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Abstract: The sharing economy has emerged as an alternative of suppliers of goods and services traditionally provided by long-established industries. Since its inception, the tourism industry has presented itself as one of the sectors that has allowed it to keep growing and in which the sharing economy has had a greater impact. Thus, this study analyses ‘collaborative tourism’ (the sharing economy in tourism) and the use of other information sources (comparators, social media…) and explores the profile and behaviour of tourists who participate in it (socio-demographic characteristics, nationalities and travel motivations). The paper also identifies the differences between the profile of tourists who use different kinds of collaborative platforms (Airbnb, HomeAway, TripAdvisor, Wikipedia, Coachsurfing and BlaBlaCar), differentiating between platforms where an economic transaction is required and those that are free. The results indicate the existence of a grouping together of cultures (countries) in four segments, depending on the use they do of sharing economy platforms. Applying a comprehensive analysis with 9,383 tourists from 19 European countries, the study provides interesting conclusions for destinations with a view to better designing marketing activities across different European countries.
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1 Introduction

Tourism services have traditionally been provided by businesses such as hotels, taxis, restaurants, tour operators, tourist guides, etc. However, recently, a growing number of individuals are proposing to temporarily share with tourists what they own (for example their house or car) or what they do (for example meals or excursions). This type of sharing is referred to as the ‘sharing economy’.

Sharing goods and services between individuals is nothing new ‘sharing’ is a phenomenon as old as time itself. However, the sharing economy is a phenomenon born of the internet age (Belk, 2014). The development of internet, and as a consequence, the creation of online platforms has made sharing easier than ever (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010), facilitating the contact between individuals who do not know each other. In the last decade, many new companies based on technology platforms have appeared in the tourism market. Well-known examples are the cases of Airbnb and Couchsurfing in the accommodation sector, Blablacar and Uber in the transportation, and TripAdvisor in the information.

Although the sharing economy is not limited to tourism and can be found in many areas of social and economic activity, tourism has been one of the sectors most impacted for these new forms of business. The sharing economy is flourishing under a context of rapid growth in international tourist arrivals in the world, as well as in Europe. International tourist arrivals worldwide have increased from 25 million in 1950 to 1,186 million in 2015, registering a growth of 4.6% over the previous year (UNWTO, 2016). In this global context, according to UNWTO (2016), Europe is the most visited
region in the world. International tourist arrivals to Europe grew 5% between 2014 and 2015, reaching a total of 608 million, slightly more than half of the world total (51%). Thus, Europe was the region with the highest growth in absolute terms: 27 million more tourists than in 2014. Europe is still the largest outbound region in the world, generating more than half of the global international arrivals per year (UNWTO, 2016). In the longer term, these numbers are expected to grow, leading to increased demand for tourist services. But, the tourism sector in Europe, as well as in many other regions of the world, is evolving in response to changes in tourist behaviour, which makes necessary to analyse the sharing economy in this context. In addition, the specificities of the European market, with common and divergent aspects between countries, demand a specific analysis to better know the differences by country in the profile of the users of social networks and their motivations of travel.

As the OECD (2014) pointed out in its report, tourists are, in general, more open to self-guided holidays and look more at information and reviews from other tourists (friends and family or anonymous tourists who post their reviews on the internet) than in the past. Many tourists use internet to plan or purchase their travel (Almeida and Moreno, 2017). Tourists demand sustainable tourism products as well as customised and authentic tourism experiences (Albinsson and Perera, 2012; Belk, 2010; Botsman and Rogers, 2010; Fuentes et al., 2015). Furthermore, the economic crisis, unemployment and tourist’s reduced purchasing power have pushed many tourists to pay increasing attention to prices and value for money. However, there is an important gap in the literature about what are the travel motivations that drive the use of different platforms of collaborative economy.

All these factors, given the sector’s need to cope with these changes, have favoured the development of the sharing economy (Hamari et al., 2016) in tourism, appearing platforms that require an economic transaction such as Airbnb, but also others that are free as TripAdvisor. Thus, understanding the differences in the profiles of the users of platforms of sharing economy with and without economic transaction is fundamental to be able to understand this phenomenon.

The impact of the sharing economy on tourism has received recent attention by the researchers Dredge and Gyimóthy (2015) however the study of sharing economy in Europe is still in its early stages. Most studies on the impact of sharing economy have been published in the USA, where many sharing economy platforms began their activity. Therefore, a greater research effort on the sharing economy in the tourist industry in the European context is required.

Bearing in mind the above, the objective of this study is to fulfil the existing gap in the literature on the profile of European tourists using the new platforms and other sources of information. In addition, the present paper analyses differences in the profile (nationality, age, gender, income) and in the travel motivations of the users of platforms of sharing economy where economic transactions are carried out with respect to the profile of those who use platforms of sharing economy in which no economic transactions are undertaken. The results of this study contribute to the sharing economy literature in tourism and provide a better understanding of the behaviour of the European tourist. This research is based on data from 19 European countries: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Russia, Finland, France, Holland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the UK, Czech Republic, Sweden and Switzerland.
2 Literature review

2.1 Sharing economy. Conceptualisation

Consumer research is changing to a greater focus on consumer practices and business models that operate under the collaborative phenomena and it has been conceptualised in different ways (see Table 1).

The choice of term highlights an arbitrary set of aspects an author is attempting to focus upon while at the same time it also conceals other dimensions (Dredge and Gyimóthy, 2015). As a result, most terms are partially appropriate, but most fail to fully capture the collaborative phenomena or tend to obscure the original socio-cultural implications of sharing (Belk, 2014). However, sharing economy seems to be most widespread term to describe this economic and social phenomenon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative economy</td>
<td>Dredge and Gyimóthy (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer economy</td>
<td>Bauwens (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gig economy</td>
<td>Friedman (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On demand economy</td>
<td>Berg (2016), Gurvich et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative consumption</td>
<td>Botsman and Rogers (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mesh</td>
<td>Gansky (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sharing systems</td>
<td>Lamberton and Rose (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-production</td>
<td>Humphreys and Grayson (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumption</td>
<td>Ritzer and Jurgenson (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product-service systems</td>
<td>Mont (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access based consumption</td>
<td>Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer participation</td>
<td>Fitzsimmons (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online volunteering</td>
<td>Postigo (2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term ‘sharing economy’ encompasses different types of relationships and actions by individuals and organisations on the internet. It is not a homogeneous phenomenon, but includes different modalities of exchange and interaction between individuals. It has been established a classification of four types of sharing economy.

- ‘Access economy’, for sharing economy initiatives whose business model implies that goods and services are traded on the basis of access rather than ownership. It refers to renting things temporarily rather than selling them permanently.
- ‘Gig economy’, for sharing economy initiatives based on contingent work that is transacted on a digital marketplace.
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- ‘Collaborative economy’, sharing economy initiatives that foster a peer-to-peer approach and/or involve users in the design of the productive process or transform clients into a community.
- ‘Communing economy’ for sharing economy initiatives that are collectively owned or managed.

Thus, the authors of this study understand by sharing economy any initiative that falls within these four categories.

In the sharing economy, individuals participate in sharing activities by renting, lending, trading, bartering, or swapping goods, services, transportation solutions, space, or money (Möhlmann, 2015). The sharing economy has been pointed out as an emerging trend that is transforming the current consumer behaviour experience (Ozanne and Ballantine, 2010; Piacentini et al., 2012). In recent years, more and more people embrace car sharing services like car2go or Zipcar, use bicycle exchange systems as CitiBike in New York, swap books or DVDs in Craigslist, or book accommodations through online communities such as Airbnb. Thus, the sharing economy is not a niche trend anymore (Möhlmann, 2015), on the contrary, it is large-scale movement, involving millions of users and constituting a profitable trend in which many companies invest (Botsman and Rogers, 2010). The sharing economy, and particularly in the tourism market, continues to grow at a spectacular rate (Heo, 2016).

2.2 Collaborative tourism

Since the emergence of the sharing economy, the tourism industry has been one of the pioneer sectors for this phenomenon, since the sharing economy allows tourists and residents to share their homes, their cars, meals and local expert knowledge (Lyons and Wearing, 2015; OECD, 2016; Sigala, 2015). There is an increasing number and growth of the new tourism services platforms based on the benefits of sharing: Airbnb, HomeAway, Blablacar, Rentalia, Onlyapartments, TripAdvisor, Wikitravel, Coachsurfing, etc. These platforms have changed the way of travel and the traditional tourism industry (Heo, 2016). Thus, tourism researchers have recently begun to explore this issue, however little attention has been paid yet to the impact of the sharing economy on the tourism landscape (Heo, 2016).

As companies under the shared economy have emerged as new players in the tourism industry, it is necessary to shed light on the relationship of tourists with these new platforms. In tourism, these new platforms have emerged in different sub-industries (Carballo, et al., 2015), some of the main ones are presented below.

2.2.1 New tourism services platforms

2.2.1.1 Accommodation

Airbnb and Couchsurfing are two of the best-known examples for sharing accommodation (Heo, 2016), along with others such as Homeaway, and other specialised platforms for different housing typologies.

Airbnb, founded in 2008, developed an online platform enabling individuals to share spare space, such as rooms or flats, with their visitors. PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) estimated that Airbnb received 155 million guest stays in 2014, nearly 22% more than
Hilton Worldwide, which had 127 million guest stays in 2014. Airbnb reported that 17 million guests stayed with Airbnb hosts around the world during summer of 2015. Merrill Lynch’s analysts reported that listings on Airbnb could account for up to 1.2% of the hotel offering and 3.6–4.3% of inventory by 2020 with an estimated 40–50% growth in listings per year.

Thus, the importance of this platform has stimulated the interest of the academic community (Ert et al., 2016; Guttenstag, 2015; Oskam and Boswijk, 2016; Yannopoulou et al., 2013; Zervas et al., 2014). For example, Choi et al. (2015) and Zervas et al. (2014) examined the impact of Airbnb in the hotel industry. On the other hand, Guttenstag (2015) explored the emergence of Airbnb through the lens of disruptive innovation theory. However, the literature has not yet paid special attention to the profile of the tourist who uses this platform and other alternatives.

Couchsurfing, started as a non-profit organisation in 2004, in August 2015 already listed more than 10 million registered profiles. Couchsurfing is a global network of travellers who host each other for free in their homes, usually for a night or two. The network grew quickly, and with more than 3.5 million members worldwide by 2012, Couchsurfing is by far one of the largest hospitality exchange site online (Molz, 2013).

HomeAway, conceptually very similar to Airbnb (rental of private homes), initially did not charge for booking, but an annual subscription fee to the owner. This fee varied according to the services that the owner wanted from the platform, and could even be free for basic cases. At present, the Airbnb-style booking model has also been incorporated by HomeAway (Bulchand-Gidumal and Melián-González, 2016).

Rentalia.com is the web of the idealistic real estate group, dedicated to the promotion of temporary or short-term rentals, holiday homes and rural houses. Its policy is based on contacting users and owners as easily as possible (Rentalia, http://es.rentalia.com/).

Onlyapartments was founded in 2003 and is headquartered in Barcelona (Spain) and currently operates in 113 countries. Its business model is to rent apartments for short stays and like Airbnb, the user must register and make the payment online (Ortiz Castro, 2017).

It can be observed how the business models behind these platforms are diverse, ranging from fully economic transactions to overnight, to free transactions or mixed models. The collaborative economy now accounts for approximately 40% of the overall world outbound accommodation market.

2.2.1.2 Transportation

In the transportation sector, the case of Blablacar stands out, in which a person who is going to make a road trip offers others who wish to join the same trip to share the expenses. It is assumed that without obtaining an economic benefit (Bulchand-Gidumal and Melián-González, 2016). Some authors have begun to shed light on this phenomenon (Farajallah et al., 2016; Orden et al., 2015). Other platforms like Uber are having an exponential growth in the last years.

2.2.1.3 Information

TripAdvisor, the world’s largest travel site, provides travel information and traveller reviews, with more than 535 million reviews and comments on more than 7 million accommodations, airlines, attractions and restaurants. It offers the largest selection of
travel profiles in the world. TripAdvisor allows public access to the wisdom of the masses, helping travellers to make their decision regarding where to stay, how to fly, what activities to do and where to eat. TripAdvisor-branded sites are available in 49 different markets and are home to the world’s largest travel community with 415 million unique visitors per month, who are looking at the sharing-content to make the most out of their travels (TripAdvisor, http://www.tripadvisor.es/).

In addition, this platform has received great interest from researchers (Amaral et al., 2014; Ayeh et al., 2013; Banerjee and Chua, 2016; Filieriet al., 2015; García-Barriocanal et al., 2010; Jeacle and Carter, 2011; Kladou and Mavragani, 2015; Lee et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2015; Miguëns et al., 2008; O’Connor, 2008, 2010; Schuckert, et al., 2016; Vásquez, 2011, 2012; Yoo et al., 2016; Zaman et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2017).

Wikipedia is a free multilingual website encyclopaedia project based on an open edition model. Wikipedia grows every day thanks to the participation of people from all over the world, being the greatest project of gathering knowledge ever realised in the history of mankind. It began on May 20, 2001, and already has 1,351,319 items. Academic literature has also turned its attention to this source (Fang et al., 2015; Hanna et al., 2011).

Wikitravel is a project whose objective is to create a free, complete, updated and available worldwide travel guide for all. It is built with the collaboration of Wikitravelers from all over the world (Wikitravel, http://wikitravel.org). Its inspiration came from Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, and also the need for travellers to access updated and timely information, usually difficult to obtain through publications that are not updated for long periods of time. In April 2006, Wikitravel and World66, another travel Wiki, were acquired by Internet Brands, Inc. (Wikitravel, http://wikitravel.org).

Although these last two platforms have been studied in other contexts (Pennell, 2008), they have not received special attention in the tourist field. While Wikipedia and Wikitravel are general platforms, and do not require economic transaction, they are one of the most important sources of information in the tourism sector (Fang et al., 2015; Hanna et al., 2011).

From the above, it can be concluded that, although researchers have paid attention to sharing economy platforms in the tourism sector, research in this sector is still not enough. Much attention has been paid to a number of platforms, while others have been marginalised in the literature. In addition, there are no studies so far, that analyse all these platforms together. Thus, this study analyses nine different platforms in 19 European countries.

2.2.2 Sharing economy and information sources classification in tourism

Themes, it has been highlighted the need to distinguish between sharing economy with and without economic transactions. More precisely exchange without economic transaction beyond cost recovery; true sharing/collaborative, like sharing of opinions, reviews, comments, tips, etc., such as in TripAdvisor, most longer distance ride share such as Blablacar, etc. and on the other hand, exchange with economic transaction beyond recovery of marginal costs – for benefit, for example, short-term rental of accommodation, such as in Airbnb, Homeaway. However, although there are few studies that have analysed several platforms of sharing economy at the same time, there is no evidence of studies that have analysed this distinction. This separation is important to understand the profiles of users and their travel behaviour, depending on the use of the
platforms that can range from more functional reasons to a deep commitment to this travel philosophy. In this study, the classification followed under this distinction is the following: Sharing economy platforms with economic transaction – Airbnb, HomeAway, OnlyApartments and Rentalia; and sharing economy platforms without economic transaction – TripAdvisor, Wikipedia, Wikitravel, Coachsurfing and BlaBlaCar.

On the other hand, the focus on academic literature when analysing the sharing economy in the tourism industry can be divided into several areas, one explores the psychological approach of sharing (Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012; Belk, 2010, 2014; Lamberton and Rose, 2012; Möhlmann, 2015; Ozanne and Ballantine, 2010) while others focus on the legal and financial perspective (Kassan and Orsi, 2012; Zervas et al., 2014) or on topics related to the characteristics of the P2P sharing transactions (Kohda and Masuda, 2013; Tussyadiah, 2015). These approaches have been discussed in various contexts such as car, house and toy sharing. This paper focuses on the first (psychological approach of sharing), but while the existing literature generally analyses only a specific platform, the present study analyses a set of them and throughout Europe. On the other hand, while the previous published works have focused on understanding why individuals use sharing economy platforms, the present study focuses on shedding light on the travel motivations that lead to the use of certain sharing economy platforms, and the profile and behaviour of these tourists. In addition, these tourists’ profiles are compared to the profile of those who use other online sources such as social networks, comparators, search engines, travel agencies and tour operators. This classification was established according to the frequencies of use of the same and given the importance of each of them in the academic literature (Almeida and Moreno, 2017; Inversini and Masiero, 2014; Mellinas, et al., 2015; Xiang et al., 2016).

2.2.3 Sharing economy by regions-countries

Although the impact of culture on the overall consumer decision-making process has been extensively studied, the impact of national culture on travellers’ information search behaviour has not been given the same attention (Gursoy and Umbreit, 2004; Hyde, 2007; Kozak, 2007). In particular, little attention has been paid, specifically for tourism, to the differences among travellers regarding the use of sharing economy platforms.

Previous studies have made interesting contributions, showing that the national culture of tourists influences how they search for information (Chen, 2000; Gursoy and Chen, 2000; Uysal et al., 1990). However, on many occasions, and because of the difficulty of obtaining information from many countries simultaneously, studies are usually confined to comparing only a few countries at the same time and they have only analysed one country when they include sharing economy platforms, lacking more regional and global representative studies. As such, future studies from additional cross-cultural comparisons of different user segments would provide researchers with a more comprehensive picture of sharing economy worldwide (Cheng, 2016). Thus, this study focuses on Europe and 19 countries.

2.3 Motivations

When tourists make the decision to travel for pleasure, they do so for different reasons (Beerli and Martin, 2004) that are critical to understanding travel behaviour (Fodness, 1994; Moreno-Gil and Martin-Santana, 2013). These motivations can be classified into
push and pull factors (Crompton, 1979). According to Dann (1977), internal motives (push) are linked to the wishes of tourists and include the desire to escape, rest, and achieve prestige, adventure and social interaction. However, pull factors are related to the attractiveness of a destination and its resources. The push factors largely dictate the search behaviour of tourist information and the specific content they demand (Pesonen, 2015). In addition, these push motivations may differ by cultures (Kim and Lee, 2000; Kozak, 2002).

In current tourism literature, a large number of studies use motivations as a criterion of market segmentation (Bieger and Laesser, 2002; Cha et al., 1995; Chenet al., 2014; Kanagaraj and Bindu, 2013; Madrigal and Kahle, 1994; Mohammad and Som, 2010; Park and Yoon, 2009; Ryan and Glendon, 1998; Sung et al., 2016; Uysal et al., 1996), and it has been argued that this is one of the most effective methods (Crompton 1979; Park and Yoon 2009; Schewe 1990). Past research has shown that heterogeneous groups of tourists can be easily categorised by these motivational factors (Awaritefe 2003, 2004; Keng and Cheng, 1999; Poria et al., 2004). Literature has identified as some of the main travel motivations the following: to rest and relax, to do watersports, to do sports activities, to enjoy the beach and good weather, to go comfortable places, to go fashion places (Beerli and Martin, 2004; Chen et al., 2014; Moreno-Giland and Martin-Santana, 2013). These motivations can be combined and have a different influence in the final decision of the tourist’s trip.

Previous literature on motivations attending to cross-cultural differences and the use of information sources does not pay attention to different new platform tourism services, given their recent appearance. On the other hand, recent studies like the research of Hamari et al. (2016), investigate people’s motivations to participate in sharing economy, however, previous literature has not paid special attention to the relationship between travel motivations and the use of different new platform tourism services. This paper does not analyse the motivations to use sharing economy platforms, but the motivations to travel. This is important to better understand how people use sharing economy depending on their pursued motivations. Thus, the contribution of this study resides in a better understanding of the relationship between the countries of origin of the tourists, the use of different new tourism services platforms and their travel motivations. This can help the marketing managers of tourist destinations to decide upon the content to communicate in different countries using different platforms.

3 Methodology

In order to achieve the proposed objectives, a field work was undertaken through a structured questionnaire that included socio-demographic (age, gender, incomes), nationality and motivational variables. The numerical scales used range from 1 to 5, with 1 being the minimum value and 5 being the maximum. For the measurement of the motivations, it was used a scale based on Fodness (1994). As long as the participants had made a trip during the last two years, they were asked about their use of internet websites, social media or new tourism services platforms usually consulted to find out about the destination. Specifically, individuals were asked to indicate what specific websites, social media or sharing economy platforms they had used, using a free elicitation question.
3.1 Population

Europe remains the largest outbound region for tourist flows in the world, a region that generates more than half of the annual international arrivals (UNWTO, 2015b). Therefore, the target population of this study were tourists, aged 16 and over, who had travelled abroad during the last two years and who had used internet to acquire information about their travel destination. The study gathers tourists from the 19 major European countries in tourist terms: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Russia, Finland, France, Holland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the UK, Czech Republic, Sweden and Switzerland.

3.2 Sample selection

The work was done through an internet questionnaire (CAWI), to a representative sample of the 19 countries mentioned, chosen from a database of panellists in each country, and a random selection of the same was made based on the variables of stratification of geographical area and province on the one hand and, on the other, of the criteria of gender and age, in order to guarantee the representativeness of the sample with the population of each country. The selected sample was sent a personalised email inviting them to participate in the study, embedded in the mail itself was a personalised link that led them to the online survey. In order to ensure the expected number of surveys, during the three months of fieldwork in the different countries, two reminders were held to encourage response. The final sample was 9,383 tourists. Figure 1 shows the basic profile of the sample analysed.

Figure 1  Tourists’ profile (see online version for colours)
3.3 Quality control and data analysis

The questionnaire was translated into the languages of each country analysed. Once the questionnaire was pre-tested in the language of the potential tourists, and the pertinent corrections made to the questions that raised comprehension difficulties, the surveys were carried out. The online system, after the relevant programming had taken place, reviewed all the surveys conducted, detecting the time that a respondent had taken to respond to the survey, thus any survey answered in less than 5 minutes was not accepted as valid. After completing the fieldwork, the analyses were carried out with the latest version of the SPSS statistical analysis program. First, a correspondence analysis (CA) was performed to identify similarities and differences in tourist information search patterns according to sociodemographic characteristics and motivations. The method used, given the nature of the variables (categorical variables) is the homals or multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) (Benzécri, 1963, 1992). The results obtained through this method are equivalent to those obtained through other methods such as principals and overals (Visauta, 1998).

Next, a K-media analysis cluster analysis by the ward method was used to classify tourists from different cultures according to the different dimensions found in the MCA. The advantage of this analysis is the joint interpretation of the culture and the sharing economy platforms used, according to the objective pursued.

4 Results

In order to meet the objective of the research, an MCA was used to reveal similarities and differences in patterns of use of new tourism services platforms among European travellers based on their socio-demographic profile and travel motivations. The MCA offers a two-dimensional solution that explains 66.8% of the variance in the first dimension and 56.6% in the second dimension.

The main coordinates derived from the MCA (Table 2), provide information on how the different categories are located in the graph. The diagrams are combined in a joint graph through a canonical normalisation procedure. The contribution to the inertia of each source of external information and the explained variance of each dimension (Table 2) indicate that the first dimension is defined by age and the following motivations: fashion places, watersports and rest and relax, with age and fashion places having the most explanatory power. The second dimension is defined by gender, income, internet (differentiating between sharing economy platforms with economy transaction and without, social networks, comparators, and others), and the motivations of comfortable places, sport activities, and Beach and good weather, with internet and comfortable places having the most explanatory power. The coordinates of the ‘SE without ET’ (–0.838) and ‘SE with ET’ modes (0.868) are represented in the plane at opposite points, suggesting important profile differences between these two groups of tourists.

The category ‘internet’ is formed by the four subcategories that are described below:

- Sharing economy without economic transactions (SE without ET): TripAdvisor, Wikipedia, Wikitravel, Coachesurfing and BlaBlaCar.
- SE with ET: Airbnb, HomeAway, Onlyapartments and Rentalia.
• Social networks: Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Pinterest and LinkedIn
• Comparators: Kayak, Trivago, Skyscanner.
• Others: Internet in general, search engines, travel agencies and tour operators.

The joint visualisation (Figure 2) reveals by proximity, the tourists that have similar use of sharing economy profiles (located near each other in the graph).

**Table 2  Multiple correspondence analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE without ET</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>- .838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE with ET</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>-.662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparators</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot 1. Rest and relax</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot 2. Watersports</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot 3. Sport activities</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>-.332</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot 4. Beach and good weather</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2  Multiple correspondence analysis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mot 5. Comfortable places</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>−.196</td>
<td>−.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mot 6. Fashion places</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>−.751</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little influence</td>
<td>−.037</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>−.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>−.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of influence</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>−.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 16 to 24</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 25 to 30</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 31 to 45</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 46 to 60</td>
<td>−.405</td>
<td>−.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 60</td>
<td>−1.208</td>
<td>−.413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>−.218</td>
<td>−.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Explained by dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12,000</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000–48,000</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,001–84,000</td>
<td>−.050</td>
<td>−.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 84,000</td>
<td>−.077</td>
<td>−.451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 2 we can distinguish the profiles that differentiate the tourists who use sharing economy with economic transaction and those who use sharing economy without economic transaction. The tourists with economic transaction, area in red of Figure 2, are tourists who use the internet to gather information either through search engines or through the websites of travel agencies or tour operators, among their travel motivations highlight the practice of sports activities and water sport activities in particular; these tourists are usually young, male and with lower income. The tourists classified under the sharing economy without the economic transaction, blue area of Figure 2, are characterised by the use of comparators and social networks to find out about the travel destination, among their motivations are the interest in visiting fashionable and comfortable places, they are tourists with higher income and age than tourists of collaborative economy with economic transaction.
To undertake the next objective and classify tourists according to the differences of profiles in the use of sharing economy platforms, a K-media cluster analysis was used to classify tourists according to the dimensions found in the MCA. The results of the cluster analysis indicate that a four-group solution is appropriate (Table 3). Specifically, the results of the ANOVA analysis confirm that the two dimensions contribute to differentiate the four clusters ($p = 0.000$).

**Figure 2** Multiple correspondence analysis of use of sharing economy platforms with and without economic transaction (see online version for colours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster name</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster I</strong></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster II</strong></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>2,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster III</strong></td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster IV</strong></td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>2,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows how clusters I and IV, respectively, contain the ‘no users of internet’ and ‘non-users of SE’. Both are groups formed by tourists that are not defined by the use they make of the sources of information and are therefore of less interest for this study; on the other hand, cluster II ‘SE without TE’ contains tourists who use sharing economy platforms without economic transaction, also use comparators and social networks to find out about the travel destination, and are motivated to go to fashionable places. Finally, the tourists in cluster III have been labelled as ‘SE with TE’ and are tourists who use...
sharing economy platforms in addition to other sources such as the internet in general, search engines, travel agencies and tour operators, among their motivations of the trip highlights the practice of sports activities, and go to places that are fashionable.

Once the different groups of tourists were segmented based on the information sources they use, a cross-table was represented to see how the nationalities are distributed in the different clusters. Figure 3 shows the distribution of countries according to the sources used. Members of cluster I ‘o users of internet’ are tourists from Germany, Holland and Spain. This cluster shows a low intensity using e-tourism platforms when searching for information about their travel. The members of cluster II ‘SE without ET’ come from Czech Republic and Poland. They intensively use TripAdvisor, Wikipedia, etc. Members of cluster III ‘SE with ET’ are from Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Russia and Sweden. This cluster shows a high intensity in using SE Platforms such as Airbnb and HomeAway. Finally, the tourists of cluster IV ‘non-users of SE’ are from Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland and the UK. They tend to use other platforms not related to SE (e.g., OTAs, destination websites, etc.). This grouping does not respond to apparent cultural similarities. This result confirms the cultural differences founded in previous studies (Moreno-Gil and Ritchie, 2017). These results are useful for DMOs when selecting, more efficiently, the media through which they will promote their destination in each market, thus making their limited resources more profitable.

Figure 3  Multiple correspondence analysis of use of sharing economy platforms by country (see online version for colours)
5 Conclusions

The aim of this research was to deepen the knowledge of the profile and behaviour of European tourists who participate in 'collaborative tourism' (socio-demographic characteristics, nationalities and travel motivations). Data from 19 countries were used to meet the objectives of this research. The present study contributes to the literature on sharing economy, where little attention has been paid to the European travellers. Additionally, this study contributes both to literature on information sources, with a special focus on sharing economy.

This study integrates the analysis of the different tourism sharing economy platforms, differentiating between those with and without economic transaction involved. Additionally, this research analyses the influence of travel motivations on the use of the different sharing economy platforms, and a joint interpretation of travel motivations, nationalities and sharing economy platforms.

Regarding tourist’s profile, the results indicate the existence of two different groups of tourists based on the use they do of sharing economic platforms (Airbnb, HomeAway, Onlyapartments, Rentalia, TripAdvisor, Wikipedia, Wikitravel, Coachsurfing and Blablacar) and other information sources ( comparators, social media...). The first group is formed by tourists who use sharing economy platforms where economic transactions are required; this group is characterised by tourists who use the internet to collect information either through search engines or through the websites of travel agencies or tour operators; their main travel motivations are practicing sport activities and in particular water sports; these tourists are often young, male and present a low-income. The tourists of the second group are tourists who use sharing economy platforms without economic transaction. This group differs from the previous one. They often use comparators and the social networks as information sources to learn about the destination they are travelling; these tourists are motivated by visiting fashionable and comfortable places; they have higher incomes and are older than the tourists belonging to the other group: sharing economy with economic transaction.

On the other hand, we can also group tourist according to their cultures (countries) in four segments, depending on the use they do of sharing economy platforms. This grouping does not respond to apparent cultural similarities: clusters I (Germany, Holland and Spain) and IV (Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland and the UK), are called ‘non-users of internet’ and ‘non-users of SE’, respectively. They are not characterised by their use of information sources, and therefore are less interesting for the goal of this study. Cluster II ‘SE without ET’ are tourists who use sharing economy platforms without economic transaction. They also use comparators and social networks to find out about the travel destination. These are tourists motivated by going to places that are fashionable and not by performing sports activities. They mainly come from Czech Republic and Poland. Tourists in cluster III have been labelled as ‘SE with ET’ and they use collaborative economy platforms in addition to other general sources, search engines, travel agencies and tour operators. Their main travel motivations are practicing sports, and they are not motivated by the beach and the good weather or by going to fashionable places. They are from Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Russia and Sweden.

Regarding managerial implications, these results can be used to design marketing strategies to attract tourists from the targeting segments. Destination management organisations and destination’s companies could emphasise their presence in those
sharing economy platforms and other information sources that are more popular among the selected targets. DMOs also can implement ‘global’ actions through the different platforms, taking into account the differences in their popularity by country blocks. On the other hand, the results are of interest to sharing economy platforms and hostess in order to design the message to be communicated in each of the different blocks of countries, taking into account the tourists motivations.

Among the limitations of this study, and future research areas to be addressed, it can be mentioned the difficulty of identifying cultural differences within each particular country, which means not assuming that each country is a homogenous culture. The incorporation of other sharing economy platforms (Uber, TaskRabbit, Handy, Fiverr, GetAround, GetMyBoat, Trip4real, EatWith, etc.) and the incorporation of other variables, apart from motivations, that influence the proper content to be published by the different agents (e.g., values and psychological profiles of tourists). Finally, another line of research could focus on the specific content to be generated and disseminated depending on the linguistic differences in Europe.
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