so doing, take customers away from hotels (Geron, 2012). P2PAs rely on a crowd of ‘producing’ users that are relatively in balance with the number of active customers on the accommodations (Sampaio *et al.*, 2017; Wirtz et al., 2019).

P2PAs platforms

P2P platforms consist of online platforms, such as mobile applications or websites built on new modes of market organization with the purpose of digitally mediate transactions between producers and consumers. It is worth noting that there in the EU Court of Justice is a pending case seeking to establish clear criteria to determine the legal category digital platforms to which they belong. Should they be considered information society services, or industry-specific businesses (Goudin, 2016)? Some of the most prominent examples of P2PA companies and platforms are Airbnb, DogVacay, Bla Bla Car, and Uber (Schor, 2016).

A move from business-to-customer organizations towards P2PAs can be witnessed all over the world and could claim to have a positive impact on sustainability such as Airbnb (2017, 2018), VRBO, Wimdu, and other “social travel” sites, (Langeslag, 2018). Studies focusing on P2PAs have found several potential benefits and disadvantages (Tsao *et al.*, 2015; Yen and Tang 2015). Airbnb has made a fundamental impact on the P2PA industry and it is crucial to find out the incentives from the guest side for using this innovative service. People tend to choose Airbnb rather than traditional accommodation. Many factors influence guest decision making on selecting Airbnb as a platform for P2PA as a replacement for traditional accommodations such as hotels. Airbnb industry is in high demand in the hospitality realm (Yang, 2016; Latifa et al., 2019; Wirtz et al., 2019).

Characteristics of P2PAs

Though the dimensions used to evaluate P2PAs are limited, P2PA is featured by a lack of rules. Guests can choose three types of accommodations listings through Airbnb: [1] an entire house/apartment, [2] a private room (often with shared facilities), or [3] a shared room. The characteristics of these lists differ greatly (e.g., shared or private bathroom, kitchen, internet access, etc.). Therefore, it is important to explore which features matter for guests when

evaluating their stay at P2PAs. Cost savings, value for money, and a drive for the community are confirmed as motivators for the use of P2PAs. Therefore, whereas guests value the same core services in the hotels and P2PA (e.g. clean room, comfortable bed), they possess different competitive advantages, hence attract different types of guests (Guttentag 2013; Owyang 2013; Möhlmann 2015; Tussyadiah, 2015, Latif *et al.*, 2019).

Potential benefits of P2PAs

The growth of P2PAs includes environmental issues, inefficiency, and congestion in city centers (Buldeo Rai *et al.*, 2017; Carbone *et al.*, 2017). Customers use P2PAs because of their economic and experiential values (Guttentag, 2013). Moreover, three major factors motivate the use of P2PAs:

- [1] sustainability (i.e. social and environmental responsibility), P2PAs residency helps with sustainability (i.e. social and environmental responsibility); P2PAs residency helps with sustainability (i.e. social and environmental responsibility); hospitality in Egypt can protect sustainability when looking at P2PAs; Tourism and hospitality in Egypt can protect sustainability when looking at P2PAs; The Egyptian arrangements currently in place for P2PAs residency initiatives are effective in protecting sustainability; Potential societal risks related to sustainability within P2PAs facilities; Possible arrangements for Egyptian tourism and hospitality institutions to fill the gaps in the current regulations regarding sustainability (Jermstipparsert *et al.*, 2019).
- [2] Community (P2PAs residency needs to train clients to benefit from different knowledge in the development of accommodation, tourism, and hospitality in their community); P2PAs residency needs to train clients to benefit from different knowledge in the development of accommodation, tourism, and hospitality in their community. P2PAs result in increasing popularity of unknown neighborhoods, active involvement of local host communities, and an increase in guests' expenses. Guests, who prefer to stay with a host, tend to spend more money, stay longer, and travel more frequently (Lalicic and Weismayer, 2017).
- [3] Economic benefits "i.e., lower-cost". P2PAs residence contributes to lower costs due to economic value; Economic benefits spur P2PAs use of residence (Tussyadiah, 2015; Zhou *et al.*, 2014; Muhammad *et al.*, 2019; Wirtz *et al.*, 2019). Positive economic impacts of tourist spend in non-tourist neighborhoods (Oskam and Boswijk, 2016).

Potential disadvantages of P2PAs

P2PAs provide a way of earning money with a relatively low barrier (Bergeijk, 2017), unable to work or experiencing problems Kuttner (2013), and there may be differences in terms of the service dimensions that people seek from alternative accommodations (Tussyadiah and Zach, 2015).

Some studies acknowledged guest satisfaction dimensions, informing hotel management with vital factors of service and customer satisfaction to direct their attention to (Muhammad *et al.*, 2019). Though, little is known if customers would evaluate P2PAs in the same manners, or for the same features, as they do hotels. These costs were measured in the hospitality dimensions (Langeslag, 2018). Gaining insights from customer intelligence available online is fundamental in today's hospitality business analytics. Studies extracting key content and themes from customer reviews to explain the important attributes of accommodations services have emerged (e.g., Zhou *et al.*, 2014; Tussyadiah and Zach, 2015, Xiang *et al.*, 2015; Latif *et al.*, 2019).

The social and political situation may negatively affect P2PA; Social benefits may negatively affect P2PA guests' satisfaction; Sustainability negatively affects satisfaction in P2P guests; the absence of cohabitation challenges the collaborative consumption concept (Tussyadiah, 2016). Another negative outcome for the P2PA that there are also potential effects on the price of housing, as this would mean that the residents meet the increased rents in neighborhoods, where home-sharing is popular. The problem is for locals experiencing nuisance and feeling danger from strangers (Frenken and Schor, 2017).

Hence, the level of creativeness must be retained to provide guests with the best Airbnb experiences and motivate them to select the P2PAs for tourism and hospitality purposes. Ensuring guests have a positive experience during their stay in the rental property will boost Airbnb reviews, which will lead to increased demand and ultimately more rental income for the Airbnb hosts. The competition in the world of P2PA is increasing without a doubt, and the experiences of the P2PAs guests are the main factor that will keep a property at the very top of this booming industry (Wirtz et al., 2019).

The study inquiry

How does the sharing economy affect travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation? As shown in table (3).

The study hypotheses

H 1: There is a significant difference between nationalities in terms of the effect of P2PAs dimensions regarding hospitality and tourism in Egypt. As shown in table (4).

H2: There are significant relationships between the variables of the study (the strangeness and weakness points "reality"; and the predictable threats) on the P2PAs. As shown in table (5).

Materials and Methodology

Questionnaires provide an efficient way of collecting a large amount of data from a sizable population of tourists in Egypt in a highly economical way. The questionnaire consists of three sections section: The first section discusses how sharing economy affects travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation. The Second section: is the actual situation "reality of P2PAs", the third section: the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs.

A pilot study was conducted in this study in September 2019. It aims to find out how the sharing economy affects travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation. Moreover, to ensure that the survey was well designed and easily understood by potential respondents, examine the reliability and validity of the research tools as well as develop and refine measure of the questions. The questionnaire was reviewed by some academic scholars to establish their appropriateness, clarity, and to ease the understanding. Some alterations were suggested and then were implemented. The questionnaire was then pre-tested to investigate the respondent's understanding of scale items and to identify also any issues that were complex or confusing to develop appropriate scale items to ensure the validity and reliability of the research. For this purpose, a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of P2PAs initiatives customers. Thirty forms were distributed to respondents who were asked to complete them.

The field study was accomplished through a survey by phone calls, social media networks, and emails. The target population for this study P2PAs initiatives customers and owners. The study was conducted from December 2019 to February 2020. 600 questionnaire forms were received only 439 completed forms were valid (73.16% response rate). The target

population for this study was from online reviews of social travel sites such as “Airbnb, 9flats, VRBO, Homeaway, Flipkey, and Wimdu”; moreover, questionnaires were conducted with online P2PAs initiatives customer. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 20.

Study instrument reliability

For all scales, Cronbach's Alpha, the correlation coefficient was calculated to regulate the internal consistency of the scale; the Reliability coefficient is over 0.70 it is considered "strongly acceptable" in most social science situations. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability was computed, and the tests showed that the reliability coefficients for all the instruments were above 0.995, which indicates that the instrument was reliable for being used. Cronbach alpha for all survey instruments was shown in the following table: 1.

Table 1
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items	No of questionnaires
.995	58	439

Results

This part of the study included the results of the questionnaire forms distributed on the internet via Facebook, email and online Google drive.

Table 2
Respondent's Demographics

Personal data		Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	Men	206	46.9
	Women	233	53.1
	Total	439	100.0
Age	From 20 years to less than 35 years	50	11.4
	From 35 years to less than 45 years	130	29.6
	45 years or over	259	59.0
	Total	439	100.0
Nationality	Europeans	140	40.5
	Americans	96	21.9
	Arab	178	31.9
	Another	25	5.7
	Total	439	100.0
Academic	Master's degree or PhD	10	2.3
	University degree	217	49.4
	High school	80	18.2
	Middle Certification	96	21.9
	Another	36	8.2
	Total	439	100.0

The distribution of the respondents according to demographic data (n= 439) indicated that regarding the gender most of the respondents were women; the percentage of respondents was 59.0 % at the age of over 45 years. In accordance with nationality, most of the respondents were Arab by the percentage of 40.5 % this indicates that they have an idea about the P2PAs. A University degree has a great percentage of 49.4 % of all respondents as shown in table (2). This indicates that most of the respondents are well educated and able to deal with technologies easily.

According to The first section: how the sharing economy affects travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, table (3) showed that (85.42 %) of studied samples of the respondents indicated that the economic and social benefits of the sharing economy affect positively on the tourist's decision to travel to a certain destination.", with a mean (4.27) and Std (0.64). These results indicate the importance of sharing economy for increasing the motivations to visit a specific destination. In the 2nd position with (85.01 %) indicate that sharing economy contributes to economic profits for tourists and local communities, with a mean (4.25) and Std (0.65). These illustrate the economic impacts of sharing economy on both tourists and local communities. Around the 3rd priority (81.73 %) of them indicated that sharing economy encouraging knowing people from the local neighborhoods, with a mean (4.09) and Std (0.70). This assured the social benefits of sharing economy. Followed in the 4th importance (81.09%) of them indicated that sharing economy provides tourists with more meaningful interaction with the hosts, with a mean (4.05) and Std (0.71); this indicates the mutual interaction between tourists and the hosts. Concerning the 5th agree level with (80.87%) of them indicated that sharing economy provides higher quality accommodation with less money, with a mean (4.04) and Std (0.84). this shows the role of sharing economy of decreasing the accommodation costs which affects positively travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, and length of stay. These results agreed with (e.g., Zhou et al., 2014; Tussyadiah and Zach, 2015, Xiang et al., 2015; Latif et al., 2019).

On the other hand, in the 18th efficiency average were Egyptian residents and policymakers have responded to the development of sharing economy by percentage (65.65), with a mean (3.28) and Std (0.45); these results indicate that sharing economy needs more and more developments. The sharing economy supports the revitalization of hospitality in light of technological changes in the 17th efficiency average by the percentage of (67.65%), with a mean (3.38) and Std (0.49); this indicates that sharing economy needs to meet and accede technological changes. Regarding the 16th agree position where the socio-economic role of sharing economy in supporting the local community, by a percentage of (68.38%) with a mean (3.42) and Std (0.76); results indicate that sharing economy has a great impact on supporting the local community. In the 15th position, social interactions stimulate tourists to visit a specific destination, by a percentage of (73.12%) as agree average, with a mean (3.66) and Std (0.65); These results indicate social interactions is a vital factor to sharing economy. These results agreed with (Lalicic and Weismayer, 2017; Latif et al., 2019; Jermsittiparsert *et al.*, 2019).

Rendering the strangeness and weakness points "reality" (second dimension) table (4) showed that in accordance with the 1st acceptance average level was that P2PAs help both of the peers. With (83.14 %) average, mean (4.16) and Std (0.75); this shows that there is a benefit for both peers. In the 2nd position was that P2PAs facilitation initiatives are commensurate with the larger trend towards participatory and circular economies, by a percentage of (82.23 %) as agree to average, with a mean (4.11) and Std (0.79); this indicates that P2PAs support participatory and circular economies. P2PAs residency helps to properly invest in peer residency places regarding the 3rd priority to the respondents with agree average level (80.91 %), mean was (3.74) and Std (0.83); P2PAs help to properly invest in peer residency places. Followed in the 4th importance with (80.09%) as an acceptance average, P2PAs residence helps stimulate hospitality and tourism, with a mean (4.00) and Std (0.83); this indicates the role of P2PAs on stimulating hospitality and tourism. Concerning the 5th agree level was P2PAs residency is a relatively new concept as these companies are

new by average (79.27 %), with Std (0.65) and mean (3.96). These results agreed with (Frenken and Schor, 2017; Sampaio *et al.*, 2017; Wirtz *et al.*, 2019).

On the other side, Egyptian arrangements currently in place for P2PAs residency initiatives are effective in protecting sustainability, by percentage (29.11), with a mean (2.46) and Std (0.50); results indicate that effectively in protecting sustainability need to improve. The attitudes and views of the local population regarding current and future development are positive is in the 16th efficiency average by the percentage of (36.99%), with a mean (2.85) and Std (0.72); this indicates that the attitudes and views of the local population need to change to positive. Regarding 15th agree position where that the extent of development of the residence market from P2PAs in Egypt is like other cities by a percentage of (59.09 %) with a mean (2.95) and Std (0.64); this indicates there are some differences in the P2PAs in Egypt. In the 14th position is the respondent practice P2PAs residence by a percentage of (61.55%) as agree average, with a mean (3.08) and Std (1.01); this indicates that P2PAs is still a new system. Concerning the 13th level agrees average was (70.75 %) regarding agree with accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt can protect sustainability when looking at P2PAs. With mean (3.54) and Std (0.74). These results agreed with (Lalicic and Weismayer, 2017; Pesonen and Tussyadiah, 2017; Merckx *et al.*, 2017; Jermisittiparsert *et al.*, 2019).

According to the third dimension: the predictable opportunities and threats, the results in table (5) showed that in accordance to the 1st acceptance average level was that the absence of technical cadres from trainers and specialists in residency P2PAs, with (95.44 %) average, mean (4.77) and Std (0.42); this indicated that P2PAs need more training and developments. In the 2nd position was that poor awareness of the value and importance of P2PAs residency, by a percentage of (94.31 %) as agree with average, with a mean (4.72) and Std (0.45); awareness needs to be improved P2PAs. Regarding the 3rd priority to the respondents' accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt have not yet taken clear positions regarding the rental of residence accommodations from P2P, and often lacks a clear policy on these platforms, with agree average level (93.17%), mean was (4.66) and Std (0.47); this indicates that the need to clear policy of P2PAs on platforms. Dealing with the 4th importance with (86.38%) as an acceptance average for preferring hotels and their services, with a mean (4.32) and Std (0.71); this indicates that P2PAs need more improvement. Concerning the 5th agree level were both the difficulty of measuring these costs in different dimensions; and difficult to integrate P2PAs residency platforms by average (84.56%), with Std (0.44) and mean (4.39). These results agreed with (Oskam and Boswijk, 2016; Lorange and Oksanen, 2016; Langeslag, 2018; Muhammad *et al.*, 2019).

On the other side, Egyptian arrangements currently in place for P2PAs residency initiatives are effective in protecting sustainability by percentage (29.11), with a mean (2.46) and Std (0.50); this indicates that P2PAs need more care regarding sustainability. The attitudes and views of the local population regarding current and future development are positive was in the 16th efficiency average by the percentage of (36.99 %), with a mean (2.85) and Std (0.72); this indicates that the local population is negative regarding the P2PAs. Regarding the 15th agree position where that the extent of development of the residence market from P2PAs in Egypt is similar to other cities by a percentage of (59.09%) with a mean (2.95) and Std (0.64); this indicates that P2PAs in Egypt need more development. In the 14th position, P2PAs are not consistent with the inclinations and desires of clients by a percentage of (56.58%) as agree average, with a mean (2.83) and Std (0.84); this indicates that P2PAs need more care regarding desires of clients. Concerning the 13th level agrees average was (58.63%) regarding agreeing with that both of them are not incentives for

customers participating in the P2PAs residence; and potential societal risks related to sustainability within P2PAs facilities. With mean (2.93) and Std (0.78); these results indicate that incentives for customers participating need more improvement and potential societal risks within P2PAs. These results agreed with (Bergeijk, 2017; Sampaio *et al.*, 2017; Wirtz *et al.*, 2019).

Table 3

The first section: how does the sharing economy affect travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation? (n = 439)

No.		Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean			Av %	Rank
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Deviation		
The first section: The social and economic Impacts of sharing economy on travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation																
Part one: Social impacts of sharing economy																
1.	Sharing economy contributes to encouraging knowing people from the local neighborhoods. increasing length of stay	0	0	0	0	50	11	301	69	88	20	4.09	0.03	0.55	81.73	3*
2.	Sharing economy provides tourists with more meaningful interaction with the hosts	0	0	0	0	100	23	215	49	124	28	4.05	0.03	0.71	81.09	4
3.	Sharing economy provides a more sustainable business model	0	0	0	0	75	17	276	63	88	20	4.03	0.03	0.61	80.59	6
4.	Sharing economy contributes to society's profits	0	0	0	0	199	45	144	33	96	22	3.77	0.04	0.79	75.31	12
Part Two: Economic impacts of sharing economy																
5.	Sharing economy contributes to economic profits for tourists and local communities.	0	0	0	0	239	54	108	25	92	21	3.67	0.04	0.80	73.30	14
6.	Sharing economy provide higher quality accommodation with less money	0	0	0	0	50	11	229	52	160	36	4.25	0.03	0.65	85.01	2
7.	Sharing economy contributes to lower costs due to economic value	0	0	0	0	145	33	130	30	164	37	4.04	0.04	0.84	80.87	5
8.	Sharing economy provides a way to earn money for the local community.	0	0	0	0	239	54	80	18	120	27	3.73	0.04	0.86	74.58	13

Part Three: Impacts of sharing economy on travelers' destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation																
9.	The lower cost of sharing economy motivates you to choose a certain destination	0	0	0	0	327	75	40	9	72	16	3.42	0.04	0.76	68.38	16
10.	Egyptian residents and policymakers have responded to the development of sharing economy	0	0	0	0	130	30	253	58	56	13	3.83	0.03	0.63	76.63	11
11.	Social interactions encourage you to visit a specific destination.	0	0	0	0	315	72	124	28	0	0	3.28	0.02	0.45	65.65	18
12.	Sharing economy helps to take longer vacation	0	0	0	0	195	44	200	46	44	10	3.66	0.03	0.65	73.12	15
13.	Sharing economy increase the frequency of your travel	0	0	0	0	90	21	221	50	128	29	4.09	0.03	0.70	81.73	3*
14.	Economic and social benefits of sharing economy affect positively on your decision to travel to a certain destination	0	0	0	0	90	21	257	59	92	21	4.00	0.03	0.64	80.09	7
15.	Sharing economy makes you do more activities while traveling	0	0	0	0	45	10	230	52	164	37	4.27	0.03	0.64	85.42	1
16.	Sharing economy contributes to peer training in technology utilization	0	0	0	0	90	21	221	50	128	29	4.09	0.03	0.70	81.73	3*
17.	Sharing economy supports the revitalization of hospitality in light of technological changes.	0	0	0	0	235	54	120	27	84	19	3.66	0.04	0.78	73.12	15
18.	Accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt can protect sustainability when looking at sharing economy.	0	0	0	0	271	62	168	38	0	0	3.38	0.02	0.49	67.65	17
19.	Sharing economy can be used to maintain sustainable accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt.	0	0	0	0	199	45	80	18	160	36	3.91	0.04	0.90	78.22	8
20.	P2PAs residency is a relatively new concept as these companies are new	0	0			100	23	255	58	84	19	3.96	0.03	0.65	79.27	5

Table 4**The Second dimension:** strangeness and weakness points “reality” (n = 439)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean		Std. Deviation	Mean	Rank				
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	No.	%	Statistic	Std. Error							
The Second dimension: the actual situation of P2PAs; the strangeness and weakness points “reality”																			
1.	I encourage P2PAs to stay				267	61	88	20	84	19	3.58	0.04	0.79	71.66	12				
2.	I practice P2PAs residence				150	34	161	37	72	16	56	13	3.08	0.05	1.01	61.55	14		
3.	P2PAs stay helps to peer benefit				0	0	0	0	95	22	180	41	164	37	4.16	0.04	0.75	83.14	1
4.	P2PAs residence helps stimulate accommodation, tourism and hospitality				0	0	0	0	150	34	137	31	152	35	4.00	0.04	0.83	80.09	4
5.	P2PAs residency helps improve the mental image of Egypt				0	0	0	0	165	38	150	34	124	28	3.91	0.04	0.81	78.13	7
6.	P2PAs stay helps strengthen customers 'sense of engagement				0	0	0	0	190	43	125	29	124	28	3.85	0.04	0.83	76.99	9
7.	Peer-to-peer accommodations residency helps to properly invest in peer residency places				0	0	0	0	223	51	108	25	135	31	3.74	0.04	0.83	80.91	3
8.	P2PAs need for insights from customer information online is essential in today's hospitality business analytics				0	0	0	0	192	44	112	26	112	26	3.95	0.04	0.75	72.16	11
9.	P2PAs residency needs to train clients to benefit from different knowledge in the development of accommodation, tourism and hospitality in their community				0	0	0	0	190	43	109	25	140	32	3.89	0.04	0.86	77.72	8
10	P2PAs facilitation initiatives are commensurate with the larger trend towards participatory and circular economies				0	0	0	0	115	26	160	36	164	37	4.11	0.04	0.79	82.23	2
11	When dealing with P2PAs, they can be used to maintain sustainable accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt				0	0	0	0	223	51	88	20	128	29	3.78	0.04	0.87	75.67	10*

12	Accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt can protect sustainability when looking at P2PAs.	0	0	0	0	267	61	108	25	64	15	3.54	0.04	0.74	70.75	13
13	P2PAs non-integrated residency platforms	50	11	189	43	200	46	0	0	0	0	2.34	0.03	0.67	46.83	
14	Customers use digital platforms to find information and recommendations from other travelers and local residents	0	0	0	0	145	33	174	40	120	27	3.94	0.04	0.78	78.86	6
15	Short-term P2PAs residency housing rental platforms are in line with the desire of "new travelers"	0	0	0	0	155	35	224	51	60	14	3.78	0.03	0.67	75.67	10*
16	Short-to-peer residency avoids taxes and poses no threat to safety and health	0	0	0	0	199	45	136	31	104	24	3.78	0.04	0.80	75.67	10*
17	The Egyptian arrangements currently in place for P2PAs residency initiatives are effective in protecting sustainability	23 9	54	200	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.46	0.02	0.50	29.11	17
18	The attitudes and views of the local population regarding current and future development are positive	15 0	34	205	47	84	19	0	0	0	0	2.85	0.03	0.72	36.99	16
19	The extent of development of the residence market from P2PAs in Egypt is like other cities	0	0	100	23	259	59	80	18	0	0	2.95	0.03	0.64	59.09	15
20	P2PAs residency is a relatively new concept as these companies are new	0	0			100	23	255	58	84	19	3.96	0.03	0.65	79.27	5

Table 5

The third dimension: the predictable opportunities and threats (n = 439)

No.		Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean		Std. Deviation	Av %	Rank
		No	%	No	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	Statistic	Std. Error			
The third dimension: the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs																
1.	Lack of interest in accommodations, P2PAs, by those in charge of accommodation, tourism and hospitality, which led to any weak attraction for clients	0	0	0	0	199	45	176	40	64	15	3.69	0.03	0.71	73.85	8*
2.	Hotel preferences and their services	0	0	0	0	100	23	99	23	240	55	4.32	0.04	0.82	86.38	4
3.	It adds to the erosion of the work contract and the increase in emergency employment" .	0	0	100	23	259	59	80	18	0	0	2.95	0.03	0.64	59.09	12*
4.	There are differences in the dimensions of the service people are searching for from alternative accommodations	0	0	105	24	210	48	124	28	0	0	3.04	0.03	0.72	60.87	11
5.	There are no incentives for customers participating in the P2PAs residence	0	0	150	34	169	39	120	27	0	0	2.93	0.04	0.78	58.63	13*
6.	The difficulty of measuring these costs in different dimensions	0	0	0	0	100	23	139	32	200	46	4.39	0.04	0.83	84.56	5*
7.	Difficult to integrate P2PAs residency platforms	0	0	0	0	100	23	139	32	200	46	4.23	0.04	0.80	84.56	5*
8.	Potential societal risks related to sustainability within P2PAs facilities	0	0	150	34	169	39	120	27	0	0	2.93	0.04	0.78	58.63	13*
9.	Possible arrangements for Egyptian accommodation, tourism and hospitality institutions to fill the gaps in the current regulations regarding sustainability	0	0	100	23	259	59	80	18	0	0	2.95	0.03	0.64	59.09	12*

No.		Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean		Std. Deviation	Av %	Rank
		No	%	No	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	Statistic	Std. Error			
10.	Getting insights from customer information available online is central to today's hospitality business analytics	0	0	0	0	140	32	211	48	88	20	3.88	0.03	0.71	77.63	7
11.	The absence of technical cadres from trainers and specialists in residency P2PAs	0	0	0	0			100	23	339	77	4.77	0.02	0.42	95.44	1
12.	Poor financial means and credits necessary to stimulate and encourage P2PAs establishment	0	0	0	0	100	23	259	59	80	18	3.95	0.03	0.64	79.09	6
13.	Poor awareness of the value and importance of P2PAs residency	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	29	314	72	4.72	0.02	0.45	94.31	2
14.	P2PAs are not consistent with the inclinations and desires of clients	0	0	199	45	116	26	124	28	0	0	2.83	0.04	0.84	56.58	14
15.	Challenges and consequences of the emergence of the P2PAs residency sector	0	0	50	11	217	49	172	39	0	0	3.28	0.03	0.66	65.56	10
16.	Procedures for renting residences from P2PAs from an organizational perspective (in Egypt).	0	0	0	0	231	53	208	47	0	0	3.47	0.02	0.50	69.48	9
17.	Accommodation, tourism and hospitality in Egypt have not yet taken clear positions regarding the rental of residence accommodations from P2PAs, and often lacks a clear policy on these platforms	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	34	289	66	4.66	0.02	0.47	93.17	3

The Hypotheses Test

H 1: There is a significant difference between nationalities in terms of the effect of P2PAs sections regarding the hospitality and tourism in Egypt. As shown in tables (6-7).

Regarding Paired Samples T-Test comparing the importance vs. resort application results showed that: There is a statistically significant difference between the results in the P2PAs sections regarding the hospitality and tourism in Egypt: (1) The first section: the benefits of P2PAs (2) The Second section: strangeness and weakness points “reality” (3) The third section: the predictable opportunities and threats. Tables (6) manifests that mean of the importance of P2PAs sections are the same across categories of Nationality.

Table (6)

Descriptive analysis of the respondents' opinions according to scores (n = 439)

H test summary				
	Null H	Test	Sig.	Decision
1.	The distribution of importance of the strangeness and weakness points “reality” of P2PAs is the same across categories of Nationality.	Independent samples Mann. Whitney U Test	.000	Reject the null H
2.	The distribution of importance of the third section: the predictable opportunities and threats may challenge the P2PAs are the same across categories of Nationality.	Independent samples Mann. Whitney U Test	.000	Reject the null H

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Nonparametric tests regarding Independent samples comparing the (total A) the first section: the strangeness and weakness points “reality”. Furthermore, (total B) the real situation of P2PAs vs (total C) the predictable opportunities and threats that challenges the P2PAs. Results showed that the T-test value was significant at (0.00) in each section this means that it is revealed a statistically significant difference between the sections.

This comparison aims to determine if there is a significant difference between nationalities in terms of the effect of P2PAs sections regarding hospitality and tourism in Egypt (Table 7).

Table 7

Kruskal-Wallis test between the different nationalities (N. 439)

Table: Kruskal Wallis Test						
Ranks	Nationality			Test Statistics ^{a,b}		
	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.	
Strangeness and weakness points “reality”	Europeans	140	344.50	360.174	2	.000
	Americans	96	226.08			
	Arab	178	89.72			
	Total	414				
the predictable opportunities and threats	Europeans	140	342.67	357.102	2	.000
	Americans	96	228.58			
	Arab	178	89.81			
	Total	414				

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Nationality

H2: There are significant relationships between the variables of the study the strangeness and weakness points “reality”; and the predictable opportunities and threats) on the P2PAs. As shown in table (8).

Regarding the research hypothesis test H2, there are statistically significant relationships between the strangeness and weakness points “reality”; and the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs as shown in Table 8. Results showed that there is a significant correlation between the impacts; strangeness and weakness points “reality”; and the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs. With (r) values ranging from (0.990) to (0.949) ($p < .01$) **. The correlation was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8

Correlation between the strangeness and weakness points “reality”; and the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs

	r	p	H
Strangeness and weakness points “reality” vs social and economic impacts of P2Pas on travelers’ destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation	0.967**	0.000	Supported correlation

r: Pearson coefficient

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) ($p < .01$).

Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the sharing economy in Egypt as a tourist destination, discussed how sharing economy affects travelers’ destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, and highlighted the Peer-to-Peer Accommodation in Egypt, as being one of the sharing economy tools.

The sharing economy has offered various options for many services via online platforms. The spread of the tourism platforms has contributed effectively to the entry of the concept of sharing economy in the tourism field. This is because of the positive role of the tourism platforms which have facilitated the direct communication between the tourist and the service providers. Nowadays, the sharing economy has gained most of the market share in the tourism industry when individuals have begun offering their services for temporary sharing. Therefore, the tourism industry has become the main market of the sharing economy because it includes several services.

According to the first section: how the sharing economy affects travelers’ destination choice, travel frequency, length of stay, and activity participation, results indicated that: sharing economy changes in travel patterns. First of all, travelers gain benefits via the sharing economy because of two factors: cost savings (i.e., economic appeal) and desire for social relationships with the local community (i.e., social appeal). Verified by the regression models in this study, these factors are significant predictors of changes in travel patterns, stimulating expansion in destination choice set, increase in travel frequency, length of stay, and range of activities participated in the destinations. These results agreed with (e.g., Zhou et al., 2014; Tussyadiah and Zach, 2015, Xiang et al., 2015; Latif et al., 2019).

On the other hand; results indicate that P2PAs need more and more development; need to meet and accede technological changes; awareness regarding sustainability stimulates P2PAs to need to improve; results indicate social interactions is a vital factor to P2PAs; results indicate that promotes P2PAs is mandatory. This result agreed with (Lalicic and Weismayer, 2017; Latif et al., 2019; Jermisittiparsert *et al.*, 2019).

Rendering the second section is the actual situation (reality) of P2P results show that there are beneficial elements for both of the peers; support participatory and circular economies; helps to properly invest in peer residency places; the role of P2PAs stimulates accommodation, tourism and hospitality. These results agreed with (Frenken and Schor, 2017; Sampaio *et al.*, 2017; Wirtz *et al.*, 2019). **On the other side**, results indicate that effective in protecting sustainability need to improve; the attitudes and views of the local population need to change to positive; there are some differences in the P2PAs in Egypt; P2PAs still a new system. These results agreed with (Lalicic and Weismayer, 2017; Pesonen and Tussyadiah, 2017; Merckx *et al.*, 2017; Jermsittiparsert *et al.*, 2019).

As for **the third section**, the predictable opportunities and threats, the results showed that: P2PAs need more training and developments; awareness needs to improve regarding P2PAs; the need to clear policy of P2PAs on platforms; P2PAs need more improvement. These results agreed with (Oskam and Boswijk, 2016; Lorange and Oksanen, 2016; Langeslag, 2018; Muhammad *et al.*, 2019). **On the other side**, results indicate that P2PAs need more care regarding sustainability; the local population is negative regarding the P2PAs; P2PAs in Egypt need more development; P2PAs need more care regarding the desires of clients; these results indicate that incentives for customers participating need more improvement and potential societal risks within P2PAs. These results agreed with (Bergeijk, 2017; Sampaio *et al.*, 2017; Wirtz *et al.*, 2019).

Regarding H 1: Paired Samples T-Test comparing the importance vs. resort application results showed that: There is a statistically significant difference between the results in the P2PAs sections regarding the hospitality and tourism in Egypt; Results showed that T-test value was significant at (0.00) in each section this means that is revealed a statistically significant difference between the sections; This comparison aims to determine if there is a significant difference between nationalities in terms of the effect of P2PAs sections regarding the hospitality and tourism in Egypt. Over more, Regarding the research hypothesis test H2, Results showed that there is a significant correlation between the impacts; strangeness and weakness points “reality”; and the predictable opportunities and threats of P2PAs. With (r) values ranging from (0.990) to (0.949) ($p < .01$) **. The correlation was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Recommendations

Recommendations concerning the development of the sharing economy in Egypt:

- Enhancing the sharing economy concept in Egypt.
- Providing a legislative framework to organize the environment of the sharing economy in the Egyptian tourist destination.
- Raising awareness towards the sharing tourism as a new trend in the Egyptian tourist destination.
- Supporting the co-operation between tourist organizations to put a set of criteria to ensure the quality of tourist services provided via the online tourism platforms.

Recommendations concerning the development of P2PAs in Egypt:

- Continuous development for P2PAs.
- Keeping pace with technological changes is mandatory for P2PAs.
- Promoting P2PAs is mandatory.
- Changing the attitudes and views of the local population to a positive image.

- P2PAs need more care regarding sustainability.
- P2PAs need more care regarding the desires of clients.
- Incentives for customers participating need more improvement and potential societal risks within P2PAs.

References

- Airbnb (2017). "How do I become a Superhost", <https://www.airbnb.com/help/article/829/how-do-ibecome-a-superhost>.
- Belk, R. (2014). "You are what you can access: Sharing and Collaborative Consumption Online." *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8): 1595-1600.
- Botsman, R. (2012). "The currency of the new economy is trust". Speech delivered at TED Global, June 2012. https://www.ted.com/talks/rachel_botsman_the_currency_of_the_new_economy_is_trust
- Brondoni, S. M. (2011). "Global Networks, Knowledge Management and World Cities, *Symphonya. Emerging Issues in Management*" (symphonya.unimib.it), 1, 7-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4468/2011.1.02brondoni>.
- Buldeo Rai, H., Verlinde, S., Merckx, J., & Macharis, C. (2017). Crowd logistics: an opportunity for more sustainable urban freight transport? *European Transport Research Review*, 9 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12544-017-0256-6>.
- Carbone, V., Rouquet, A., & Roussat, C. (2017). The Rise of Crowd Logistics: A New Way to Co-Create Logistics Value. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 38(4), 238–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbl.12164>
- Codagnone, C., Abadie, F., Biagi, F., & Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, (2016). The Future of Work in the "Sharing Economy." Luxembourg: Publications Office. Retrieved from <http://dx.publications.europa.eu/10.2791/431485>
- Codagnone, C., Biagi, F., Abadie, F., & Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, (2016). The Passions and the Interests: Unpacking the "Sharing Economy". Luxembourg: Publications Office. Retrieved from <http://bookshop.europa.eu/uri?target=EUB:NOTICE:LFNA27914:EN:HTML>
- Cooper, C. and Hall, M. (2008) *Contemporary Tourism: An International Approach*. Oxford:Good fellow Publishers Ltd.
- Dredge, D. and Gyimóthy, S. (2015) The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical Perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research*. 40 (3). p. 286-302.
- Frenken, K., & Schor, J. (2017). Putting the sharing economy into perspective. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*.
- Frenken, K; Meelen, T; Arets, M.; & Glind, P, (2015). Smarter regulation for the sharing economy. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/science/political-science/2015/may/20/smarter-regulation-for-the-sharing-economy>
- Frenken, K., & Schor, J. (2017). Putting the sharing economy into perspective. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2017.01.003>

- Geron, T. (2012, November). “Airbnb had \$56 million impact on San Francisco: Study.” Forbes. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/tomiogeron/2012/11/09/study-airbnb-had-56-million-impact-on-san-francisco/>
- Geron, T. (2013, January). “Airbnb and the Unstoppable Rise of the Share Economy.” Forbes. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/tomiogeron/2013/01/23/airbnb-and-the-unstoppable-rise-of-the-share-economy/>
- Goudin, P. (2016). The Cost of Non- Europe in the Sharing Economy. Economic, Social and Legal Challenges and Opportunities. EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service. European Added Value Unit.
- Goudin, P., European Parliament, & Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services, (2016). The Cost of Non-Europe in the Sharing Economy: Economic, Social and Legal Challenges and Opportunities. Luxembourg: Publications Office. Retrieved from <http://bookshop.europa.eu/uri?target=EUB:NOTICE:QA0116059:EN:HTML>
- Guttentag, D. (2013). “Airbnb: Disruptive Innovation and the Rise of an Informal Tourism Accommodation Sector.” *Current Issues in Tourism*, ahead of print, 1-26.
- Hira, A. & Reilly, K. (2017). ‘The Emergence of the Sharing Economy: Implications for Development’, SAGE Publications, 33(2), 175–190.
- J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, (2015). The sharing economy prosumer. <https://www.jwtintelligence.com/2015/06/the-sharing-economy-prosumer/>
- Jermstiparsert, K; Siam, M; Issa, M; Ahmed, U; & Pahi, M, (2019). “Do Consumers Expect Companies to Be Socially Responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior.” *Uncertain Supply Chain Management* 7 (4): 741-752.
- Langeslag, J, (2018), Peer-to-Peer Parcel Delivery, Exploring Governance Arrangements to Protect Sustainability as a Public Value, Master Thesis, Industrial Ecology, TU Delft – Leiden University.
- Lalicic, L. & Weismayer, C. (2017). The Role of Authenticity in Airbnb Experiences. *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2017*, pp.781-794.
- Latif, R; Subramaniam, S; Rahim, R; & Nesamanyd, S, (2019), An Empirical Study on AIRBnB Accommodation Services and Customer Decision Making. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*. www.ijicc.net. Volume 6, Issue 3, 284-311 .
- Lorange, J and Oksanen, N, (2016), An Exploratory Study of: Peer-To-Peer Accommodation Rentals in Copenhagen - A Resident Perspective, Semester Master Thesis, Global Tourism Development, and Aalborg University.
- Möhlmann. M. (2015). “Collaborative Consumption: Determinants of Satisfaction and the Likelihood of Using a Sharing Economy Option Again.” *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*. DOI: 10.1002/cb.1512.
- Muhammad, K; Saoula, O., Issa, M; & Ahmed, U. (2019). Contract Management and Performance Characteristics: An Empirical and Managerial Implication for Indonesia. *Management Science Letters*, 9(8), 1289-1298.
- Orabi, R. (2019), "Studying the effect of a sharing economy on the Tourism Industry: Developing the local economy for the Nubian Community: An empirical study using the

- Gharb Soheil Village", *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, Volume 8 (5) - (2019) ISSN: 2223-814X.
- Oskam, J., & Boswijk, A. (2016). Airbnb: The Future of Networked Hospitality Businesses. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 2(1), 22-42.
 - Owyang, J. (2013). "The Collaborative Economy: Products, Services and Market Relationships Have Changed as Sharing Startups Impact Business Models. A Market Definition Report." Altimeter. <https://www.slideshare.net/Altimeter/the-collaborative-economy>.
 - Peeters, P., Dijkmans, C., Mitas, O., Strous, B. & Vinkensteijn, J. (2015). 'Research for Tran Committee - Tourism and The Sharing Economy: Challenges and Opportunities for the Eu', Brussels: European Parliament.
 - Pesonen, J. & Tussyadiah, I. (2017). Peer-to-peer accommodation: drivers and user profiles. In Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (Eds.) *Collaborative Economy and Tourism. Perspectives, Politics, Policies and Prospects*. Springer. pp. 285-303. <http://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319517971>
 - Piscicelli, L., Cooper, T. and Fisher, T. (2015) the Role of Values in Collaborative Consumption: Insights from a Product-Service System for Lending and Borrowing in the UK. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 97 (2015). PP.21-29.
 - Schor, J. (2014). Debating the Sharing Economy. Retrieved January 7, 2020, from <http://greattransition.org/publication/debating-the-sharing-economy>.
 - Schor, J. (2016). Debating the Sharing Economy. *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics*, 4(3), 7-22 .
 - Täuscher, K., & Laudien, S. M. (2017). Understanding platform business models: A mixed methods study of marketplaces. *European Management Journal*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2017.06.005>
 - Tsao, C; Hsieh, T; Shih, W; and Lin, Y. (2015). "Compliance with eWOM: The Influence of Hotel Reviews on Booking Intention from the Perspective of Consumer Conformity." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 46, 99-111.
 - Tussyadiah, P. (2015). "An Exploratory Study on Drivers and Deterrents of Collaborative Consumption in Travel." In *Information & Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015*, edited by I. Tussyadiah, and A. Inversini. Switzerland: Springer, pp. 819-832.
 - Tussyadiah, P. (2016). Factors of Satisfaction and Intention to Use Peer-to-Peer Accommodation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 70-80. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.03.005.
 - Tussyadiah, P., & Pesonen, J. (2016). Impacts of Peer-To-Peer Accommodation use on Travel Patterns. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1022-1040.
 - Tussyadiah, L and Zach, F, (2015). Hotels vs. Peer-to-Peer Accommodation Rentals: Text Analytics of Consumer Reviews in Portland, Oregon. *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*. 2. 2015 ttra International Conference. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/ttra2015/Academic_Papers_Oral/2
 - Varma, A., Jukic, N., Pestek, A., Schultz, C. & Nestorov, S. (2016). Airbnb: Exciting Innovation or passing fad?, *Tourism management perspective*, 20, 228-237.

- Weston R. (2015) Research for Tran Committee - Tourism and The Sharing Economy: Challenges and Opportunities for the EU, Directorate General for Internal Policies. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2861/965550>
- Wirtz, J; Fung So, K; Mody, M; Liu, S; Chun, H, (2019), Platforms in the Peer-To-Peer Sharing Economy. *Journal of Service Management*. Vol. 30 No. 4, 2019. pp. 452-483. Emerald Publishing Limited 5818-1757. DOI 10.1108/JOSM-11-2018-0369.
- Xiang, Z; Schwartz, J; Gerdes, H; and Uysal, M, (2015). "How Can Big Data and Text Analytics Tell us about Hotel Guest Experience and Satisfaction?" *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 44: 120-130.
- Yang, S., & Ahn, S. (2016). Impact of Motivation in the Sharing Economy and Perceived Security in Attitude and Loyalty toward Airbnb. doi:10.14257/astl.2016.129.36
- Yannopoulou, Natalia, Mona Moufahim, and Xuemei Bian. "User-generated brands and social media: Couchsurfing and AirBnb." *Contemporary Management Research* 9.1 (2013): 85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7903/cmr.11116> Zervas
- Yen, C, and Tang, H (2015). "Hotel Attributes Performance, eWOM Motivations, and Media Choice." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 46, 79-88.
- Zervas, G; Proserpio, D; & Byers, W. (2015, June). The Impact of the Sharing Economy on the Hotel Industry: Evidence from Airbnb's Entry into the Texas Market. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation* (pp. 637-637). ACM.
- Zhou, L; Ye, S; Pearce, L; and Wu, Y, (2014). "Refreshing hotel satisfaction studies by reconfiguring customer review data." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 38, 1 – 20.

دراسة الاقتصاد التشاركي في مصر كمقصد للسياحة والضيافة

سلامة عمار¹، هاني قزمال² وتامر أحمد عبد العزيز³

¹ قسم الدراسات السياحية، المعهد العالي للسياحة والفنادق، الأقصر (إيجوث)، مصر

² قسم الدراسات الفندقية، المعهد العالي للسياحة والفنادق، الأقصر (إيجوث)، مصر

³ قسم الدراسات السياحية، المعهد العالي للسياحة والفنادق، مدينة 6 أكتوبر، مصر

المخلص

تتبنى السياحة والضيافة في عصر اقتصاد المشاركة نموذجًا قائمًا على مفهوم عالمي مع ممارسة محلية. يقوم العرض السياحي التقليدي على مناطق الجذب السياحية بالمقصد السياحي، والتي يتم التعبير عنها بميزات المقصد السياحي نفسه، ومجموعة من الخدمات المتعلقة بالسكن والنقل والطعام. فعلى مدار السنوات الخمس الماضية، تم تطوير ما يقرب من 500 منصة اقتصادية مشتركة تتعلق بالخدمات السياحية. يرتبط 50% منها بقطاع النقل و 39% للترفيه و 11% للسكن. وقد أدى تطور تقنيات نظير إلى نظير في صناعة السياحة والضيافة إلى تسهيل عملية الاتصال بين السياح ومقدمي الخدمات، مما أدى إلى اختفاء الوسطاء. تهدف هذه الورقة إلى دراسة اقتصاد المشاركة في مصر كمقصد للسياحة والضيافة، ومناقشة كيف يؤثر الاقتصاد التشاركي في اختيار السائح للمقصد السياحي، تكرار الزيارة، ومدة الإقامة، وكذلك الأنشطة التي يمارسها وأخيرًا كيفية تطوير سكن نظير إلى نظير (P2PA) في مصر باعتباره أحد أدوات اقتصاد المشاركة في صناعة السياحة والضيافة على مستوى العالم. تم إجراء دراسة تجريبية خلال شهر سبتمبر 2019. ووجدت الدراسة أن تطبيق اقتصاد المشاركة في المقصد السياحي المصري لا يزال بحاجة إلى مزيد من التطوير. من ناحية أخرى، كما أكدت الدراسة على أن هناك تأثيرًا للاقتصاد التشاركي على اختيار السائح للمقصد السياحي، تكرار الزيارة، ومدة الإقامة، وكذلك الأنشطة التي يمارسها، في حين أكد معظم الأشخاص الذين أجابوا على الاستبيان أن السكن من نظير إلى نظير هو نهج عالمي جديد. يجب بذل المزيد من الجهود من قبل مديري السياحة والضيافة المصريين لتحفيز إمكانات سوق P2PA.

معلومات المقالة

الكلمات المفتاحية

الاقتصاد التشاركي؛
الإقامة من نظير إلى
نظير (P2PA)؛
السياحة والضيافة؛
الإقامة؛ الخدمات
الفندقية؛ إرضاء
العملاء.

(JAAUTH)

المجلد 18، العدد 2،

(2020)،

ص -