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ABSTRACT

The proliferation of home sharing in the extant marketing and tourism literature has only been accelerated in recent times due to the emergence of the sharing economy. This paper contends that it is now an opportune time to pursue a stock take of existing knowledge in order to guide future marketing and tourism research on home sharing. Therefore, the goal of this paper is to review and propose an agenda for home sharing from a marketing and tourism perspective. Through a framework-based systematic review, this paper offers an organized, retrospective view of the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes (ADO) of home sharing in marketing and tourism. The paper also provides a snapshot on the theories, contexts, and methods (TCM) employed to gain this understanding before concluding with a discussion on the extant knowledge gaps and the ways in which these gaps could be addressed through pertinent ideas for future marketing and tourism research on home sharing.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of this systematic review

Home sharing, which encapsulates accommodation services at private residences, is not new. This is because many people have traditionally offered accommodation in private homes, such as bed and breakfasts, farm stays, guesthouses, and homestays (Lynch & MacWhannell, 2000). In the early 2000s, these traditional forms of accommodation in private vicinities represented approximately one quarter of available tourist accommodation (Di Domenico, 2008). Fast forward to today, home sharing has become ubiquitous among travelers due to the emergence of the sharing economy (Hossain, 2020).

Of the home sharing companies operating today, the most well-known is Airbnb, an online peer-to-peer (P2P) platform that facilitates marketing exchanges between hosts and guests, whereby the host is a non-commercial provider (i.e., not a registered business) who has and is willing to offer a space suitable for overnight stays (e.g., entire place, private room, shared room) to the guest, who is an end user seeking paid accommodation in private vicinities (Airbnb, 2019). Airbnb is regarded as an iconic business model and the prototypical exemplar of home sharing (Mikhalkina & Cabantous, 2015) and thus takes center stage in this paper. This deliberate decision is predicated on the call by Dolnicar (2019), who encouraged future research to concentrate on home sharing arising from online and paid (e.g., Airbnb) rather than offline (e.g., classifieds in print media, word of mouth) or unpaid trading (e.g., Couchsurfing) of P2P accommodation due to the disruptive effects brought by the former rather than the latter two to the contemporary marketplace. There is also substantive significance for research in this direction as home sharing that is paid and facilitated through online platforms has grown into a global phenomenon due to greater connectivity and network effects brought by the Fourth Industrial Revolution, with more than five million home-sharing listings by hosts in over 191 countries and 81,000 cities (Airbnb, 2019). Similar home-sharing platforms that facilitate online and paid marketing exchanges between hosts and guests are also considered in this paper (e.g., Xiaozhu, Tujia).

Though home sharing was hardly a topic of academic interest in the past (Oskam & Boswijk, 2016), its proliferation in academia has coincided with the emergence, disruption, and dominance of the largest networked home-sharing service in the industry, Airbnb, which is now bigger than the world’s top five hotel brands put together in terms of number of beds offered and market valuation (Hartmans, 2017). The emergence of numerous systematic reviews on the sharing economy...
Despite the availability of existing systematic reviews on the sharing economy, including home sharing, three major issues continue to persist, and thus, deserve further attention.

First, systematic reviews on the sharing economy often encompass myriad forms of sharing services (e.g., home, office, and ride sharing). Though such reviews may be useful to gain a basic understanding, this paper argues that such reviews are unlikely to contribute to an in-depth understanding as they are too broad to meaningfully account for the unique peculiarities that may exist in home sharing. For example, the systematic review carried out by Cheng (2016), which included co-citation and content analyses of 66 publications on the sharing economy, was limited to insights pertaining to normalized citations, strength of co-citation ties, and language-based semantic associations in a relatively short review period from 2010 to 2015. Similarly, the systematic review conducted by Ryu et al. (2019), which involved a content analysis of 297 publications on the sharing economy from 2008 to 2017, had a larger review sample and a longer review period than Cheng (2016), but was nonetheless limited to descriptive statistics and trends. Such insights characterizing the systematic reviews by Cheng (2016) and Ryu et al. (2019) are often perceived to be superficial, if not skeptical, by many researchers as they do not deal with theories, contexts, and methods as much as they do with bibliometric associations and descriptions (Paul & Criado, 2020). In another instance, the systematic review initiated by Ter Huurne et al. (2017), which relied on a qualitative synthesis of 45 publications from 2002 to 2016, had narrowly focused on trust in the sharing economy. Though such a review may be useful for people who wish to gain an in-depth understanding of trust, it is unlikely that the review will gain significant attention and impact from the broader community, who are more likely to be interested in state-of-the-art insights beyond a single construct (Paul & Criado, 2020). In contrast, the systematic review performed by Hossain (2020), which included 219 publications on the sharing economy from 2008 to 2018, had a larger review sample but a shorter review period than Ter Huurne et al. (2017). Though Hossain (2020) did cover a good range of theories and constructs, he did not discriminate the insights across the two dominant sharing-economy sectors that emerged from his review—i.e., accommodation and transportation—thereby, offering limited takeaways for home sharing.

Second, systematic reviews on home sharing, to date, have described disparate fragments of home-sharing literature without an organizing framework, which is problematic given that the product of a high-quality systematic review should result in reconciliation as opposed to continued estrangement of the literature (Fernandez, 2019). For example, Belarmino and Koh (2020) carried out a critical review of 107 publications on P2P accommodation between 2010 and 2017 and discussed nine themes that emerged from that review, whereas Dann et al. (2019) conducted a content analysis of 118 publications on Airbnb from 2013 to 2018 that revealed five themes, Dolnicar (2019) produced a knowledge map of 122 publications on online and paid P2P accommodation from 2010 to 2018 that uncovered 21 themes, Guttentag (2019) carried out a content analysis of 132 publications on Airbnb from 2013 to 2018 that shed light on six themes, and Sainaghi and Baggio (2019) revealed nine themes from a cross-citation review of 189 publications on P2P accommodation platforms from 2010 to 2019. However, neither Belarmino and Koh (2020), Dann et al. (2019), Dolnicar (2019), Guttentag (2019), nor Sainaghi and Baggio (2019) specified whether these themes were structurally independent or interrelated to one another, which in turn, signals a noteworthy knowledge gap. An organizing framework is especially important in this regard as such a framework typically connects the dots and results in a structured assembly of relationships that exist in the literature (Paul & Benito, 2018). Though some scholars did attempt to utilize an organizing framework, they appear to have chosen a framework that speaks to only a limited set of stakeholders. For example, the systematic review performed by Prayag and Ozanne (2018), which included 71 publications on home sharing from 2010 to 2016, presented insights into the home-sharing ecosystem from the multi-level perspective of landscape, regime, and niche. Such insights may be useful for policy makers, but not for scholars who are interested in identifying the extant gaps and key takeaways for future research, as evidenced by the notable absence of an agenda for future research, and for executives who wish to gain a one-stop collection of pragmatic insights relevant for industry implementation. More recently, Sainaghi (2020) reviewed 189 publications on P2P accommodation platforms from 2010 to 2019 and organized the ensuing insights based on three main actors: hosts, platforms, and guests. Though this review spoke to a wider range of stakeholders than Prayag and Ozanne (2018), it remains limited to a standalone subset of themes, some (e.g., interaction) of which were narrowly confined to a single actor (e.g., host), which may be in fact related to two or more actors (e.g., host, platform, and guest). These extant gaps highlight the need for a framework-based systematic review that is predicated on established organizing frameworks to clarify the relationships that exist among the findings of past studies and to craft a holistic agenda that speaks more relevantly to the disparate needs of a variety of stakeholders, as premier journals, such as the Journal of Business Research, are read not only by scholars in academia, but also by executives from the industry (Burton, Gruber, & Gustafsson, 2020).

Third, a systematic review on home sharing from a marketing perspective remains absent to date—it has so far been limited to a tourism perspective. Historically, the essence of marketing has been omnipresent in the market transactions between the buyer and the seller in organized markets (Sherb, 2020). Indeed, marketing, as a discipline, has a noteworthy track record of organizing and synthesizing disparate branches of knowledge to drive future agenda (Lim, 2020; Paul & Mas, 2020). Thus, it becomes sensible for marketing to play a more prominent role in systematic reviews to strengthen the industry relevance and research impact of home sharing—that is, to empower hosts of private homes with marketing knowledge so that they can avoid experiencing premature exits from the sharing economy, especially in times of global crises, as many hosts have experienced during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. More importantly, the marketing (i.e., theory-driven) and tourism (i.e., context-driven) perspectives, when taken together, can provide us with a holistic understanding of home sharing, which we otherwise would not be able to gain when these perspectives are applied independently.
sharing economy (e.g., Cheng, 2016; Hossain, 2020; Ryu et al., 2019), including that which is narrowly focused on a single construct (e.g., trust; Ter Huurne et al., 2019), this paper endeavors to take a specific yet comprehensive approach to its systematic review. In particular, the subject of review will be specific to home sharing arising from online and paid P2P accommodation marketing exchanges, and the scope of review will consider an extensive array of constructs that influence and proliferate through those exchanges.

Second, unlike the (semi-)structured approach employed by past scholars in their systematic reviews of home sharing (e.g., Belarmino & Koh, 2020; Dann et al., 2019; Dolnicar, 2019; Gutten tag, 2019; Sainaghi & Baggio, 2019), this paper adopts the framework-based systematic review approach to provide a more robust encapsulation of home sharing, wherein insights from the existing literature are not only clarified using the theories, contexts, and methods (TCM) framework (Paul, Parthasarathy, & Gupta, 2017), but also organized to communicate a structured assembly of relationships through the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes (ADO) framework (Paul & Benito, 2018).

Third, unlike the discipline-agnostic approach undertaken in past systematic reviews (e.g., Cheng, 2016; Hossain, 2020; Ryu et al., 2019), this paper adopts and applies a marketing lens in sourcing for and reporting on its framework-based systematic review, which is in line with the call by Dolnicar (2019) to focus on home-sharing research that involves exchanges that are value-based (e.g., space in return for a fee). Indeed, the concept of marketing, which encapsulates “the activities, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large” (American Marketing Association, 2017), is highly suitable to the agenda of this review as it underpins the endeavor of the review to unravel the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes characterizing home sharing as a tourism product for marketing exchange in the extant marketplace. Hence, the one-stop insights derived from this systematic review is poised to empower the marketing of home sharing for tourism growth and beyond.

1.5. Contributions of this systematic review

The framework-based systematic review of marketing and tourism literature on home sharing emerging from online and paid P2P accommodation should produce three major contributions.

First, the review answers the call by Dolnicar (2019) for greater research on online and paid P2P accommodation. The review, which is an appraisal of accumulated knowledge, “deserves higher priority now than adding a new experiment or survey” (Glass, 1976, p. 4), as there is a need to reconcile the sheer volume of research (Paul & Criado, 2020), to overcome the limitations of past reviews (Kahiya, 2018), and to redirect future research in light of recent calls by leading scholars in the field (e.g., Dolnicar, 2019).

Second, the review helps scholars to gain structured insights on the nature of relationships among the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes for online and paid P2P accommodation using the ADO framework (Paul & Benito, 2018), and the theories, contexts, and methods that were used to reveal existing insights can be used to uncover new insights using the TCM framework (Paul et al., 2017). These frameworks should help to harmonize fragmented knowledge and to mitigate the production of isolated knowledge (Kahiya, 2018). Indeed, insights that are synthesized logically will equip scholars with a good grasp of the state of the literature, which in turn, provides a starting point to build on existing knowledge and advance the field (Kumar, Paul, & Unnithan, 2019).

Third, the review empowers industry practitioners and policy makers with state-of-the-art insights on home sharing of online and paid P2P accommodation. Unlike past systematic reviews that consider each theme as independent (e.g., Belarmino & Koh, 2020; Dann et al., 2019; Dolnicar, 2019; Gutten tag, 2019; Sainaghi & Baggio, 2019), the review herein considers emerging themes as interdependent, and thus, provides well-mapped insights underpinned by well-established frameworks (i.e., the ADO and TCM frameworks) on the nature of relationships among pertinent considerations in home sharing. Hence, non-academic readers stand to gain practical tips developed based on a structured synthesis of the extant literature, including a preview of what to expect from future research in this area.

1.6. Structure of this systematic review

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The paper begins with a discussion of the methodological peculiarities of its framework-based systematic review. Following that, using the ADO framework, the paper reports on the structured assembly of antecedents, decisions, and outcomes, which enables the paper to explain “what do we know” about home sharing. Next, using the TCM framework, the paper reports on the theories, contexts, and methods used by previous scholars to uncover these past findings, thereby answering the question of “how do we know” about home sharing. Finally, the paper proposes a potentially fruitful agenda for future marketing and tourism research on home sharing based on the insights from the ADO and TCM frameworks, and thus, shedding light on “where we should be heading” with respect to the intersections of home sharing, marketing, and tourism.

2. Method

2.1. Systematic review

Systematic review is a scientific form of secondary research that relies on reproducible methods and procedures to identify, select, and appraise prior studies in response to a research agenda (Paul & Criado, 2020). The agenda and contribution of systematic reviews typically include producing state-of-the-art insights on a focal phenomenon; flagging inconsistencies and knowledge gaps that limit empirical generalizations in a topical domain; and driving the theoretical, contextual, and methodological development of future research that advance from the current state-of-the-field (Hulland & Houston, 2020; Palmatier, Houston, & Hulland, 2018). The noteworthy value of systematic reviews has been widely recognized and highly solicited, as evidenced through the establishment of premier journals that exclusively publish review articles (e.g., Academy of Management Review, International Journal of Management Reviews, Journal of Economic Literature, Psychology Bulletin), special issue calls (e.g., Paul & Rowley, 2020; Paul, Dwivedi, Pappu, & Roy, 2019) and publications (e.g., Hulland & Houston, 2020; Paul & Criado, 2020) dedicated to systematic reviews.

Similar to empirical papers, systematic reviews can be conducted in numerous ways. In general, there are four broad classifications of systematic reviews: domain-based, theory-based, method-based, and meta-analytical reviews (Paul & Criado, 2020). The essence of these classifications is explained, as follows:

- Domain-based reviews are centered on a topical domain and can be conducted in five different ways: (1) structured reviews that focus on widely-used theories, constructs, contexts, and methods (Canabal & White III, 2008; Hao, Paul, Trott, Guo, & Wu, 2020; Kahiya, 2018; Paul & Feliciano-Cestro, 2020; Paul & Singh, 2017; Rosado-Serrano, Paul, & Dikova, 2018); (2) framework-based reviews that use a framework that scholars can either adopt from others or develop on their own (Lim, 2020; Paul & Benito, 2018); (3) bibliometric reviews that focus on statistics and trends (Donthu, Kumar, & Pattnaik, 2020; Randhawa, Wilden, & Hohberger, 2016; Vallaster, Kraus, Lindahl, & Nielsen, 2019); (4) hybrid reviews that integrate the tenets of two or more review types (Dabić et al., 2020; Lim, 2016; Paul et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2019); and (5) theory development-based reviews that propose new theories, hypotheses, and/or propositions (Lim, 2020; Paul, 2019a; Paul & Mäg, 2020).

- Theory-based reviews are focused on analyzing the role of a specific
theory in a given field. Examples of theory-based reviews include the role of gradual internationalization versus born-global models in international business (Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019), the role of self-determination theory in marketing (Giral, Zhang, Paul, & Gilal, 2019), and the role of theory of planned behavior in consumer behavior (Hassan, Shiu, & Parry, 2016).

- Method-based reviews are dedicated to analyzing the utilization of a specific method in a subject area. Examples of method-based reviews include the use of structural equation modeling in marketing (Hair, Hult, Ringle, Sarstedt, & Thiele, 2017), the use of qualitative case research in international entrepreneurship (Ji, Plakoyiannaki, Dimitratos, & Chen, 2019), and the use of behavioral experiments in operations and production management (Perera, Fadhimnia, & Tokar, 2020).

- Meta-analytical reviews are focused on statistical assessments of prior empirical research on a specific research topic, whereby the common effects are identified through consistency in the direction of effect, effect size, and statistical power, and the reason for variations are explained. Examples of meta-analytical reviews include antecedents of foreign subsidiary divestment (Schmid & Morschett, 2020), celebrity endorsements (Knoll & Matthes, 2017), health motives and organic food purchases (Rana & Paul, 2020), and host country risks and foreign ownership strategies (Tang & Buckley, 2020).

In this paper, a domain-based systematic review using the framework-based approach is conducted to answer the questions of what do we know, how do we know, and where should we be heading with respect to home sharing in marketing and tourism. In particular, the framework-based approach is chosen over other domain-based approaches because of the limitations of existing semi-structured or structured systematic reviews on the sharing economy (e.g., Cheng, 2016; Hossain, 2020; Ryu et al., 2019; Ter Huurne et al., 2017), including home sharing (e.g., Belarmino & Koh, 2020; Dann et al., 2019; Dolnicar, 2019; Guttenberg, 2019; Prayag & Ozanne, 2018; Sainaghi, 2020; Sainaghi & Baglio, 2019), in organizing the relationships that entail home sharing in marketing and tourism. The organization of extant relationships is important, as without it, the field will suffer from the continued estrangement of the extant literature (Fernandez, 2019).

To this end, the framework-based approach to systematic reviews is a highly suitable approach that can address this gap, as a review using this approach can reap the benefit of organizing frameworks, which can help to connect the dots (i.e., results) of past studies in a structured assembly of relationships (Paul & Criado, 2020). The organizing frameworks that will guide the systematic review herein will be discussed in the next section.

2.2. Organizing framework

An organizing framework in a systematic review is a structure that is used to guide the integration of peculiarities from disparate streams of literature. Many established scholars and premier journals have called for “well done” reviews (e.g., Hulland & Houston, 2020; Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science), whereby a review is “well done” when it structures its content—e.g., theories, constructs, contexts, and methods—scientifically and logically (Hulland & Houston, 2020; Paul & Criado, 2020). Therefore, the structure of a systematic review is important, and organizing frameworks are a means to provide this structure in ways that enhance rigor, improve relevance, and facilitate impact (Paul & Criado, 2020).

There are several organizing frameworks that have been championed by past scholars. For example, Paul and Rosado-Serrano (2019) developed and applied the theory, construct, characteristics, and methodology (TCCM) framework, whereas Paul et al. (2017) coined and employed the TCM framework to account for peculiarities pertaining to theory, context, and method. Many semi or fully structured reviews do cover some or all of these elements, but it is important to acknowledge Paul and Rosado-Serrano (2019) and Paul et al. (2017) as the inaugural scholars who have established the combinations of these elements in organized ways. Other examples of organizing frameworks include the interrogative framework used by Xie, Reddy, and Liang (2017), which considers six function words consisting of what, when, who, why, how, and where, and the ADO framework by Paul and Benito (2018), which considers the assembly of relationships among constructs in the form of antecedents, decisions, and outcomes.

In this paper, two organizing frameworks are selected to develop a comprehensive review of the extant literature on home sharing in marketing and tourism: the ADO framework and the TCM framework. The tenets of these frameworks are elucidated, as follows:

- The ADO framework was developed by Paul and Benito (2018), wherein “A” refers to antecedents, “D” refers to decisions, and “O” refers to outcomes. In essence, antecedents clarify the reasons for engaging or not engaging in behavior, whereas decisions explain the types of behavioral performance or non-performance, and outcomes encapsulate the evaluations that emerge after behavioral performance or non-performance.

- The TCM framework was established by Paul et al. (2017), wherein “T” refers to theories, “C” refers to contexts, and “M” refers to methods. In particular, theories encapsulate the perspectives that scholars rely upon to guide their investigation, whereas contexts depict the circumstances that entail in an investigation, and methods shed light on the nature of empirical evidence through which the investigation develops.

The combination of the ADO and TCM frameworks is necessary for two major reasons. First, the ADO framework is an excellent framework to organize the findings (i.e., constructs and its ensuing relationships) of past research in a structured assembly (Paul & Benito, 2018). However, on its own, the ADO framework may be inadequate to direct future research as it does not explain the theories, contexts, or methods that could guide future research. Second, the TCM framework is an excellent framework to organize the underpinnings of past research (Paul et al., 2017), and thus, equip future scholars with tools to replicate or make new discoveries in the field. Yet, on its own, the TCM framework may be inadequate to drive future research as it does not deal with topical content as much as the ADO framework.

To this end, the integration of the ADO and TCM frameworks, as depicted in Fig. 1, allows us to leverage the strengths and overcome the shortcomings of each framework. More specifically, the ADO framework answers the questions of “what do we know” (existing) and “where should we be heading” (new), whereas the TCM framework answers the question of “how do we know” with respect to the preceding questions. Noteworthy, this is the first time that a framework-based systematic review is using more than a single organizing framework, thereby exemplifying a significant advancement in framework-based systematic reviews and raising the standards for future systematic reviews intending to use organizing frameworks as a means to achieve a holistic review of a topical domain.

2.3. Procedure

The preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) protocol is applied to curate a collection of articles relevant to home sharing in the fields of marketing and tourism (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, & Group, 2009). This protocol consists of four stages—i.e., identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion—and was selected because it provides a clear guideline for the reviewing process (Ter Huurne et al., 2017). The details of each stage are presented in Fig. 2 and explained in detail in the next sections.
2.3.1. Identification

The identification stage was executed based on five considerations in the following order: (1) source type, (2) source quality and relevance, (3) search engine, (4) search period, and (5) search keyword.

First, in terms of source type, the review considers only articles published in journals. Other publications were not considered for numerous reasons. In particular, books and book chapters were excluded as they rarely contribute to scholarly advancement, whereas grey literature such as conference papers, industry reports, and working papers were omitted because they do not usually receive as much independent scrutiny as journal articles.

Second, in terms of source quality and relevance, the review adopts a tripartite criteria, whereby articles are deemed to be “high quality” and “relevant” if they are published in journals that are (1) indexed and (2) ranked “A*” or “A” in (3) the field of research of “marketing and tourism” in the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) journal ranking list. The decisions with respect to the criteria emerged from the discussion, deliberation, and consensus among the authors, with the main underpinning rationales disclosed, as follows:

- The ABDC journal ranking list was chosen as it is a widely-used benchmark for journals in business that are of international standard (Hao et al., 2020). In particular, the ABDC journal ranking was chosen over the Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS) journal guide for a variety of reasons. First, journals could appear only in a single field of research in the ABDC journal ranking list, but in multiple fields of research in the Web of Science and Scopus journal rankings, which creates more confusion than clarity when quality measures are considered (e.g., Q1/Q2 in “tourism, leisure, and hospitality management,” but Q3/Q4 in “marketing,” or vice versa). Moreover, the ABDC journal ranking list transcends beyond using citations as a quality measure—i.e., an inherent limitation of Web of Science and Scopus—as journal rankings in this list are collectively determined by senior scholars and subject-matter experts who also consider the prestige and rigor of these journals among peers in the field.
- The journal ranks of “A*” and “A” were selected as the source-quality threshold for article inclusion in this review. In particular, the source-quality threshold of “A*” and “A” offers two major benefits. First, it enables the review to focus on novelty as opposed to replication (i.e., inherent attribute of “A*” and “A” journals), and second, it helps authors to curate a more manageable collection of articles for review.
- Including source quality and relevance in the identification stage—as opposed to the eligibility stage—was a strategic and pragmatic decision. This is because the “marketing and tourism” journal titles that are ranked “A*” and “A” in the ABDC journal ranking list are already known and thus can be used for the search in the identification stage. Moreover, the number of journal titles that meet this criterion is relatively small—i.e., 76 journal titles—and thus manageable. More importantly, conducting a search by journal titles ensures that all relevant articles that must be considered from unrelated (e.g., sports, transport) sector-based journals, thereby making the CABS journal guide inferior to the ABDC journal ranking list for the purpose of this review.

Fig. 1. An integrated ADO-TCM framework for framework-based systematic review (adapted from Paul and Benito (2018) and Paul et al. (2017)).
each journal title are covered.

Third, in terms of search engine, Google Scholar was selected due to its accessibility (i.e., free to use by anyone, anywhere, anytime) and sophistication (i.e., world’s largest academic search engine) (Gusenbauer, 2019). Moreover, most, if not all, academic articles that avail through academic databases (e.g., EBSCO, Ingenta, ProQuest, ScienceDirect), indexes (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science) and publishers (e.g., Emerald, Sage, Springer, Taylor and Francis) are searchable through Google Scholar, which makes this search engine highly efficient and effective for systematic reviews. It should also be noted that Scopus and Web of Science may be more relevant as a quality criterion for article inclusion or exclusion, rather than as a search engine, because of the time lag in their indexing of “in press” articles (i.e., published ahead of print)—a practical insight that was uncovered when the authors explored and deliberated on the alternatives for search engines at the identification stage.

Fourth, in terms of search period, this review identified articles on home sharing in marketing and tourism based on a search that starts from 2008, which is the year that the world’s first and largest online and paid P2P accommodation platform was established (Airbnb, 2019), and that ends at June 25, 2020 to ensure that all relevant and recent articles at the time of writing had the opportunity to be considered for inclusion in this systematic review, which follows a similar practice in the recent systematic review by Dolnicar (2019). The 12-years review period is also longer than the review period in existing home-sharing systematic reviews by Belarmino and Koh (2020) (i.e., seven years from 2010 to 2017), Dann et al., 2019 (i.e., five years from 2013 to 2018), Dolnicar (2019) (i.e., eight years from 2010 to 2018), Guttentag (2019) (i.e., five years from 2013 to 2018), Prayag and Ozanne (2018) (i.e., six years from 2010 to 2016), Sainaghi (2020) (i.e., nine years from 2010 to 2019), and Sainaghi and Baggio (2019) (i.e., nine years from 2010 to 2019). More importantly, the inclusion of recent articles in 2019 and 2020 herein will contribute fresh and timely insights.

Fifth, in terms of search keyword, the review considered and utilized only a single keyword—i.e., “Airbnb”—as opposed to multiple keywords. This decision was reached after three strategic deliberations. First, the authors had to ensure that the search strategy closely resonates to the focus of the review, that is, home sharing emerging from online and paid marketing exchanges for P2P accommodation, and Airbnb, as the poster child for online and paid home sharing, exemplifies this focus, which is in line with the call by Dolnicar (2019) for greater research in this area. Second, the authors read existing home-sharing systematic reviews by Belarmino and Koh (2020), Dann et al., 2019, Dolnicar (2019), Guttentag (2019), Prayag and Ozanne (2018), Sainaghi (2020), and Sainaghi and Baggio (2019) and came to the conclusion that Airbnb is omnipresent in most, if not all, articles on home sharing, regardless of whether or not the subject of home sharing is online and paid, thereby indicating that “Airbnb” is a “must-cite” example in home-sharing research and that a search using “Airbnb” as a sole keyword would be sufficient to locate articles of interest for this review. Third, and perhaps more importantly, the authors conducted and compared two exploratory Google Scholar search—i.e., one using a single keyword (i.e., “Airbnb”) versus another using multiple keywords (i.e., “home sharing,” “peer-to-peer accommodation,” “host,” “platform,” “guest,” “Airbnb”)—and found that using a single keyword...
produced more search results as opposed to using multiple keywords (i.e., single keyword = 59,900 results; multiple keywords = 234 results). The ensuing discussion, deliberation, and consensus among the authors suggest that using “Airbnb” as a single keyword for the search was most pragmatic and transparent given the outcome of the exploratory search. The large number of search results from the exploratory search can be mitigated when the source quality and relevance criterion—i.e., “marketing and tourism” journal titles ranked “A” or “A*” in the ABDC journal ranking list—is applied.

To put it simply, a Google Scholar search using “Airbnb” as a keyword for the period of 2008 to 2020 was conducted for each of the 76 “marketing and tourism” journal titles ranked “A” or “A*” in the ABDC journal ranking list (i.e., one search for each journal title) (see Appendix 1). In total, 1,145 articles were returned from the search. This return on search is considered to be appropriate at the time of writing, as the largest number of discipline-agnostic articles relevant to home sharing that was most recently reported in home-sharing systematic reviews stood at 189 articles (Sainaghi, 2020; Sainaghi & Baggio, 2019).

2.3.2. Screening

The screening stage was executed using a two-step approach: the first step was to identify and exclude articles returned from the search that were not published in the journal titles that were searched, whereas the second step was to screen articles that were duplicates for exclusion.

In total, 60 articles were excluded based on the two-step approach at the screening stage. In particular, 35 articles were excluded because they were not journal articles (e.g., books, book chapters, conference papers, industry reports, and working papers) and six journal articles were excluded because they were not published in “marketing and tourism” journal titles ranked “A” or “A*” in the ABDC journal ranking list. The reason behind the emergence of these publications in the search results may be attributed to the concise and generic names of some journal titles that were used in the search (e.g., Journal of Business Research, Tourism Management). Moreover, one journal article was excluded because it was published by a predatory (clone) journal bearing the same name as a legitimate (original) journal title. This rare encounter was unsurprising given the rise of predatory journals, lurking to “trick” inexperienced scholars who need to survive the “publish or perish” culture that is prevalent in academia today. Finally, 18 articles were excluded because they were duplicates in the form of institutional and social networking (e.g., ResearchGate) copies to the original version of journal articles.

2.3.3. Eligibility

The eligibility stage was executed based on two major considerations: article type and content relevance.

In terms of article type, this review only included conceptual and empirical articles published in “marketing and tourism” journal titles ranked “A**” or “A” in the ABDC journal ranking list as they typically receive detailed, and perhaps the highest level of, scrutiny through an independent peer-review process. However, editorials and book reviews published in these journals were excluded because these articles are often excused from peer review. Systematic reviews in these journals were also not considered as they were deemed to be redundant for the present review.

In terms of content relevance, the full text of the articles that progressed from the screening stage were thoroughly assessed in the eligibility stage to ensure only articles that focused on home sharing emerging from online and paid marketing exchanges for P2P accommodation were included.

In total, 863 articles were excluded from progressing to the next (inclusion) stage as they did not meet the eligibility assessment of article type and content relevance. In particular, six articles with relevant content were excluded because they were not conceptual or empirical articles (e.g., systematic reviews), whereas 840 conceptual or empirical articles were omitted because of non-relevant content. Seventeen articles were not considered because they were neither conceptual nor empirical articles (e.g., editorials, books and systematic reviews) and their content was not relevant to the focus of this review.

2.3.4. Inclusion

The inclusion stage encapsulates a countercheck and a content analysis of articles in the review.

A random check in “marketing and tourism” journals ranked “A**” and “A*” in the ABDC journal ranking list was conducted for “in-press” articles on home sharing at the website of publishers. The countercheck confirmed that no new records other than the ones included herein could be found, which reaffirms the earlier contention on the sophistication and timeliness of Google Scholar as a highly efficient and effective search engine for systematic reviews.

In total, 222 conceptual and empirical articles were included for the content analysis in the review (see Appendix 2).

A content analysis guided by the ADO and TCM frameworks was performed to extract, code, and organize the data from the reviewed articles (Paul & Benito, 2018; Paul et al., 2017). In line with the pursuit of objectivity and systematization for systematic reviews (Kahiya, 2018), this review considers a protocol focusing on (1) bibliometric aspects of authorships, citations, and publication outlets; (2) antecedents, decisions, and outcomes; and (3) theories, contexts, and methods of home-sharing research. Following the guidelines suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006), two coders who were experts in the sharing economy and systematic reviews read the articles independently to familiarize with the data (i.e., content). Following that, the coders generated initial codes and then compared and combined them into categories in line with the ADO and TCM frameworks. The associations—or relationships—between the codes, were also noted as this served as a prelude to the synthesis. The vote counting method is used as it allows us to aggregate the associations between codes that reflect the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes of home sharing, whereby a vote is allocated each time an association was encountered—e.g., 10 occurrences of associations will yield 10 votes (Kahiya, 2018). The same voting method is applied for the categories of marketing knowledge adopted from Rossiter (2001, 2002) to describe the rigor of associations. The associations and categories were then reviewed and agreed on to ensure that they reflect the codes and content of the articles. The outcome of the content analysis is reported in the next sections.

3. What do we know?

Home sharing is a domain that has gained increasing academic attention in recent years. Though the period of search for articles began in 2008, the review indicates that home sharing only made its debut in “marketing and tourism” journals ranked “A**” or “A” in the ABDC journal ranking list in 2015 (see Fig. 3). Since the appearance of three conceptual and empirical articles on home sharing in premier marketing and tourism journals in 2015, the proliferation of home-sharing research in these journals have steadily increased to five articles in 2016 (↑67%), 21 articles in 2017 (↑320%), 31 articles in 2018 (↑48%), 88 articles in 2019 (↑184%), and 75 articles in 2020 as of June 25, 2020. The total number of citations for the 222 articles included in the review stood at 9,062 citations, wherein the 10 most cited articles, with an average of 1,238.9 citations per year, contributed to 51.5% (or 4,675 citations) of the total number of citations (see Tables 1 and 2). These statistics are highly impressive—especially when they are compared with that of other systematic reviews in the field. For example, the most cited article in the systematic review by Kahiya (2018) took 39 years to accumulate 2,203 citations, whereas the most cited article herein—i.e., Gutten tag (2015)—took only five years to reach 51.7% of that number (or 1,140 citations) and will very likely meet and surpass the citations of that
article in a shorter timeframe. The leading authors in the field are Daniel Guttentag (male) and Iis Tussyadiah (female) who are tied with three articles each appearing in the 10 most cited articles in this review. In contrast, the leading journal for home-sharing research depends on the metric that is used to gauge the stature of “leading.” In particular, *International Journal of Hospitality Management* is the leading journal in terms of the number of articles published on home sharing (42 articles), whereas *Tourism Management* takes pole position in terms of the number of citations received for the articles that the journal publishes on home sharing (1,729 citations). Both journals are ranked “A*.” In total, home-sharing research has appeared in 31 out of 76 (48%) “marketing and tourism” journals ranked “A*” or “A” in the ABDC.

Building on the bibliometric above, the next sections of this paper will shed light on the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes of marketing exchanges for home sharing in the marketplace. In total, the review of 222 articles reveals 10 categories of antecedents with a total of 133 constructs, one category of decisions with a total of five constructs, and two categories of outcomes with a total of seven constructs. The paper provides an overview of these constructs in Fig. 4 and the ensuing associations, which are guided by the ADO framework, are presented alongside the categorization of marketing knowledge in Table 3.

### 3.1. Antecedents

Antecedents encapsulate the reasons for engaging or not engaging in behavior, and thus, they may produce a direct influence on decisions or an indirect influence on outcomes (Paul & Benito, 2018).

In the present review, 10 categories of antecedents in the marketing exchange of home sharing that were related to (1) guest, (2) platform, (3) host, (4) property, (5) location, (6) social factors, (7) trust, (8) value, (9) macroenvironment, and (10) tourism were revealed. When a marketing lens is applied, this review contends that these antecedents could be logically organized into a new marketing schema that the authors originally coin herein as the 3Ps of marketing exchange, namely *participants, products, and properties*. In particular, (1) guest, (2) platform, and (3) host are the participants, whereas (4) property is the product, and (5) location, (6) social factors, (7) trust, (8) value, (9) macroenvironment, and (10) tourism are the properties of marketing exchange in home sharing.

The antecedents and their ensuing associations were also supported by Rossiter’s (2001, 2002) categories of marketing knowledge: first-order knowledge relating to descriptions of concepts in isolation, second-order knowledge relating to empirical generalizations and non-causal associations of concepts, and third-order knowledge relating to principles about cause-and-effect. In total, the review found 1,044 associations for a total of 133 antecedents across the 10 categories of antecedents, whereby 562 associations were directly related to decisions and 482 associations were indirectly related to outcomes. The voting method suggested by Kahiya (2018) is applied with which the association between constructs occurred—as opposed to the number of studies—is given a vote. The same method is also applied to the categories of marketing knowledge with which concepts and/or associations that belong to a category of marketing knowledge are given votes. The next sections detail the peculiarities of the antecedents and their ensuing associations.

#### 3.1.1. Guest-related antecedents

Guest-related antecedents encapsulate the characteristics of guests that could impact marketing exchange in home sharing. In total, 26 guest-related antecedents were uncovered with the support of 99 votes from second-order knowledge and 25 votes from third-order knowledge: attachment, attitude, behavioral control, desire, empathy, experience (staying), familiarity, guest profile, involvement, length of booking, motivation, openness to experience, party type and size, personal innovativeness, personality, power distance, price sensitivity, psychological distance, reciprocity, self-brand connection, sense of...
power, sociodemographics, strategic behavior, tolerance, trip purpose, and value orientation. In general, these guest-related antecedents positively influence booking intentions (33 positive votes) and actual stay (14 positive votes) among guests. The experience and familiarity of guests with home sharing also had noteworthy effects on encouraging affective and conative loyalty (Cheng & Jin, 2019; Möhlmann, 2015; Liang, Choi, and Joppe, 2018a, 2018b). Yet, guest-related antecedents appear to have little to no influence on host behavior such as property listing (two positive votes, one neutral vote, two negative votes) and pricing (three neutral votes). Finally, the absence of first-order knowledge relating to concepts that explain guest-related antecedents is observed, indicating that existing investigations on guest-related antecedents have relied heavily on insights from the existing literature (e.g., general consumer behavior, guest behavior in hotel settings), and thus, future research at this level could explore new guest-related attributes that may be potentially unique to home sharing to enrich our understanding in this area.

### 3.1.2. Platform-related antecedents

Platform-related antecedents denote the characteristics of home-sharing platforms that could impact the facilitation of marketing exchange in home sharing between guests and hosts. In total, 16 platform-related antecedents were revealed based on four votes focusing on first-order knowledge and 104 votes focusing on second-order knowledge: accuracy of information, algorithmic management, brand impression, comparability, customer service support, cybersecurity, ease of use, enjoyment, financial benefits, quality assurance, policy, privacy, system functionality, telepresence, usefulness, and variety. In general, these platform-related antecedents had a positive influence on guest booking (nine positive votes). Yet, it is equally concerning that platform-related antecedents, such as customer service, cybersecurity, quality assurance, and system functionality (Huang, Coghlan, & Jin, 2020; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018), were found to negatively influence the actual stays of guests (eight negative votes), which indicates that platform-related antecedents are likely to be responsible for the intention–behavior gap in home sharing. Whereas, algorithmic management in home-sharing platforms, such as Bayesian social learning and dynamic pricing, was a platform-related antecedent that had a noteworthy impact on the pricing of home sharing (six positive votes, one neutral vote, and four negative votes), which in turn, corresponds to the economic returns encountered by hosts (Gibbs, Guttentag, Gretzel, Yao, & Morton, 2018; Koh, Belarmino, & Kim, 2019; Kwok & Xie, 2019). Finally, the absence of third-order knowledge relating to cause-and-effect is noted, and given that home-sharing platforms are technologically-enabled, it may be worthwhile for future research to pursue eye-tracking experiments that could potentially reveal novel insights with respect to the content and navigational features that guests and hosts pay most attention to when they use the platforms to book or list shared homes, thereby strengthening theory in this area.

### 3.1.3. Host-related antecedents

Host-related antecedents refer to the characteristics of hosts that could impact marketing exchange in home sharing. In total, 18 host-related antecedents were uncovered based on 10 votes from first-order knowledge, 145 votes from second-order knowledge, and three votes from third-order knowledge: acceptance rate, confirmation efficiency, communication, entrepreneurial capital, experience (hosting), flexibility, friendliness, helpfulness, host profile, informational disclosure, integrity, marketing message, personalization, place making, price positioning, property clustering, property quantity, and review. In general, host-related antecedents had a positive impact on booking intentions (24 positive votes), actual stays (13 positive votes), and cognitive (11 positive votes), affective (20 positive votes) and conative (9 positive votes) loyalty among guests, with communication (e.g., ease, openness, responsiveness) and informational disclosure (e.g., profile, number of photos) regarded as some of the most important host-related attributes.
Fig. 4. State-of-the-art overview of the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes of marketing exchanges in home sharing and its supporting theories, contexts and methods.
that guests consider and evaluate pre-, during, and post-marketing exchange in home sharing (Belarmino, Whalen, Koh, & Bowen, 2019; Han, Shin, Chung, & Koo, 2019; Lee, Yang, & Koo, 2019). Whereas, property quantity was a noteworthy host-related attribute that significantly influenced the price listed by hosts for home sharing (Moreno-Izquierdo, Ramón-Rodríguez, Such-Devesa, & Perles-Ribes, 2019; Moreno-Izquierdo, Rubia-Serrano, Perles-Ribes, Ramón-Rodríguez, & Such-Devesa, 2020). Finally, the low number of votes focusing on third-order knowledge is observed, and thus, future research may wish to dive deeper into the cause-and-effect of different host-related information on guest behavior so that hosts can strategically share information that would yield desired behavior among potential guests, such as those that lead to bookings and actual stays of shared homes.

3.1.4. Property-related antecedents

Property-related antecedents encapsulate the characteristics of shared homes made available by hosts for end users seeking accommodation. In total, 14 property-related antecedents were revealed based on 11 votes focusing on first-order knowledge, 152 votes focusing on second-order knowledge, and one vote focusing on third-order knowledge: ambience, amenities, cleanliness, comfort, house rules, occupancy, physical barriers, popularity, privacy, product performance risk, safety, service quality, substitutability, and underutilized asset. In general, property-related antecedents had a positive impact on booking intentions (21 positive votes), actual stays (12 positive votes), and affective loyalty (14 positive votes) among guests, with authenticity and cultural richness emerging as key considerations (Shi, Gursoy, & Chen, 2019; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2016). In contrast, distance had a negative influence on the price that hosts charge (Gibbs et al., 2018), whereas the emergence of tourism clusters increases their listings and economic returns (Ioannides, Röslmaier, & Van Der Zee, 2019). The lack of first- and third-order knowledge is noted but may not be easily addressed due to the limitations in the focus of control of the elements pertaining to location. Authenticity and cultural richness were standout attributes, but a single host effort may be inadequate to create a significant change in the area. Thus, future research in this area may wish to explore the dynamics for community organizing that could help create and transform neighborhoods with home-sharing potential into authentic and culturally-rich tourism clusters.

3.1.5. Location-related antecedents

Location-related antecedents pertain to the surrounding with which the shared home is situated. In total, 14 location-related antecedents were uncovered based on six votes from first-order knowledge, 121 votes from second-order knowledge, and four votes from third-order knowledge: accessibility, agglomeration, authenticity, cultural richness, competition, convenience, distance, population density, resident perception, safety, serenity, tourism clusters, traffic, and urban–rural divide. In general, location-related antecedents positively influence booking intentions (19 positive votes), actual stays (13 positive votes), and affective (14 positive votes) and conative (6 positive votes) loyalty among guests, with authenticity and cultural richness emerging as key considerations (Shi, Gursoy, & Chen, 2019; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2016). In contrast, distance had a negative influence on the price that hosts charge (Gibbs et al., 2018), whereas the emergence of tourism clusters increases their listings and economic returns (Ioannides, Röslmaier, & Van Der Zee, 2019). The lack of first- and third-order knowledge is noted but may not be easily addressed due to the limitations in the focus of control of the elements pertaining to location. Authenticity and cultural richness were standout attributes, but a single host effort may be inadequate to create a significant change in the area. Thus, future research in this area may wish to explore the dynamics for community organizing that could help create and transform neighborhoods with home-sharing potential into authentic and culturally-rich tourism clusters.

3.1.6. Social-related antecedents

Social-related antecedents denote the peculiarities that emerge when people take center stage in home sharing. In total, 17 social-related antecedents were revealed based on seven votes focusing on first-order knowledge, 101 votes focusing on second-order knowledge, and 11 votes focusing on third-order knowledge: attitudinal barriers, cosmopolitanism, cultural differences, empowerment, interaction, interdependence, online social network, privacy, sense of community, sharing economy philosophy, social closeness, social presence, social similarity, social utility, spatial distance, space appropriation, and subjective norms. In general, social-related antecedents have a more prominent effect for guests as opposed to hosts, as bookings (19 positive votes), stays (nine votes), cognitive (six positive votes), affective (19 positive votes), and conative (14 positive votes) loyalty, and value co-
creation (four positive votes) were especially prominent guest-related decisions and outcomes impacted by social-related considerations. Social interaction was the standout attribute that largely affected guests as well as a minority of hosts when deciding whether or not to participate in marketing exchanges for home sharing (Lin, Fan, Zhang, & Lau, 2019; Philip, Ozanne, & Ballantine, 2015). It was interesting to note that many social-related antecedents that were revealed through this review could in fact help explain the nature of social interactions (e.g., cultural differences, sense of community) (Cheng & Zhang, 2019; Philip et al., 2015). Yet, the low number of votes focusing on first- and third-order knowledge of social-related antecedents suggests that future research might be better off focusing on social-related antecedents that could be encouraged, such as causal studies that lead to tangible recommendations to curate convivial social interactions. For studies that wish to pursue a social science understanding, contextual considerations, such as the impact of COVID-19, might be a potentially fruitful pathway, which this paper will elaborate more substantively toward the end.

3.1.7. Trust-related antecedents

Trust-related antecedents consist of the attributes that create confidence toward marketing exchanges in home sharing. In total, eight trust-related antecedents were uncovered based on five votes from first-order knowledge, 82 votes from second-order knowledge, and four votes from third-order knowledge: attractiveness, benevolence, certification, competence, verification, reputation, risk, and trust as a multidimensional construct. In general, trust-related antecedents are prevalent considerations among guests when they book shared homes in the marketplace (16 positive votes), and when present, increases their willingness to pay (11 positive votes). Indeed, trustworthy hosts are typically earmarked through various means, such as certification and reputation indicators on home-sharing platforms (Moreno-Izquierdo et al., 2019, 2020). Nevertheless, the impact of trust-related antecedents on the prices that hosts could charge is mixed. For example, certification such as Superhost status had more neutral votes (four) than positive votes (three), whereas reputation indicators such as ratings had more positive votes (five) than neutral votes (two). The low number of votes for first-order and third-order knowledge is observed, and thus, future research may wish to engage in studies that increase the breadth of first-order knowledge with respect to trust-related antecedents, with which studies that endeavor to deliver third-order knowledge could examine through causal means such as field experiments.

3.1.8. Value-related antecedents

Value-related antecedents refer to the benefits and costs associated with marketing exchange in home sharing. In total, nine value-related antecedents were revealed based on three votes focusing on first-order knowledge, 117 votes focusing on second-order knowledge, and two votes focusing on third-order knowledge. In general, value-related antecedents had the strongest influence on bookings (19 positive votes), affective (18 positive votes) and conative (12 positive votes) loyalty, and value co-creation (10 positive votes). Economic value was the main driver behind the positive impact on these decisions and outcomes (Tussyadiah, 2016; Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2016), whereas social value was a noteworthy driver of affective loyalty (Jiang, Balaji, & Jha, 2019; Wang, Asaad, & Filieri, 2020). The multi-faceted antecedents to value co-creation is also interesting as the 10 votes it garnered comprised of economic, emotional, epistemic, ethical, functional, green, and social values (Jiang et al., 2019; Zhang, Jahromi, & Kizilidag, 2018). Nevertheless, the votes from first-order and third-order knowledge remain low, and thus, future research is encouraged to actively explore and empirically manipulate the ways in which these different values could be activated and delivered through the marketing exchanges that entail in home sharing.

3.1.9. Macroenvironment-related antecedents

Macroenvironment-related antecedents denote the forces in the marketing environment that affect the marketing exchanges in home sharing and beyond. In total, five macroenvironment-related antecedents were derived based on three votes focusing on first-order knowledge, 48 votes focusing on second-order knowledge, and three votes focusing on third-order knowledge. In general, macroenvironment-related antecedents had the largest impact on the listing and pricing decisions of hosts in home sharing, with eight and five positive votes, respectively. In particular, economic and regulatory forces were the two main contributors to these votes for hosts (Moreno-Izquierdo et al., 2019, 2020), whereas the sustainability agenda appears to have a promising impact on the booking intentions and actual stays of shared homes among guests (Agag, 2019; Philip et al., 2015). The overall votes of marketing knowledge for macroenvironment-related antecedents are generally low to medium, and thus, could benefit from additional studies, especially in the era of the ‘new normal’ that ensues the COVID-19 global humanitarian crisis.

3.1.10. Tourism-related antecedents

Tourism-related antecedents characterize the unique peculiarities emerging from travel. In total, six tourism-related antecedents were uncovered based on three votes from first-order knowledge and 19 votes from second-order knowledge: destination attractiveness, destination engagement, seasonality, travel benefits, travel memorability, and tourist arrivals. In general, tourism-related antecedents positively influence the listing of hosts with five positive votes. Nevertheless, the seasonality that entails in tourism requires hosts to increase and reduce prices, thereby producing mixed outcomes in economic returns (Heo, Blal, & Choi, 2019; Li & Srinivasan, 2019), whereas travel memorability is a standout tourism-related antecedent that encourages coative loyalty among guests (Mody, Hanks, & Dogru, 2019a; Mody, Suess, & Lehto, 2017). The overall votes of marketing knowledge for tourism-related antecedents are generally low to medium, and thus, greater exploration and empirical testing is needed to enrich insights in this area, such as by progressing destination attractiveness from a first-order knowledge to a second- or third-order knowledge by means of empirical testing and experimentation.

3.2. Decisions

Decisions relate to behavioral performance or non-performance, and thus, they serve as a direct response to antecedents and a precursor of outcomes (Paul & Benito, 2018).

The review reveals six major decisions that entail in marketing exchanges for home sharing: booking, listing, pricing, responsible conduct, actual stays, and support. The votes amongst antecedents and decisions appear to be concentrated around guest decisions, whereby guest booking intentions and actual stays received 223 and 115 votes, respectively. More specifically, when guests are considered, guest-related antecedents appear to be in the forefront in shaping bookings, with 47 votes. This is followed by location-related antecedents with 31 votes, host- and property-related antecedents with 28 votes each, value-related antecedents with 25 votes, social-related antecedents with 23 votes, trust-related antecedents with 21 votes, platform-related antecedents with 13 votes, macroenvironment-related antecedents with six votes, and tourism-related antecedents with one vote. A similar trend is observed for actual stays, thereby indicating that consistency in marketing efforts throughout the marketing exchange process is necessary to ensure that bookings translate into actual stays.

Whereas, host decisions such as listing and pricing received 61 and 135 votes, respectively. In particular, when hosts are considered, macroenvironment-related antecedents take pole position in influencing listings, with 17 votes. This is followed by location-related antecedents with 11 votes, value-related antecedents with nine votes, social-related antecedents with seven votes, tourism-related antecedents with
six votes, guest-related antecedents with five votes, and platform-, host-, property-, and trust-related antecedents with two votes each. Pricing decisions, however, appear to be very much dependent on host-related antecedents, which garnered a total of 37 votes. This is followed by property-related antecedents with 30 votes, location- and trust-related antecedents with 17 votes each, platform-related antecedents with 11 votes, macroenvironment-related antecedents with eight votes, tourism-related antecedents with four votes, and guest-related antecedents with three votes.

Responsible conduct and support were interesting decisions that emerged from the review, though the former received only one vote from integrity, which is a host-related antecedent (Farlampaki, Stergiou, & Kaniadakis, 2019). As for the latter, guest-related antecedents were paramount to the support among hosts, platforms, and residents for home sharing—eight votes garnered. Social-related antecedents were next on the list with six votes, followed by property- and value-related antecedents with four votes each, location-related antecedents with three votes, and macroenvironment-related antecedents with two votes. Indeed, the decisions of responsible conduct and support are important to the success and sustainability of home sharing, and thus, deserve additional attention—especially given the increasing concerns of discrimination in the marketplace for home sharing in recent times (Farlampaki & Kladou, 2020; Zhu, 2020).

3.3. Outcomes

Outcomes refer to the evaluations that emerge subsequent to behavioral performance or non-performance (Paul & Benito, 2018). The review reveals two major outcomes of home sharing—namely loyalty and impact.

3.3.1. Loyalty

Loyalty is a prominent outcome among guests who have had the opportunity to stay in shared homes transacted via online and paid home-sharing platforms. In line with Zhu, Cheng, Wang, Ma, and Jiang (2019), the content analysis of the review herein reaffirms that guest loyalty is manifested in three prominent ways, namely:

- cognitive loyalty, which derives from comparisons of previous knowledge or recent information that leads to disclosure and recommendation of a preferred alternative (Baute-Diaz, Gutierrez-Taño, & Diaz-Armas, 2020; Shi et al., 2019);
- affective loyalty, which emerges from pleasurable experiences that lead to attachment, brand love, satisfaction, trust, and psychological ownership (Lee et al., 2019; Mody & Hanks, 2020); and
- conative loyalty, which relates to future stays and listings of shared homes (Wang et al., 2020; Ye, Ying, Zhou, & Wang, 2019).

Among the three manifestations of loyalty, affective loyalty emerged with the highest number of votes (178 votes), followed by conative (105 votes) and cognitive (54 votes) loyalty. When cognitive loyalty is considered, host- and trust-related evaluations appear to have the highest impact with 12 votes each, followed by guest- and platform-related evaluations with nine votes each, social-related evaluations with six votes, and property-, location-, and value-related evaluations with two votes each. Whereas, when affective loyalty is considered, platform-related evaluations produced the highest impact with 28 votes, followed by host- and property-related evaluations with 27 votes each, value-related evaluations with 26 votes, social-related evaluations with 22 votes, trust-related evaluations with 14 votes, guest-related evaluations with 11 votes, and macroenvironment-related evaluations with 2 votes. Finally, when conative loyalty is considered, platform-related evaluations had the highest impact with 19 votes, followed by social-related evaluations with 18 votes, guest- and value-related evaluations with 14 votes, host-, property-, and trust-related evaluations with 9 votes each, tourism-related evaluations with three votes, and macroenvironment-related evaluations with two votes. More importantly, these loyalty outcomes were mostly related to guests as opposed to hosts, whose evaluations mainly revolved around future listings and psychological ownership (Lee et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020), and thus, future research that examines the loyalty of hosts to home-sharing practices in the marketplace would help to fill in the extant gap in this area.

3.3.2. Impact

Impact is another noteworthy outcome of marketing exchange for home sharing in the marketplace. While existing insights on loyalty were highly focused on the guest perspective, most outcome constructs organized under impact spoke to a broader range of stakeholders. In total, four impact outcomes were revealed through the review: economic returns, externalities, tourism growth, and value co-creation. Economic returns, which affect hosts, received the highest number of votes (74 votes). This is followed by externalities (30 votes), which affect countries and (neighborhood) residents, value co-creation (29 votes), which affects guests, hosts, and platforms, and tourism growth (12 votes), which affects country performance. Upon detailed scrutiny, the review indicates that economic returns—such as property appreciation, listing performance, and host revenue—were most impacted by host-related evaluations (15 votes), followed by platform- and property- (11 votes each), trust- (seven votes), tourism- (five votes), guest- (four votes), value- (three votes), and macroenvironment-related (two votes) evaluations. Whereas, externalities—such as environmental, socioeconomic, and tourismphobia outcomes—were most impacted by property-related evaluations (14 votes), followed by social-, value-, and macroenvironment-related evaluations (four votes each), and guest- and host-related evaluations (two votes each). Tourism growth received the most votes from macroenvironment-related evaluations (four votes), followed by property- and value-related evaluations (two votes each), and social-related evaluations (one vote). Finally, value co-creation, as the name suggests, was most impacted by value-related evaluations with 16 votes, followed by social- (six votes), host- (three votes), property- (two votes), and platform-related (one vote) evaluations.

4. How do we know?

4.1. Theories

Theories are a means for scholarly advancement. Like a compass, theories provide scholars with a guide that they can use to search for answers to their research questions in the pursuit of meeting their research objectives. Guided by theories in the form of the ADO and TCM frameworks (Paul & Benito, 2018; Paul et al., 2017), the present review of conceptual and empirical articles on home sharing published in “marketing and tourism” journal titles ranked “A*” or “A” in the ABDC journal ranking list reveals a number of pertinent insights on the theories for home-sharing research.

First, this review found an astonishing amount of theories that have been used to guide home-sharing research (see Table 4). In total, 75 different theories have been applied to home-sharing research in 110 articles. Indeed, the sheer volume of theories is rare and remarkable, especially given that the earliest articles on home sharing in this review were only five-years old at the time of writing—i.e., Guttentag (2015), Möhlmann (2015), and Philip et al. (2015).

Second, the ratio of 1.5:1 for the number of articles with theory to theory indicates that the current theoretical landscape of home-sharing research in “A*” and “A” journals may have the breadth but not the depth in scholarly insights. Indeed, the broad range of theories corresponds to the breadth of antecedents, decisions, and outcomes that was depicted in Fig. 4 and the lack of depth in the first- and third-order knowledge illustrated in Table 3.

Third, the large number of theories indicates that there is no
Table 4
List of theories.

| Theory Main focus | N articles | Theory Main focus | N articles |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| Agency theory    | Participants 1 | Revealed preferences theory | Participants 1 |
| Agglomeration theory | Properties 1 | Semantics perspective | Properties 1 |
| Appeals (rhetorical) theory | Participants 2 | Service dominant logic | Product 3 |
| Attachment theory | Participants 1 | Service language model | Properties 1 |
| Bottom-up spillover theory | Participants 1 | Sharing-exchange continuaum | Product 1 |
| Cognitive appraisal theory | Participants 2 | Signaling theory | Product 4 |
| Competitive advantage theory | Product 1 | Similarity-attraction theory | Properties 2 |
| Construal level theory | Participants 7 | Social categorization theory | Properties 1 |
| Crime pattern theory | Properties 1 | Social comparison theory | Properties 1 |
| Diffusion of innovation theory | Properties 3 | Social contact model | Properties 1 |
| Disruptive innovation theory | Properties 4 | Social exchange theory | Properties 6 |
| Environmental commitment and sacrifice theory | Properties 1 | Social model of disability | Properties 1 |
| Fogg behavior model | Participants 1 | Social penetration theory | Properties 1 |
| Grounded theory | Participants 7 | Social presence theory | Properties 3 |
| Entrepreneurship theory | Properties 1 | Sociotechnical theory | Properties 1 |
| Expectation (dis)confirmation theory | Participants 1 | Spatial triad theory | Product 1 |
| Hedonic pricing model | Properties 10 | Stimulus-organism-response theory | Participants 2 |
| Information systems success model | Properties 1 | Tax planning theory | Properties 1 |
| Interactive value formation | Properties 1 | Technology acceptance model | Properties 1 |
| Intimacy theory | Participants 1 | Theory of asymmetric information | Participants 2 |
| Lifecycle model | Properties 1 | Theory of boundary spanning | Product 1 |
| Macroeconomic theory | Properties 1 | Theory of consumption systems | Properties 1 |
| Marketing exchange theory | Product 1 | Theory of extended self | Participants 1 |
| Means-end-chain theory | Participants 2 | Theory of formal and substantive rationality | Participants 1 |
| Microeconomic theory | Properties 1 | Theory of monopolistic competition | Properties 1 |
| Moral identity theory | Participants 1 | Theory of planned behavior | Participants 4 |
| Motivation theory | Participants 1 | Theory of power | Participants 1 |
| Network sociality theory | Properties 1 | Theory of reasoned action | Participants 3 |
| Plutchik’s emotion wheel | Participants 1 | Theory of self | Participants 1 |
| Observational learning theory | Participants 1 | Transaction theory | Properties 1 |
| Power theory | Participants 1 | Triple tier systems framework | Properties 1 |
| Practice theory | Properties 1 | Trust theory | Properties 2 |
| Prism of epistemic culture | Properties 1 | Trust transfer theory | Properties 1 |
| Prospect theory | Participants 2 | Two-factor (motivation-hygiene) theory | Participants 1 |
| Protection motivation theory | Participants 1 | Utilization maximization theory | Participants 1 |
| Rational action (choice) theory | Participants 2 | Value-belief-norm theory | Participants 1 |
| Relational demography theory | Properties 1 | With theory | 110 |
| Rent gap theory | Properties 1 | Without theory | 112 |
| Resource-based theory | Properties 1 | 222 |

Note: 3Ps of marketing exchange = participants, product, properties. Participants = guest, host, platform. Product = property. Properties = location, social factors, trust, value, macroenvironment, tourism. See full list of articles and associated theories in Appendix 3.

Table 5
Contextual coverage.

| Context | n of articles | % of articles | Context | n of articles | % of articles |
|---------|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| Population | Guests only | 97 | 43.7 | Countries (cont.) | Norway | 3 | 1.2 |
| Host only | 93 | 41.9 | Portugal | 3 | 1.2 |
| Host and guests | 24 | 10.8 | South Korea | 3 | 1.2 |
| Residents only | 8 | 3.6 | Thailand | 3 | 1.2 |
| Platform | Airbnb | 192 | 86.5 | Austria | 2 | 0.8 |
| Xiaozhu | 8 | 3.6 | New Zealand | 2 | 0.8 |
| Tuja | 1 | 0.5 | Turkey | 2 | 0.8 |
| Others | 21 | 9.5 | Brazil | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Denmark | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Egypt | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Estonia | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Iceland | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | India | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Jamaica | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Jordan | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Malta | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Russia | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Sweden | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Switzerland | 1 | 0.4 |
| | | | Vietnam | 1 | 0.4 |
Table 6
Research approach.

| Approach                        | N of articles | Sample articles                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Conceptual (n = 4)              |              | Dolnicar and Zare (2020); Gutentag (2015),           |
| Conceptual analysis             |              |                                                      |
| Qualitative (n = 78)            |              | Adamiai (2018); Brochado, Troilo, and Adiyya (2017),|
| Content analysis (e.g., Leximancer software) | 31         | Farmaki et al. (2020); Shi et al. (2019),           |
| Thematic analysis (e.g., NVivo software) | 27         | Grimmer, Vorobiovas-Pinta, and Massey (2019); Keogh, Kriz, Barnes, and Rosenberger (2020), |
| Case study                      | 7            |                                                      |
| Netography                      | 5            | Randle and Dolnicar (2019); Shapit and Bjerke (2019),|
| Co-occurrence analysis (e.g., Geph software) | 4           | Cheng and Foley (2018); Cheng and Zhang (2019),     |
| Other qualitative analyses (e.g., critical incident analysis, Lexical analysis) | 4           | Pera et al. (2019); Tussydiah and Zach (2017),      |
| Quantitative (n = 148)          |              |                                                      |
| Regression analysis (e.g., methods = binomial, binomial logistic, frontier, hedonic, instrumental variables probit, logistic, multinomial logistic, multiple, ordered, rank, ordinal, ordinary least squares, panel, poisson, principal component, probability, quantile, spatial, stepwise, time series, tobit, weighted; software = R, SPSS, and Stata) | 72         | Abrate and Viglia (2019); Cai et al. (2019); Falk et al. (2019) Mahdeev (2020); Wu, Ma, and Xie (2017); Xie and Mao (2017); Yang and Mao (2020), |
| Structural equation modeling (e.g., method = covariance-based, partial least squares; software = AMOS, SmartPLS) | 43         | Agag and Eid (2019); Suess et al. (2020),           |
| Other quantitative analyses (e.g., ANOVA, t-test) | 33         | Belarmino et al. (2019); Gutentag et al. (2018),     |
| Experimental (n = 14)           |              |                                                      |
| Multiple experiment             | 8            | Pera et al. (2019); Shuqair, Pinto, and Mattila (2019) |
| Quasi-experiment                | 3            | Song, Xie, Park, and Chen (2020); Su and Mattila (2019), |
| Choice experiment               | 1            | Karlsson et al. (2017),                             |
| Simulated experiment (e.g., agent-based modeling) | 1           | Vinogradov, Leick, and Kivedal (2020),              |
| Single experiment               | 1            | Liu and Mattila (2017),                             |

shortage of theories that could be considered and deployed in future home-sharing research. Hedonic pricing model was the most popular theory (10 articles). This is unsurprising given that most articles in our review examined a wide range of attributes that avail on home-sharing listings, which resonates the call and premise of the hedonic pricing model for multi-attribute investigations (Cai, Zhou, & Scott, 2019; Chattopadhyay & Mitra, 2020; Chen & Xie, 2017; Falk, Larpin, & Scaglione, 2019; Gibbs et al., 2018; Moreno-Izquierdo et al., 2019, 2020; Ønder, Wiesmayer, & Gunter, 2019; Tang, Kim, & Wang, 2019; Tong & Gunter, 2020). The other two theories that join the hedonic pricing model to make up the top three most-used theories for home-sharing research are the construal level theory (seven articles) and the social exchange theory (seven articles). The rest of the theories were used by less than five articles. However, we believe that the paradox of choice is a potential issue that future scholars may encounter as a result of having too many theories to choose from. To mitigate this potential problem, the 3Ps of marketing exchange, which was originally conceived earlier to organize the 10 antecedents of marketing exchange in home sharing, is applied to help future scholars identify suitable theories that resonate with the main focus of their home-sharing research: participants, product, or properties.

Finally, this review finds that premier journals in marketing and tourism remain receptive to research that relies only on literature reviews to guide scholarly investigations, as evidenced by 112 out of 222 (50.5%) articles that did not use a theory. This shortcoming may be attributed to existing systematic reviews that failed to offer a comprehensive list of theories for future research, which is now resolved through the present review.

4.2. Contexts

Contexts relate to the circumstances that entail in the investigation (Paul et al., 2017). This review considers three main contexts that characterize the 222 articles under study: population, platform, and countries (see Table 5). In terms of population, 43.7% of articles in the review concentrated on guests, whereas 41.9% of articles focused on hosts, 10.8% of articles considered both hosts and guests, and 3.6% of articles shed light on residents only. The population mix of guests and hosts appears to be healthy, but additional attention may be given to residents in future research given the importance of neighborhoods in creating a convivial experience for guests of shared homes (Stergiou & Farmaki, 2019). Next, in terms of platform, most articles have focused on Airbnb as a home-sharing platform (86.5%), with a small number of articles considering its local competitors, such as XiaoZhu (3.6%) and TuJia (0.5%) in China. This is unsurprising given the dominance of Airbnb worldwide. Finally, in terms of countries, most studies on home sharing have been conducted in the United States (30.6%). The composition of countries is worrying as Africa and Asia appear to be underrepresented, and thus, deserves scrutiny in future research.

4.3. Methods

Methods entail the nature of empirical evidence that investigations develop (Paul et al., 2017). This review considers two major attributes of methods that characterize the 222 articles under study: research approach and research data.

The research approach that was used in home-sharing research is fourfold: conceptual, qualitative, quantitative, and experimental (see Table 6). Two-thirds of the articles in the review employed a quantitative method (148 articles), with regression-based analysis (72 articles) being the most preferred method of analysis due to the variety of quantitative data that could be analyzed using this method. Seventy-eight articles pursued a qualitative approach, with content analysis (31 articles) and thematic analysis (27 articles) being the top two most preferred methods to analyze qualitative data. Conceptual and experimental methods were least used, which in turn, corroborates with the lack of first- and third-order knowledge that we uncovered and encourage future research to pursue previously.

The research data that was used had a healthy balance between primary and secondary data (see Table 7). It appears rather odd in the first instance that many studies have decided to use secondary data, but the availability and relevance of such data for home-sharing research...
has made secondary data especially popular and useful. In particular, 89 out of 139 articles relied on secondary data pertaining to listings on home-sharing platforms. AirbnbDNA (32 articles) and Inside Airbnb (21 articles) were the mostly wide-used secondary data for Airbnb listings, whereas Python (12 articles) was the software that was utilized the most to crawl and scrape listings as an alternative to purchasing listings from AirbnbDNA and Inside Airbnb. In terms of primary data, online surveys were highly popular, with Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) (27 articles) and Qualtrics (11 articles) representing the most-used crowd-sourcing alternatives to administer online surveys. Most qualitative studies relied on in-depth interviews (23 articles), with online interviews (6 articles) emerging as the second alternative alongside focus groups (6 articles). The alternative to interviews were observations, which indicates the lack of variety in data artefacts that could be suitably used to enrich the symbolic meanings that typifies qualitative research. Nevertheless, the acceptance of data collected by third parties was notably used to enrich the symbolic meanings that typifies qualitative research. Which indicates the lack of variety in data artefacts that could be suitably used to enrich the symbolic meanings that typifies qualitative insights. Nevertheless, the acceptance of data collected by third parties was notably used to enrich the symbolic meanings that typifies qualitative research.

### Table 7

| Data | n of articles | Sample articles |
|------|--------------|----------------|
| Primary (n = 124) Qualitative (n = 40) In-depth interviews | 23 | Farmaki et al. (2020); Keogh et al. (2020), |
| Focus group interviews | 6 | Buhalis et al. (2020); Kim et al. (2020), |
| Online interviews (e.g., Skype) | 6 | Farmaki (2019); Philip et al. (2015), |
| Written interviews | 2 | Kim et al. (2020); Paulauksaite, Powell, Coca-Stefaniak, and Morrison (2017), |
| Observation | 2 | Buhalis et al. (2020); Jokela and Minoia (2020), |
| Online observation | 1 | Shhapit and Bjork (2019), |
| Quantitative (n = 84) Online survey (n = 68) MTurk | 27 | Birinci, Berezina, and Cobanoglu (2018); Mody and Hanks (2020), |
| Self-collected | 15 | Hajihiab and Doliacar (2017); Wang et al. (2020), |
| Qualtrics | 11 | Mody et al. (2019b, 2019c); Moon et al. (2019), |
| SoJump | 4 | Shi et al. (2019); Ye et al. (2019, 2020), |
| SurveyMonkey | 4 | Amaro et al. (2019); Yang et al. (2018, 2019), |
| Third party | 4 | Garau-Valledell et al. (2019); Liang et al. (2018a, 2018b), |
| CATI | 1 | Berg, Slettemels, Kjarstad, and Rosenberg (2020), |
| Prolific Academic | 1 | Jiang et al. (2019), |
| Toluna | 1 | Baute-Diaz et al. (2020), |
| Offline survey | 16 | Ju, Back, Choi, and Lee (2019); Priporas et al. (2017a, 2017b), |
| Secondary (n = 139) Listings (n = 89) Airbnb listings (n = 80) AirDNA | 32 | Adamiak (2018); Ert and Fleischer (2019), |
| Inside Airbnb | 21 | Gil and Sequeria (2020); Tussyadah and Park (2018), |
| Self-collected: Unspecified | 19 | Chen and Xie (2017); Xie and Mao (2017, 2019), |
| Self-collected: Python | 3 | Martin-Fuentes et al. (2018); Sun, Liu, Zhu, Chen, and Yuan (2019), |
| Self-collected: Ruby | 2 | Liang et al. (2017, 2020), |
| Self-collected: ParseHub | 1 | Ju et al. (2019), |
| Unspecified third party | 1 | Li and Srinivasan (2019), |
| Valais Tourism Observatory | 1 | Falk et al. (2019), |
| Xiaohu listings: Self-collected (Python) Wu et al. (2017); Xie and Chen (2019), | 8 | |
| Tuja listings: Self-collected (Python) Liu et al. (2020), | 1 | |
| Online reviews (e.g., Airbnb community, AirbnbBell, Facebook, TripAdvisor, TrustPilot, Twitter, self-collected) | 18 | Shhapit (2019); Shchapit and Bjork (2019), |
| Government data and report | 17 | Volgger, Pfoer, Stavenoiga, Taplin, and Matthews (2018); Wyman, Mothorpe, and McLeod (2020), |
| Industry data and reports (e.g., CoreLogic, Infogroup, Smith Travel Research) Muller (2020); Yang and Mao (2020), | 4 | Cheng, Zhang, and Wong (2020); Zho (2020), |
| Online forum (e.g., Airbnb, Facebook) Hassani, Small, and Darcy (2019); Pern and Viglia (2016), | 5 | |
| Other sources of secondary data (e.g., Airbnb stories on YouTube; online comments on The Guardian; newspapers on ProQuest; blogs, magazines, newspapers, webpages) | 4 | |
| Location data (e.g., Google Earth, Open Street Map) Xu, Hu, La, Wang, and Huang (2020); Yang and Mao (2020), | 2 | |

5. Where should we be heading?

At the end of each section in the preceding review, we briefly advised future research on the ways to strengthen the categories of marketing knowledge underpinning the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes of marketing exchange in home sharing. Moreover, we cued future research on home sharing to consider the unique peculiarities that we uncovered from our review of the theories, contexts, and methods that entail home-sharing studies published in premier journals. These “tips” for future research were intentionally relayed upfront as we made a deliberate decision to dedicate the next sections for pathways that we believe will substantially advance the theoretical novelty, contextual relevance, and methodological rigor of future research on home sharing in view of recent developments and unprecedented global changes. Specifically, the profound effect of COVID-19, declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 12, 2020, on travel has fundamentally affected home sharing and the way future marketing and tourism research on home sharing ought to be conducted. The pandemic’s impact on home sharing cannot be ignored and that future marketing and tourism research from this...
point onwards must not pretend that this seismic change is irrelevant. Hence, what we intend to curate in the next sections are pathways that reimagine the marketing exchange in home sharing in view of the ‘new normal’ (see Table 8 for a summary). This pertains to public-health measures—such as social distancing, travel and mobility bans, community lockdowns, limits on public gatherings, stay-at-home campaigns, and self- or mandatory-quarantine—that have halted global travel and will alter hospitality and tourism marketing.

5.1. Pathways for advancing theoretical novelty

Despite having identified in the systematic review 75 different theories applied to home-sharing research, we opined that many of these theories, on their own, will not provide novel insights to home sharing for marketing and tourism scholarship in times of global crises and pandemics. In light of the 3Ps of marketing exchange presented herein, we further propose three novel theoretical lenses to enrich home-sharing research in light of COVID-19 and predicted future outbreaks.

5.1.1. Reimagining social interactions

As revealed in our review, social-related antecedents could explain the nature of social interactions between hosts and guests (Cheng & Zhang, 2019; Philip et al., 2015). While the host is central to the guest’s experience of home sharing (Lynch, 2005), and there is evidence of a reciprocal nature of encounters between guests and hosts (Fischer, Pahus, & Bager, 2019), we predict that interactions will be very different during COVID-19 and a post-pandemic period. This is because people are now encouraged to (1) distance themselves socially, (2) avoid physical contact such as touching and shaking hands, and (3) employ hygienic practices, which may mean the difference between catching and not catching the virus. Personal, one-to-one interactions used to be home sharing’s competitive edge over hotels that offer a service with no personal ties. Thus, the value of interactions that transpire in authentic experiences and when socializing with the locals (Gutentag, 2015; Shi et al., 2019) are now questionable.

Given the ‘new normal,’ we encourage future research to explore the potential of technology in mediating the social dynamics of host-guest relations without undermining the personality of the experience. This is because during the COVID-19 lockdown, technology became the tool that people depended on to keep life going, with business meetings conducted via videoconferencing, virtual dinner parties emerging, and university lectures running online. Similarly, social and cultural experiences in travel are carried out online such as Airbnb’s latest campaign, “Go there without going anywhere.” Airbnb’s latest offering of experiences and unique activities has moved online where hosts can now offer cooking classes or bee-keeping virtual tours online, which goes on to show that the concept of home sharing may evolve and transcend beyond the delivery of accommodation services and into the offering of other social practice-led home-based experiences. To shed light on how social practices in home sharing can evolve from colloqued to tech-mediated, yet retain their core meanings, future researchers are encouraged to consider three research questions:

- What do hosts and guests reassemble social practices and interactions in tech-mediated spaces?
- What conditions are required to maintain the core meanings of social interactions in home sharing?
- How can social practice-led home-based experiences enable the “home” in home sharing to be commercialized beyond accommodation?

Using practice theories as a theoretical framing, future researchers could investigate how social interactions are translated online by looking at the role of technology during social-practice performances. They can further challenge the boundaries of co-presence to explain what hosts and guests gain and lose during tech-mediated interactions by combining practice theory with assemblage thinking as a novel theoretical approach. Specifically, assemblage thinking (DeLanda, 2016) holds the potential to capture the requisite components and conditions for reassembling social-relational practices that have capacity to adapt to change (i.e., new environments, new channels) and evolve, which we believe are important nuances that could enrich our understanding of social interactions in the ‘new normal.’

5.1.2. Reimagining motivations

Decisions to use home sharing as a tourism product for marketing exchange will also be different during (and after) COVID-19. Generally, there are risks when traveling to a new country or sharing a home with a stranger. From the tourist’s perspective, perceived risks are important predictors of tourists’ behaviors in avoiding travel to infected destinations (Cooper, 2008), thereby creating potential implications for property-related antecedents. Indeed, visitors’ sense of safety influences their behavior to travel (Zou & Meng, 2019), and this sense will be heightened during a pandemic, and after borders open and restrictions ease, where those sharing a home will require greater efforts to gain trust in the other. This implies that hosts will have to maintain high standards of cleanliness and both parties must ensure that they are not carrying the virus, knowingly or unknowingly, with new screening practices likely to emerge.

Existing studies have found that online photos and physical interactions can build and solidify trust and manage expected experiences among participants in the marketing exchange of home sharing (Ert, Fleischer, & Magen, 2016; Gutentag, 2015). Future researchers could investigate how social distancing requirements and wearing face masks that cover most of the facial features—whether these become normalized—can hinder trust being built in home sharing where critical trust constructs may no longer exist in an ecosystem of the ‘new normal.’ Vulnerability is presented as an important concept to research; trusting parties must be vulnerable to some extent for trust to become operational (Disney & Cannon, 1997). In times of crisis, one party often perceives themselves to be physically more vulnerable than others in efforts of self-protection (Dean, Wentworth, & LeCompte, 2019). Other research avenues can look to compare the fundamental human motivation to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) when traveling to new destinations compared to perceptions of vulnerability and fears of contamination that may also hinder trust in the host and the sharing experience.

From the host’s perspective, the poor demand for home sharing despite the ability and willingness of hosts to share their home in times of pandemics puts them at financial risk. COVID-19 has worsened an already difficult situation for hosts (e.g., job insecurity, income instability, lack of insurance and other benefits) due to intensifying competition emerging from the growth of tourism micro-entrepreneurs (Sigala & Dolnicar, 2017) and non-standard working opportunities (Stewart & Stanford, 2017) in the marketplace. Hosts may experience increased financial pressures if they solely depended on traditional home-sharing marketing exchanges (e.g., accommodation) to cover their mortgages with no alternative income streams, health insurance, or income protection schemes to cover them for a loss of income or in case they get infected while ‘working and sharing.’ From the perspective of internal marketing and the people perspective of the marketing mix, hosts become vulnerable unofficial employees that may not be entitled to government subsidies provided to those impacted by COVID-19 (Sigala, 2020). This is especially true for home-sharing workers, as opposed to casual employees (Goods, Veen, & Barratt, 2019). COVID-19 highlights the struggles of non-standard workers, and how they must look for different ways to support themselves during forced closures or changing the way they host, with the need to rethink long-term viability of these types of ‘gigs’ in hospitality and tourism (Martins, Rierdan, & Dolnicar, 2020). Further research can utilize emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983) as a theoretical approach to understand the
pressures emerging from marketing exchanges of gig work during global crises.

Fear and concerns for sharing homes during the COVID-19 outbreak also puts a spotlight on the manifested forms of discrimination and xenophobia that were already evident in home sharing based on race or socio-economic class (Cheng & Foley, 2018; Schor & Attwood-Charles, 2017). Responsible conduct related to host integrity, and guest support of hosts, platform and neighborhood residents, which emerged from the review as part of their decisions to use home sharing will be of utmost importance to the sustainability of home sharing. Despite efforts to end discrimination against others (e.g., Airbnb’s anti-discrimination policy pre COVID-19), the issue is heightened with disease racialization. With no basis in medical facts, incidents are being reported on the avoidance of Chinese businesses, services, and disease racialization (e.g., Aguilera, 2020). Hence, we recommend future research to consider a set of research questions in relation to the motivations to travel and/or share a home:

- How does perceived risk of travel and contamination impact trust in the host, property, and platform? What implications does this have on the likelihood of booking and/or having a positive home-sharing experience?
- How do tourists negotiate the need to belong while traveling to new destinations and staying in shared homes in light of perceptions of vulnerability and fears of contamination?
- How does emotional labor manifest in hosting during a pandemic outbreak? How does it impact a host’s vulnerability and wellbeing?
- How does digital discrimination manifest in host practices and guest booking selection? To what extent does race and/or country of origin impact these decisions? How are notions of power balance and freedom (e.g., part of the sharing economy ethos) impacted with current digital discrimination?
- What can marketers do to overcome the aforementioned challenges and to convince hosts and guests of the continued relevance and value of home sharing to meet their needs?

5.2.2. Reimagining externalities

Our systematic review revealed that most empirical studies on home sharing are set in the American and European context. We believe that home sharing is a unique context that would benefit from replication in non-Western contexts (e.g., Africa and Asia). We suspect that the antecedents relating to guest, host, trust, value, and social aspects of home sharing are likely to be susceptible to cultural influences—as precluded by the findings of cross-cultural differences by past scholars in the area of international marketing (Ito, Walker, & Liang, 2014; McCort & Malhotra, 1993). We encourage future research to examine collective-oriented values that may moderate or intervene the effects of these antecedents on decisions and outcomes relating to marketing exchange in home sharing. Furthermore, cross-cultural research is crucial in establishing the validity and generalizability of theories and concepts (Slater & Yanì-de-Soriano, 2010). That is, we believe that cross-cultural studies would be particularly helpful in understanding the often-mixed results regarding the relationship between existing antecedents, decisions, and outcomes. Future home-sharing research should also delve into understanding cultural or ethnic differences with respect to consumer sentiments, expectations, and motives linked to home sharing experience. To put it simply, we propose two additional research questions for future research that would enhance the contextual relevance of home-sharing studies in marketing and tourism:

- Do culture(s) moderate the relationships between antecedents, decisions, and outcomes in home sharing, and if so, how?
- What can hosts do to cater to cultural differences among guests in home sharing?

5.2.2. Reimagining externalities

History has proven that disasters often lead to significant changes in human society. As consumers cope with the COVID-19 pandemic and adapt to the ‘new normal,’ what determines their attitudes, perceptions, and decisions may become different. Future research should take into account, for example, the moderating effects of psychological constructs caused by the pandemic such as emotions (e.g., panic, fear, gratitude, and empathy) on the relationships between the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes. There is also a need for research on exploring how the shift of consumption priorities and goals affects consumers’
travel and accommodation choice in home sharing. Moreover, future work in this area will require accurate and comprehensive forecasts of the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on home-sharing demand that are essential to practitioners for decision-making, planning, and resource management. Thus, we propose two new research questions relating to context for future research on home sharing in marketing and tourism:

- How do participant-related attributes moderate the relationship of product- and property-related attributes affecting the decisions and outcomes of marketing exchange in home sharing?
- How has the prioritization of marketing exchange shifted in light of new externalities such as COVID-19 and how has these shifts impacted the decisions and outcomes of marketing exchange in home sharing?

5.2.3. Reimagining platforms

We observed that the reviewed studies are predominantly focused on Airbnb as a home sharing platform, and because the history and nature of one platform differs from another, future research should replicate and extend some of these studies to other platforms, such as FlipKey, Homestay, Xiaozhu, and Tujia. Also, we believe that more attention needs to be devoted to examine and compare the relative impact of platform-related antecedents (e.g., algorithmic management, brand impression, customer service support, policy, etc.) across various platforms as these analyse can be used for brand comparison purposes to build competitive advantages. Trust is considered a prerequisite for the success of home-sharing hosting. Recent research has reported the impact of anthropomorphism (i.e., the attribution of human characteristics or behavior to non-human entities) on people’s assessment of the trust-worthiness of a product or service (Foehr & Germelmann, 2020). Building on existing studies on trust-related antecedents that were largely focused on Airbnb, future research could test the trust-related effects of brand anthropomorphism on behavior using other platforms. To this end, we propose two more research questions that we believe will enrich contextual understanding in future research on home sharing in marketing and tourism:

- Do marketing exchanges in home sharing differ according to platforms, and if so, how?
- How do hosts and guests perceive home-sharing brands and what can these brands do to strengthen their relationship with and trust among these participants of marketing exchange in home sharing?

| Pathways for advancing theoretical novelty | Research questions | Methods |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reimagining social interactions | How do hosts and guests reassemble social practices and interactions in tech-mediated spaces? What conditions are required to maintain the core meanings of social interactions in home sharing? How can social practice-led home-based experiences enable the “home” in home sharing to be commercialized beyond accommodation? | Ethnographic fieldwork combining autobiography, reflexive/travel writing, sensory anthropology, formal/informal interviews, and/or participant observations. |
| Reimagining motivations | How does perceived risk of travel and contamination impact trust in the host, property, and platform? What implications does this have on the likelihood of booking and/or having a positive home-sharing experience? How do tourists negotiate the need to belong while traveling to new destinations and staying in shared homes in light of perceptions of vulnerability and fears of contamination? How does emotional labor manifest in hosting during a pandemic outbreak? How does it impact a host’s vulnerability and wellbeing? How does digital discrimination manifest in host practices and guest booking selection? To what extent does race and/or country of origin impact these decisions? How are notions of power balance and freedom (e.g., part of the sharing economy ethos) impacted with current digital discrimination? What can marketers do to overcome the aforementioned challenges and to convince hosts and guests of the continued relevance and value of home sharing to meet their needs? | Sentiment analytics using big data combined with survey-based research. In-depth interviews. Focus groups and in-depth interviews. Mixed methods such as netnography, interviews, and surveys. Experiments and surveys using projective techniques. |
| Reimagining shared spaces | If the pandemic causes more individuals to become germophobes, how does the concept of contamination impact the marketing of home sharing in the longer-term? Does the call for social distancing mean the end of sharing home spaces that entail social closeness, and the ideals of sharing and caring for others that the so-called sharing economy has brought to the surface? If so, what can marketers do to avoid the demise of home sharing and to ignite another wave of disruption that home sharing could bring to the marketplace? | Focus group and in-depth interviews using projective techniques. Participant observation online (communities/forums/blogs/social media) and offline (homes shared) and in-depth interviews. |
| Pathways for enhancing contextual relevance | Research questions | Methods |
| Reimagining cultures | Do culture(s) moderate the relationships between antecedents, decisions, and outcomes in home sharing, and if so, how? What can hosts do to cater to cultural differences among guests in home sharing? | Experiments and surveys. Experiments and surveys. |
| Reimagining externalities | How do participant-related attributes moderate the relationship of product- and property-related attributes affecting the decisions and outcomes of marketing exchange in home sharing? How has the priorities of marketing exchange shifted in light of new externalities such as COVID-19 and how has these shifts impacted the decisions and outcomes of marketing exchange in home sharing? Do marketing exchanges in home sharing differ according to platforms, and if so, how? How do hosts and guests perceive home-sharing brands and what can these brands do to strengthen their relationship with and trust among these participants of marketing exchange in home sharing? | Experiments and surveys. Secondary data analysis of industry and company reports, stock market analysis, travel statistics, and country policies. Experiments using projective techniques and psychophysiological measures in neuroscience. |
| Reimagining platforms | | |
5.3. Pathways for improving methodological rigor

Notwithstanding the multitude of methods that could be employed for home-sharing research, as observed through our review, we maintain that new methods must emerge in order to equip future scholars with additional tools that could yield richer and more rigorous insights on home sharing in marketing and tourism. Hence, we dedicate three sub-sections that speak to each category of marketing knowledge, namely first-order knowledge relating to concepts, second-order knowledge relating to associations, and third-order knowledge relating to causes-and-effects.

5.3.1. Reimagining first-order knowledge

Our findings revealed the lack of (new) first-order knowledge relating to home-sharing research—most studies appear to have borrowed concepts from other streams of literature (e.g., general consumer behavior, guest behavior in hotel settings). In light of this shortcoming, we encourage future research to adopt conceptual approaches predicated on systematic reviews to develop new concepts and theories that will advance our theoretical understanding in this area. Future research could consider theory development-based reviews (Lim, 2020; Paul, 2019a; Paul & Mas, 2020). This approach to systematic review helps analyze and challenge existing assumptions, arguments, and philosophies, which serves to provide a radical view of home sharing and its place in the marketing and tourism domains, and thus, to develop new concepts and theories in the area. Another type of systematic review that could lead to first-order knowledge is theory-based review (Gilal et al., 2019; Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019; Hassan et al., 2016). This form of review has holds considerable potential given the absence of depth in conceptual and theoretical insights in home-sharing research as well as the ‘new normal’ in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. Future research could review the collection of concepts and theories relating to home sharing and analyze their unique peculiarities, the evolvement and development of these existing concepts and theories in the field, and to consolidate and refine their boundaries for furthering conceptual and theory advancement. The methods-based review is also another option that future scholars can consider to strengthen the building blocks of home sharing predicated on first-order knowledge (Hair et al., 2017; Ji et al., 2019; Perera et al., 2020).

In particular, future research could conduct an in-depth review covering the ontological, and epistemological considerations that could be used to promote methodological rigor in conceptualization and operationalization endeavors in home-sharing research. Thus, we propose three research objectives for future research to broaden the base of first-order knowledge on home sharing in marketing and tourism:

- To develop new concepts and theories for home sharing using theory development-based reviews (see Lim, 2020; Paul, 2019a; Paul & Mas, 2020).
- To consolidate and refine concepts and theories based on a review of existing concepts and theories for home sharing using theory-based reviews (see Gilal et al., 2019; Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019; Hassan et al., 2016).
- To strengthen methodological rigor in the conceptualization and operationalization of concepts and theories in home-sharing research using methods-based reviews (Hair et al., 2017; Ji et al., 2019; Perera et al., 2020).

5.3.2. Reimagining second-order knowledge

Despite the predominance of second-order knowledge in the existing home-sharing literature, we see new opportunities for future scholarly development. Our review suggested that scholars seem to favor quantitative methods, while the reviewed qualitative studies relied mainly on in-depth and focus group interviews. As the lines of research on this topic developed with emerging issues (e.g., COVID-19 crisis and development) are being explored, the field needs more interpretive methodologies that enable an in-depth and meaning-based understanding of the subject. For example, this field can benefit immensely by employing a combination of ethnographic fieldwork, autobiography, and travel writing to unravel the social dynamics and complex meanings that underlie host-guest relations (Makkar & Yap, 2020). Likewise, the sensory anthropology (i.e., the study of socio-cultural responses to sensory stimuli) that is grounded in the concept of embodiment can offer different insights as compared to traditional surveys, interviews, and experiments (Scott & Uncles, 2018). Scholars may apply this sensory approach to ethnographic study to generate multi-sensory data about home-sharing consumption experiences. To elicit deeper insights, visual methods can be applied as archival data for analysis, direct and projective stimuli for data collection, and as a means for recording (or presenting) qualitative data (i.e., findings) (Belk, 2013). Moreover, videography by the researcher or informant could also be applied to study the human and non-human factors entangled in manifestations of home-sharing hospitality. Methodologies such as Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET) works particularly well in delving into consumers’ unspoken thoughts and feelings that are below the level of consciousness (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). Future research could use the ZMET methods to explore the meaning of home and to uncover the agencies and processes involved in transforming the home into hospitable spaces. Home-sharing scholars could also consider other types of projective techniques, including word association, object personification, role play, collage construction, sentence completion, and dream exercises. Thus, we propose two research objectives to improve the methodological rigor of second-order knowledge emerging from qualitative investigations:

- To examine the social dynamics and complex meanings underlying host-guest relations in home sharing using interpretive methods and multi-sensory data points.
- To elicit deeper insights among participants of marketing exchange in home sharing using projective techniques and visual-based methods going beyond superficial observations.

5.3.3. Reimagining third-order knowledge

Following the lack of third-order knowledge observed in our review, we encourage future work to bear on the new opportunities and challenges brought by the COVID-19 pandemic and technology advancement. For example, the advancement of big data could be useful for simulated experiments. The proliferation of big data has resulted in the increasing popularity of sentiment analytics—i.e., the use of natural language processing and machine learning capabilities to systematically extract public opinions and analyze subjective information derived from massive textual data (Fu, Hao, Li, & Hsu, 2019). The use of big data and sentiment analytics to study research problems such as pre- and post-pandemic home-sharing norms, consumer sentiments about home-sharing services, and the impact of online reviews on home-sharing hosting performance can be a potentially fruitful future research direction. Further, the psychophysiological measures in neuroscience (e.g., facial electromyography methods, electro-dermal analysis, skin conductance, heart rate response, and eye-tracking system) can be fertile tools for studying consumers’ emotions and spontaneous responses toward home-sharing advertising materials (e.g., posters, billboards, company websites, flyers, and brochures) in true-and quasi-experiments (Li, Scott, & Walters, 2015). For example, future research could apply these psychophysiological methods to examine consumers’ affective responses to traditional hotel accommodation vis-à-vis P2P home-sharing platforms (e.g., Airbnb) in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. More importantly, many of these neuroscience-based techniques are now available through wearable devices and can therefore be implemented remotely (Lim, 2018), and thus, constitute safe and rigorous ways for conducting cause-and-effect research during the pandemic and beyond. Thus, we propose two research objectives that we believe would improve the methodological rigor and practice leading to third-order knowledge:
• To deploy big data and machine learning techniques in simulated experiments on home sharing in marketing and tourism.
• To employ neuroscientific techniques enabled through wearable devices in true- and quasi-experiments on home sharing in marketing and tourism.

6. Conclusion

The agenda of this systematic review is threefold: it sought to explain (1) what we know; (2) how we know; and (3) where should we be heading with respect to home sharing in marketing and tourism. To do so, the review adopted a framework-based approach using the ADO framework coined by Paul and Benito (2018) and the TCM framework developed by Paul et al. (2017). We argued that the adoption of these organizing frameworks was important to address the estrangement of our understanding about home sharing, which continued to persist despite the availability of numerous systematic reviews on home sharing and the sharing economy. We contended that though there were many dots (clusters, themes) uncovered by past scholars, our understanding of these dots had remained limited as we did not know whether these dots were independent or interrelated to one another. We believe that our contention was validated as the outcome of our review demonstrates the usefulness of the ADO and TCM frameworks in providing a logical synthesis, wherein the associations between the dots have been clarified in a rich and rigorous manner. Our review was also supported by the PRISMA protocol (Moher et al., 2009), the categories of marketing knowledge (Rossetter, 2001, 2002), and the 3Ps of marketing exchange that we originally developed, thereby adhering to the principles of novelty, rigor, and transparency that typifies “well done” systematic reviews (Hulland & Houston, 2020; Paul & Criado, 2020).

6.1. Implications from the ADO framework

Using the ADO framework by Paul and Benito (2018), we produced a knowledge map that (1) communicated the associations that entailed between the antecedents, decisions, and outcomes of marketing exchanges in home sharing and that (2) scrutinized the foundation of knowledge that underpinned those associations. Specifically, we identified a total of 1,044 associations for 133 antecedents across 10 categories of antecedents, whereby 562 associations were directly-related to decisions and 482 associations were indirectly-related to outcomes, which suggest that an average of 4.7 associations were studied in the 222 articles that we reviewed from “marketing and tourism” journals ranked “A” and “A-” in the ABDC journal ranking list. We believe that these findings have important implications not only for academia, but also industry practitioners and policy makers, as the aggregation of associations in our review provides a quick snapshot in view of what can or cannot work for marketing exchanges in home sharing.

Nevertheless, upon detailed scrutiny, we observed that 988 associations were supported by second-order knowledge relating to empirical generalizations and non-causal associations of concepts, whereas 56 associations were supported by third-order knowledge relating to principles about cause-and-effect. We also noted 52 insights from first-order knowledge relating to the conceptualization (definition) and operationalization (measurement) of concepts in isolation (i.e., without associations). Moving forward, we believe that the striking lack of first- and third-order knowledge reveals an urgent need for future studies that (1) explore and (re)imagine concepts (first order) to strengthen the building blocks of home sharing, especially in light of the “new normal” as a result of COVID-19, and that (2) investigate cause-and-effect relationships (third order) to reliably explain observations that can lead to tangible recommendations for practice, wherein the latter is regarded by Dolnicar (2019) as the “most powerful form of knowledge.” We hope that the immediate and multifaceted response that we sharply and succinctly presented in the sections that were dedicated to explaining the antecedents, decisions, and consequences would be fruitful to address these knowledge gaps.

6.2. Implications from the TCM framework

Using the TCM framework by Paul et al. (2017), we uncovered many theoretical, contextual, and methodological insights that were not previously revealed. Specifically, our review revealed that (1) there was no shortage, but in fact an abundance, of theories for home sharing as we uncovered the use of 75 different theories by 110 articles within the last five years, (2) non-Western countries and non-Airbnb platforms were under-represented, and (3) secondary data using home-sharing listings from AirDNA, Inside Airbnb, and self-scraping were relied upon the most among home-sharing studies in premier journals. Building upon the insights from our review, we presented a set of pathways that we encourage future marketing and tourism research to consider for advancing theoretical novelty, enhancing contextual relevance, and improving methodological rigor with respect to future home-sharing research.

6.3. Implications from the systematic review

To this end, we concur with Kumar et al. (2019) and Paul and Criado (2020) that a subject advances when we have a good grasp of the existing literature. We extend this belief with that of our own, as we believe that systematic reviews that are “well done” could play a prominent role as knowledge brokers to empower future studies with state-of-the-art insights of the field. More importantly, we wish to end our paper with four key takeaways for future systematic reviews on home sharing and beyond: two building from the strengths of our review and two emerging from the concessions we had to make for pragmatic reasons.

First, we believe that our framework-based review is the first to have employed more than one organizing framework in the form of the ADO and TCM frameworks by Paul and Benito (2018) and Paul et al. (2017). We hope that our usage of these two frameworks will inspire future framework-based systematic reviews to consider using multiple frameworks to develop holistic insights with respect to the subject of review, and in the case of the present review, the topical content and the research background of existing studies on marketing exchange in home sharing.

Second, we demonstrate that framework-based systematic reviews could also contribute in a novel way when new frameworks are born out of the review. In particular, we found the ADO framework to be useful as an overarching framework albeit limited when applied as a finer-grained lens. This insight emerged from our reflection towards the end of our content analysis, where we found ourselves seeking a new theory that could explain the 10 antecedents that we encountered in our review. We believe the large number of antecedents triggered this reaction. This reaction, in turn, led to the birth of the 3Ps of marketing exchange, which we originally conceived as a new framework to organize our antecedents into the meaningful categories: participants (e.g., guest, platform, host), product (e.g., property), and properties (e.g., location, social factors, trust, value, macroenvironment, and tourism) of marketing exchange in home sharing. We believe that our 3Ps of marketing exchange can also be applied across myriad transactional settings in the marketplace, and thus, we encourage future systematic reviews in marketing and tourism to consider this new framework that we have developed herein.

Third, our review was constrained to home sharing arising from online and paid rather than offline or unpaid trading of P2P accommodation. Though we argued that this concession was sensible for our study, which was situated at the intersection of marketing and tourism, and that this concession was supported by calls by past scholars such as Dolnicar (2019) in view of the disruptive effects of the former rather than the latter to the marketplace, we acknowledge that home sharing that does not involve payment and that is negotiated in-person could be...
of scholarly interest, especially among scholars in social sciences. We also did not encounter a systematic review that concentrated solely on offline or unpaid home sharing, and thus, we believe that such a review should be potentially rewarding for social scientists.

Finally, our review was limited to only conceptual and empirical articles published in “marketing and tourism” journals ranked “A*” and “A” in the ABDC journal ranking list. Though this concession was made on the grounds of quality (novelty) and realistic expectation (manageable), we concede that there may be other studies on home sharing that could be relevant but were not included in our review due to the source-quality threshold for article inclusion that we applied upfront at the identification stage of the PRISMA protocol. Nonetheless, we maintain that this was a pragmatic decision suited for a framework-based systematic review, but perhaps could be relaxed for other types of systematic review, such as method- or theory-based systematic reviews, where the number of articles available for review may be smaller, and thus, more manageable.

We hope that the readers of the *Journal of Business Research* have enjoyed reading this paper as much as we enjoyed writing it and that our systematic review will inspire an exciting pipeline of home-sharing research and “well done” systematic reviews post-COVID-19.
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### Appendix 1. “A*” and “A” journals listed in “marketing and tourism” field of research in the 2019 ABDC journal ranking list

| No. | Journal title                                      | Publisher             | ISSN   | ISSN online | Year inception | Rating |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| 1   | Annals of Tourism Research                        | Elsevier              | 0160-7383 | 1873-7722 | 1973           | A*     |
| 2   | Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics   | Emerald Group Publishing | 1355-5855 | 1758-4248 | 1988           | A      |
| 3   | Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research          | Taylor & Francis Online | 1994-1665 | 1741-6507 | 1996           | A      |
| 4   | Australasian Marketing Journal                    | Elsevier              | 1441-3582 | 1839-3349 | 1993           | A      |
| 5   | Cornell Hospitality Quarterly                     | Sage Publications     | 1938-9655 | 1938-9663 | 2008           | A      |
| 6   | Current Issues in Tourism                         | Taylor & Francis Online | 1368-3500 | 1747-7603 | 1998           | A      |
| 7   | European Journal of Marketing                     | Emerald Group Publishing | 0309-0566 | 1758-7123 | 1967           | A*     |
| 8   | Event Management                                  | Cognizant Communication Corporation | 1525-9951 | 1943-4308 | 1993           | A      |
| 9   | Habitat International                            | Elsevier              | 0197-3975 | 1873-5428 | 1976           | A      |
| 10  | Housing Studies                                  | Taylor & Francis Online | 0267-3037 | 1466-1810 | 1986           | A      |
| 11  | Industrial Marketing Management                   | Elsevier              | 0019-8501 | 1873-2062 | 1971           | A      |
| 12  | International Journal of Advertising             | Taylor & Francis Online | 0265-0487 | 1759-3948 | 1982           | A      |
| 13  | International Journal of Bank Marketing          | Emerald Group Publishing | 0265-2323 | 1758-5937 | 1983           | A      |
| 14  | International Journal of Consumer Studies        | Wiley-Blackwell Publishing | 1470-6423 | 1470-6431 | 1977           | A      |
| 15  | International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management | Emerald Group Publishing | 0959-6119 | 1757-1049 | 1989           | A      |
| 16  | International Journal of Cultural Policy         | Taylor & Francis Online | 1028-6632 | 1477-2833 | 1994           | A      |
| 17  | International Journal of Hospitality Management   | Elsevier              | 0278-4319 | 1873-4693 | 1982           | A*     |
| 18  | International Journal of Market Research         | Sage Publications     | 1470-7853 | 2515-2173 | 1959           | A      |
| 19  | International Journal of Public Opinion Research  | Oxford University Press | 1471-6909 | 1471-6909 | 1999           | A      |
| 20  | International Journal of Research in Marketing   | Elsevier              | 0167-8116 | 1873-8001 | 1984           | A*     |
| 21  | International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management | Emerald Group Publishing | 0959-0552 | 1758-6690 | 1973           | A      |
| 22  | International Journal of Tourism Research        | Wiley-Blackwell Publishing | 1099-2340 | 1522-1970 | 1998           | A      |
| 23  | International Marketing Review                    | Emerald Group Publishing | 0265-1135 | 1758-6763 | 1983           | A      |
| 24  | Journal of Advertising                           | Taylor & Francis Online | 0091-3367 | 1557-7805 | 1960           | A      |
| 25  | Journal of Advertising Research                  | World Advertising Research Center | 0021-8499 | 1740-1909 | 1960           | A      |
| 26  | Journal of Brand Management                      | Springer International Publishing | 1350-231X | 1479-1803 | 1993           | A      |
| 27  | Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing       | Emerald Group Publishing | 0885-8624 | 2052-1189 | 1986           | A      |
| 28  | Journal of Business Research                     | Elsevier              | 0148-2963 | 1873-7978 | 1973           | A      |
| 29  | Journal of Consumer Affairs                      | Wiley-Blackwell Publishing | 0022-0078 | 1745-6606 | 1967           | A      |
| 30  | Journal of Consumer Behaviour                    | Wiley-Blackwell Publishing | 1472-0817 | 1479-1838 | 2001           | A      |
| 31  | Journal of Consumer Marketing                    | Emerald Group Publishing | 0736-3761 | 2052-1200 | 1984           | A*     |
| 32  | Journal of Consumer Psychology                   | Wiley-Blackwell Publishing | 1057-7408 | 1532-7663 | 1992           | A*     |
| 33  | Journal of Consumer Research                      | Oxford University Press | 0993-5301 | 1537-5277 | 1974           | A*     |
| 34  | Journal of Destination Marketing & Management    | Elsevier              | 2212-571X | 2212-5752 | 2012           | A      |
| 35  | Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management    | Elsevier              | 1447-6770 | 1839-5260 | 1994           | A      |
| 36  | Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research        | Sage Publications     | 1996-3480 | 1557-7554 | 1976           | A      |
| 37  | Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management    | Taylor & Francis Online | 1936-8623 | 1936-8631 | 2009           | A      |
| 38  | Journal of Interactive Marketing                 | Elsevier              | 1994-9968 | 1528-6653 | 1986           | A      |
| 39  | Journal of International Marketing               | Sage Publications     | 1069-031X | 1547-7215 | 1993           | A      |
| 40  | Journal of Leisure Research                      | Taylor & Francis Ltd. | 0022-2216 | 2159-6417 | 1969           | A      |
| 41  | Journal of Macromarketing                        | Sage Publications     | 0276-1467 | 1552-6534 | 1981           | A      |
| 42  | Journal of Marketing                             | Sage Publications     | 0022-2429 | 1547-7185 | 1936           | A*     |
| 43  | Journal of Marketing Management                  | Taylor & Francis Online | 0267-257X | 1472-1376 | 1985           | A      |
| 44  | Journal of Marketing Research                    | Sage Publications     | 0022-2437 | 1547-7193 | 1964           | A*     |
| 45  | Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management   | Taylor & Francis Online | 0885-3134 | 1557-7813 | 1980           | A      |
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Appendix 3. List of theories and sources

| Theory                        | Source                                                                 | Theory                        | Source                                                                 |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Agency theory                 | Lu, Cai, and King (2020)                                               | Protection motivation theory  | Sues, Woosnam, and Erd (2020)                                         |
| Agglomeration theory          | Xie, Kwok, and Heo (2020)                                              | Rational action (choice) theory | Liang, Schuckert, Law, and Chen (2017)                                 |
| Appeals (rhetorical theory)   | Han et al. (2019)                                                      | Relational demography theory  | Liang, Schuckert, Law, and Chen (2020)                                 |
| Attachment theory             | Yang, Lee, Lee, and Koo (2018)                                        | Resource-based theory         | Su and Mattila (2019)                                                  |
| Bottom-up spillover theory    | Suess, Woosnam, Mody, Dogru, and Turk (2020)                           | Revealed preferences theory   | Gunther (2018)                                                         |
| Cognitive appraisal theory    | Suess, Woosnam, Mody, Dogru, and Turk (2020)                           | Semantics perspective         | Zhu et al. (2019)                                                      |
| Competitive advantage theory   | Ye, Lei, Shen, and Xiao (2020)                                        | Service dominant logic        | Buhalts, Andreu, and Gnoth (2020)                                      |
| Construal level theory        | Liu, Park, Xie, Song, and Chen (2020)                                 | Service language model        | Scerri and Presbury (2020)                                             |
|                               | Frechette, Arnold, Kalkait, and Singh (2020)                           | Sharing-exchange continuum    | Petruzi, Sheppard, and Murals (2019)                                   |
|                               | Garcia, Munoz-Gallego, Vigila, and Gonzalez-Benito (2020)              | Signaling theory              | Mauri, Minazzi, Nieto-Garcia, and Vigila (2018)                        |
|                               | Osman, D’Acunto, and Johns (2019)                                      |                               | Xie and Mao (2017)                                                     |
| Crime pattern theory | Tuneçel and Tektag (2020) | Tsing and Yang (2019) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Diffusion of innovation theory | Tussysadid and Pesonen (2018) | Xia and Li (2018) |
| | Huang et al. (2020) | Xu and Park (2018) |
| | Wang and Jeong (2018) | Yang et al. (2018) |
| Disruptive innovation theory | Guttaggitt (2015) | Yang et al. (2019) |
| | Guttaggitt and Smith (2017) | Yang et al. (2020) |
| | Muller (2020) | Yang et al. (2021) |
| Environmental commitment and sacrifice theory | Varma, Jukic, Pestek, Shultz, and Nestorov (2016) | Xie and Kon (2019) |
| Fogg behavior model | Dogru, Zhang, Sus, Mody, Bulut, and Sirakaya-Turk (2020) | Xie and Kon (2020) |
| Grounded theory | Bulchand-Gidumal and Melcin-Gonzalez (2020) | Xie and Kon (2021) |
| | Keohg, Kriz, Barnes, and Rosenberger III (2020) | Xie and Kon (2022) |
| | Phua (2019) | Xie and Kon (2023) |
| | Shihapit and Bjork (2019) | Xie and Kon (2024) |
| | Shihapit and Jimenez-Barroso (2018) | Xie and Kon (2025) |
| | Stors (2020) | Xie and Kon (2026) |
| Entrepreneurship theory | Alrawadieh and Alrawadieh (2018) | Xie and Kon (2027) |
| Expectation (dis)confirmation theory | Ju et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2028) |
| Hedonic pricing model | Cai et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2029) |
| | Chattapadyay and Mitra (2020) | Xie and Kon (2030) |
| | Chen and Xie (2017) | Xie and Kon (2031) |
| | Falk et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2032) |
| | Gibbs, Guttaggitt, Gretzel, Morton, and Goodwill (2018) | Xie and Kon (2033) |
| | Moreno-Izquierdo et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2034) |
| | Moreno-Izquierdo et al. (2020) | Xie and Kon (2035) |
| | Ønder et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2036) |
| | Tang et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2037) |
| Information systems success model | Tong and Gunter (2020) | Xie and Kon (2038) |
| Interactive value formation | Shahapit (2019) | Xie and Kon (2039) |
| Intimacy theory | Shi et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2040) |
| Lifecycle model | Adamiak (2020) | Xie and Kon (2041) |
| Macroeconomic theory | Dogru, Zhang, Sus, Mody, Bulut, and Sirakaya-Turk (2020) | Xie and Kon (2042) |
| Marketing exchange theory | Zhang et al. (2018) | Xie and Kon (2043) |
| Means-end chain theory | Liang, Chen, and Song (2018b) | Xie and Kon (2044) |
| Microeconomic theory | Liu, Yen, and Jiang (2019) | Xie and Kon (2045) |
| Moral identity theory | Gunter, Ønder, and Zekan (2020) | Xie and Kon (2046) |
| Motivation theory | Farmaki et al. (2019) | Xie and Kon (2047) |
| Network sociality theory | Wu, Zeng, and Xie (2017) | Xie and Kon (2048) |
| Plutchik’s emotion wheel | Marques and Matos (2020) | Xie and Kon (2049) |
| Observational learning theory | Luo and Tang (2019) | Xie and Kon (2050) |
| Power theory | Xie, Mao, and Wu (2019) | Xie and Kon (2051) |
| Practice theory | Amore, de Bernardi, and Arvanitis (2020) | Xie and Kon (2052) |
| Prism of epistemic culture | Camilleri and Neuhofer (2017) | Xie and Kon (2053) |
| Prospect theory | Sibbritt, Volger, Weber, and Geneste (2019) | Xie and Kon (2054) |
| | Liang et al. (2018b) | Xie and Kon (2055) |
| | Mao and Lyu (2017) | Xie and Kon (2056) |
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