REVIEW PAPER
UDK: 001.818:004.65]:33
DOI: 10.5937/EKOPRE2306355L
Date of Receipt: April 28, 2023

Miljan Leković
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism
Vrnjačka Banja

Darko Dimitrovski
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism
Vrnjačka Banja

Tanja Stanišić
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism
Vrnjačka Banja

A CONTEMPORARY BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF THE SHARING ECONOMY LITERATURE

Savremena bibliometrijska analiza literature na temu ekonomije deljenja

Abstract

The study deployed an evaluative bibliometric analysis of contemporary literature on the topic of sharing economy indexed in the Web of Science (WoS) and/or Scopus within the fields of economics, business and management to provide an objective insight into its academic structure. Also, a comparative analysis of WoS and Scopus databases was conducted with the intention to examine the importance of both index databases concerning the investigated issue. Using a data-driven analysis, geographical distribution, the level of dispersion of papers among journals, the most frequently researched topics, the most influential authors, papers and scientific journals of the sharing economy knowledge within the predefined research field were determined. Comparative analysis of WoS and Scopus databases revealed that Scopus is a more comprehensive, but not more significant source of the sharing economy knowledge than WoS database, which itself could be characterized as an outstanding subset of Scopus.

Keywords: *sharing economy, bibliometric analysis, Web of Science, Scopus*

Sažetak

U radu je izvršena evaluativna bibliometrijska analiza savremene literature na temu ekonomije deljenja indeksirane u Web of Science (WoS) i/ili Scopus indeksnoj bazi u okviru oblasti ekonomija, biznis i menadžment, sa ciljem da se obezbedi objektivan uvid u akademsku strukturu ove discipline. Takođe, sprovedena je uporedna analiza WoS i Scopus baza sa namerom da se ispita značaj analiziranih indeksnih baza za istraživanu problematiku. Primenom analize zasnovane na podacima utvrđeni su geografsko područje koje prednjači u istraživanju discipline ekonomije deljenja u okviru unapred definisanih istraživačkih oblasti, nivo disperzije radova među časopisima, najčešće istraživane teme, najuticajniji autori, radovi i naučni časopisi. Putem uporedne analize WoS i Scopus indeksnih baza zaključeno je da je Scopus obuhvatniji, ali ne i značajniji izvor znanja iz oblasti ekonomije deljenja od WoS indeksne baze koja se u istraživanoj disciplini može okarakterisati kao izvanredan podskup Scopus-a.

Ključne reči: *ekonomija deljenja, bibliometrijska analiza, Web of Science, Scopus*

Introduction

Contemporary scientific thought is characterized by the growing interest of the academy in sharing economy concept and its wide application in various contexts, such as tourism, transport, finance, education, communications, retail, media, workspace, entertainment and more [8], [24], [33], [34], [61], [68]. The concept was grounded on the notion of sharing products, space, human and intellectual resources, but also time, through providing access to users [17], [44]. The consumption that goes beyond ownership has grown rapidly in the last decade. The driver of the accelerated development of the sharing economy knowledge comes as a result of the evolution of the consumption phenomena [43] and broader awareness of resource scarcity and growing concerns about its environmental, social and developmental impacts [40], [46]. In this context, the sharing economy was often grasped as a sustainable concept charachterized by access to resources at lower prices, their efficient and sustainable use and the promotion of cooperation and solidarity. Aimed at the three pillars of sustainability, it reduces resource use, stimulates economic growth and increases the quality of life [17]. The diffusion and growing importance of digital technologies, especially the Internet and smartphones, have played a key role in the concept development by reducing the cost of coordinating resources and enabling the involvement of large numbers of users [62], [70]. Although it relies on social dynamics and collaboration, and the concept itself was originally economic, based on economic philosophy and way of thinking, the basis of the sharing economy relies on the technological platforms [40], so it is percived as the platform economy concept [3], [25], [36].

Accordingly, the aim of the paper is twofold: first, to perform an objective evaluation of contemporary literature on the topic of sharing economy within the fields of economics, business and management by performing bibliometric analysis and second, to perform a comparative analysis of the Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus databases to determine which of them is a more comprehensive and reliable source of scientific information and contemporary knowledge on the sharing economy. The research is limited to fields of economics, business and management, due to the fact that the sharing economy was perceived as economic concept and philosophy, and to the ten-year period 2010-2019 reflecting the contemporary structure of the analyzed discipline.

Bibliometric analysis of sharing economy discipline has already been implemented by a few authors [28], [47]. However, in contrast to Lima and Carlos Filho study [47] that explores "sharing economy in a broad spectrum of knowledge fields" [47, p. 238] and without time constraints, this paper examines contemporary scientific thought related to the sharing economy exclusively from an economic perspective. By encircling the ten-year period, a difference was made in relation to the eight-year research period from the study of Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28]. The two-year difference between studies was significant given the exponential growth of literature in this field [42] and potential change in citation impact of authors, papers and journals. Finally, the comparative analysis of the WoS and Scopus databases was undertaken, to additionally distinguish the research from previous studies by applying the Meyer index, traditional overlap and relative overlap. These differences point towards the originality of the research, which is significant as it complements existing knowledge related to the comparison of the WoS and Scopus databases in different areas [31], [56], [59].

Methodology

Bibliometric analysis is "often used as a measure of the quality of the work produced by an author, journal or department" [6, p. 121]. The focus of an analysis of article citations and their impact on referencing and dissemination is determined by a set of bibliometric methodologies and analytical techniques [32], [57]. According to Acedo et al. [2] "the use of citation, frequency as an indicator of influence, is legitimate" [2, p. 965], and accordingly, it could be seen as a study quality indicator. The importance of bibliometric analysis lies in the fact that it is characterized by a high level of objectivity in contrast to the usual literature reviews, which is commonly exposed to subjective interpretation [23], [73]. One of the rare objections to bibliometric analysis is that it is, by definition, aimed at the past rather than the future [64, p. 383]. However, without acknowledgement

of the past (academic knowledge evolution), there is no possibility of a successful future, something that is apparent in scientific research. This data-driven analysis is widely used in the field of economics, business and management [5], [7], [21], [30], [32].

Bibliometric analysis within the study was deployed over 2020 using Harzing's Publish or Perish 6.45 software which has been used widely in the areas outlined [15], [39], [53], [69]. In the first step, Publish or Perish software was utilized to create a representative sample of documents based on the keywords search: *sharing economy, collaborative economy and collaborative consumption*, following the approach used in the previous studies [28], [47]. The initially formed sample of a total of 365 papers was then filtered by excluding: editorials, letters, notes or errata, chapters published in monographs, papers published in thematic collections and scientific papers not published in English. In accordance with the aim of the research, only papers published in the WoS and Scopus journals that have an impact factor or quartile Q1 or Q2 in the field of economics, business or management over the period 2010-2019 were included in the sample. Finally, the sample was further narrowed by considering solely highly cited papers and papers relevant to the research subject, that has eventually resulted in a list of 31 papers on the sharing economy within predefined research fields.

Within the bibliometric analysis of the predetermined sample, an analysis of the authors' affiliation countries was performed to determine the countries that lead the field. Moreover, the level of concentration of papers in individual journals and the analysis of keywords was obtained, identifying which the most frequently researched topics are within this relatively young subject matter. Also, to determine the most influential papers and the most influential journals, a citation analysis was conducted, which included self-citations in addition to heterocytes, since, according to Nisonger [58], they do not impair the quality of the analysis.

In the concluding analytical part of the paper, a comparative analysis of the WoS and Scopus databases was performed within the sample, to discover which of the index databases better depicts the area of the research. Some studies have shown that the coverage of the WoS and Scopus databases differs substantially [56], [65], as Scopus covers a broader number of journals [31]. According to Sánchez et al. [65], the WoS and Scopus databases are "complementary and not mutually exclusive" [p. 8]. The comparative analysis was performed by applying the following measures: the Meyer index; traditional overlap; and relative overlap, which were calculated both in the case of journals and papers. *The Meyer index* shows the degree to which a particular index base covers the research area. At the same time, this index is a measure of the singularity of the index base, thus, a higher value of the index indicates a higher degree of singularity in terms of more journals appearing in only one index database (primary sources/ single journals) and more papers appearing in only one index database (unique papers/single articles). When calculating the Meyer index, single journals and single articles are not weighted, while journals and papers that appear in the two index databases are weighted with 0.5. In the case of conducting a comparative analysis of three index bases, the weight is 0.3, in the case of four index bases, the weight is 0.25, and so on. The Meyer index for journals and papers is calculated using the following formula [52]:

$$Meyer\ index_{Sources} = \frac{\Sigma\ Sources * Weight}{Total\ Sources} \quad (1)$$

$$Meyer\ index_{Articles} = \frac{\Sigma\ Articles * Weight}{Total\ Articles} \quad (2)$$

Traditional overlap (TO) is a measure of the overlap of index bases A and B, with a higher value of this measure indicating a greater similarity of index bases in terms of the journals and papers covered, and vice versa. Traditional overlap for journals and papers is calculated using the following formula [37]:

$$\%TO_{Sources} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}\right) \quad (3)$$

$$\%TO_{Articles} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}\right) \quad (4)$$

The relative overlap shows the percentage of one index base that covers journals and papers of another index base, and is calculated as follows [10]:

$$\%Overlap_{A_{Sources}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|A|}\right)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \%Overlap_{B_{Sources}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|B|}\right) \qquad (5)$$

$$\%Overlap_{A_{Articles}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|A|}\right)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \%Overlap_{B_{Articles}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|A \cap B|}{|B|}\right) \qquad (6)$$

The application of these measures enables detailed insight into the coverage, overlap and dispersion of sources and articles across the WoS and Scopus index databases.

Results and discussion

Bibliometric analysis

Upon the creation of a representative sample of papers, a bibliometric analysis of the countries of affiliation of the authors was initiated. This analysis aims to identify the countries that are at the forefront of research in the field of sharing economy (Table 1).

Within the analyzed sample, the country with the highest number of authors engaged in the sharing economy research is the United Kingdom (UK), with a share of 21.3%. The UK is followed by Germany and the United States of America (USA), both of which having a 13.1% share of the total number of authors. The percentage

Table 1: Country of affiliation of the authors

Author(s)	Country of affiliation of the first author	Country of affiliation of the second author	Country of affiliation of the third author	Country of affiliation of the fourth author
Albinsson, P.A., & Perera, B.Y. (2012)	USA	USA		
Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G.M. (2012)	USA	USA		
Behrend, M., & Meisel, F. (2018)	Germany	Germany		
Belk, R. (2010)	Canada			
Belk, R. (2014)	Canada			
Cadarso, M.-Á., López, L.-A., Gómez, N., & Tobarra, M.-Á. (2012)	Spain	Spain	Spain	Spain
Cheng, M. (2016)	Australia			
Christie, L., & Gibb, K. (2015)	UK	UK		
Cohen, B., & Kietzmann, J. (2014)	Chile	Canada		
DeVore, M.R., & Weiss, M. (2014)	Italy	Germany		
Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015)	Denmark	Denmark		
Edelman, B., Luca, M., & Svirsky, D. (2017)	USA	USA	USA	
Ert, E., Fleischer, A., & Magen, N. (2016)	Israel	Israel	Israel	
Forno, F., & Garibaldi, R. (2015)	Italy	Italy		
Guyader, H. (2018)	Sweden			
Hofmann, E., Hartl, B., & Penz, E. (2017)	UK	Austria	Austria	
Laamanen, M., Wahlen, S., & Campana, M. (2015)	Finland	Netherlands	UK	
Lichtenthaler, U. (2016)	Germany			
Lindblom, A., Lindblom, T., & Wechtler, H. (2018)	Finland	Finland	Australia	
Martin, C.J. (2016)	UK			
Martin, C.J., Upham, P., & Budd, L. (2015)	UK	UK	UK	
Mittendorf, C. (2018)	Germany			
Möhlmann, M. (2015)	Germany			
O'Sullivan, S.R. (2015)	Ireland			
Ravenelle, A.J. (2017)	USA			
Roos, D., & Hahn, R. (2017)	Germany	Germany		
Skerratt, S., & Hall, C. (2011)	UK	UK		
Sordi, J.D., Perin, M.G., Petrini, M. de C., & Sampaio, C.H. (2018)	Brazil	Brazil	Brazil	Brazil
Tridimas, G. (2011)	UK			
Wang, D., & Nicolau, J.L. (2017)	Hong Kong	Spain		
Wilson, I.E., & Rezgui, Y. (2013)	UK	UK		

Source: Authors

of the total number of authors from these three most prolific countries is 47.5% – accounting for almost half of the authors within the sample. If the affiliation of the first author is taken as a criterion for the distribution of articles by country [20], these three countries also have encircled more than half of the papers within the sample (UK - 22.6%, Germany - 16.1%, USA - 12.9%). The dominance of Europe as a geographical area is evident (64.5%), which is in line with the affiliation statistics provided by Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28]. However, in terms of individual countries, the dominance of the UK is in contrast to the conclusion of the study of Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28], in which the USA ranked first in terms of the number of published papers on the sharing economy, with a share of 25.5%.

It is important to note that 35.5% of the papers in the sample are single-author papers, as well as that the index of co-authorship is 1.97 (31 papers from the sample are the result of the cooperation of 61 authors). A similar value of the index of co-authorship (1.91) was determined by Lima and Carlos Filho [47] in their study of the sharing economy, while the percentage of single-author papers was slightly higher (40%). In the case of co-authored works, 70% of the papers included are the result of national cooperation (cooperation of authors from the same country), while the remaining co-authored works are the result of international cooperation (cooperation of authors from different countries). A slight increase in the share of co-authored papers in relation to the results of the research of Lima and Carlos Filho [47] indicates growing cooperation of authors within this field.

Table 2: The journal distribution of the papers

Journal	Number of papers
Ecological Economics	3
Journal of Consumer Behaviour	2
International Journal of Hospitality Management	2
Journal of Services Marketing	2
International Journal of Consumer Studies	2
Local Economy	2
Journal of Consumer Research	2
Journals with one paper	16
Total	30

Source: Authors

Table 2 shows the distribution of papers within the sample across the journals, proposing journals solely with a minimum of two papers per journal.

In terms of the journals in which the articles were published, the most popular was *Ecological Economics*, with three published papers and thus, a share of approximately 10%. The average number of papers per journal is 1.35, which undoubtedly indicates a low concentration of papers and, respectively, their large dispersion among journals. Lima and Carlos Filho [47] commented on the expansive scientific production dispersion of the "sharing economy in a broad spectrum of knowledge fields" [p. 238]. The distribution of papers among journals was an indicator of insufficient maturity of the research area, characterized by accelerated development, as evidenced by the growing production of papers on this topic [42].

In order to determine the most frequently researched issues within the sharing economy, a keyword analysis was performed (Table 3). The total number of analyzed keywords is 154, and the primary criterion for selecting a specific keyword and including it in Table 3 is its occurrence in at least three papers within the sample. It is important to emphasize that certain keywords of a similar context are adapted and proposed as a single phrase.

To gain even more precise insight into the dominant research niches within the sharing economy, a word cloud of the keywords was constructed (Figure 1). The keywords presented in a larger font and positioned closer to the center of the cloud are perceived as more important.

Table 3: Repeated keywords within the dataset

Keyword	Number of repetitions
sharing economy	14
collaborative consumption	12
sharing	8
theory	6
sustainability	4
management	4
tourism	4
Airbnb	4
trust	4
behavior	4
collaborative economy	3
innovation	3

Source: Authors

Figure 1: Word cloud of the keywords

Source: Authors

Since the search for papers included in the sample was performed in Harzing's Publish or Perish 6.45 software using the terms *sharing economy, collaborative economy and collaborative consumption*, it was expected that these words would occupy a dominant position in Table 3 and a central position in Figure 1. However, unlike the terms *sharing economy* and *collaborative consumption*, which are identified as the most commonly used keywords, the term *collaborative economy* has a modest frequency of three instances. In addition to the widespread application of the concept of sharing in consumption, the analysis indicated that important research niches within the sharing economy are the application of this concept in the field of sustainable development, management and tourism. Also, the pronounced application of different theories in the sharing economy literature was confirmed, which was noted within the critical literature review. Finally, the concept of sharing is closely related to issues of trust and behavior, and within the keywords, *Airbnb* emerged as a typical sharing economy product in the field of tourism. The results of the keyword analysis are partly in line with the results of an analysis of numerous papers in the field of information systems undertaken by Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28], where *information systems, distributed computer systems, Internet and human-computer interaction* were singled out. Finally, it is essential to emphasize that within the sample, the keywords were not found in the works of Albinsson and Perera [4], Bardhi and Eckhardt [8], Möhlmann [55], and O'Sullivan [60], so these papers were excluded from further analysis.

The sample of 31 articles produced 4,641 Crossref citations, with an average number of citations per paper of 149.7, while the average citation per author was 76.1 (Table 4). Citation analysis across the selected papers was implemented to identify the papers and authors who provided the greatest contribution and had the most substantial influence on the development of the sharing economy knowledge within the fields of economics, business and management.

The distribution of citations, in terms of their absolute number, indicates that the most influential papers are

Table 4: Distribution of the citations across the selected papers

Paper	Crossref	Cites per year	Cites per author
Albinsson & Perera (2012)	196	24.5	98
Bardhi & Eckhardt (2012)	**655**	**81.8**	**327.5**
Behrend & Meisel (2018)	8	4	4
Belk (2010)	**657**	**65.7**	**657**
Belk (2014)	**878**	**146.33**	**878**
Cadarso et al. (2012)	45	5.63	11.25
Cheng (2016)	221	55.25	221
Christie & Gibb (2015)	4	0.8	2
Cohen & Kietzmann (2014)	282	47	141
DeVore & Weiss (2014)	12	1.71	6
Dredge & Gyimóthy (2015)	130	26	65
Edelman et al. (2017)	133	44.33	44.33
Ert et al. (2016)	**333**	**83.25**	**111**
Forno & Garibaldi (2015)	48	9.6	24
Guyader (2018)	7	3.5	7
Hofmann et al. (2017)	13	4.33	4.3
Laamanen et al. (2015)	30	6	10
Lichtenthaler (2016)	3	0.75	3
Lindblom et al. (2018)	6	3	2
Martin (2016)	**369**	**92.25**	**369**
Martin et al. (2015)	86	17.2	28.67
Mittendorf (2018)	13	6.5	13
Möhlmann (2015)	**323**	**64.6**	**323**
O'Sullivan (2015)	15	3	15
Ravenelle (2017)	32	10.67	32
Roos & Hahn (2017)	2	0.67	1
Skerratt & Hall (2011)	3	0.33	1.5
Sordi et al. (2018)	3	1.5	0.75
Tridimas (2011)	9	1	9
Wang & Nicolau (2017)	118	39.33	59
Wilson & Rezgui (2013)	7	1	3.5

Source: Authors

Belk [13], Belk [12], Bardhi and Eckhardt [8], Martin [50], Ert et al. [27] and Möhlmann [55]. Dividing the number of citations by the number of years of the paper's availability gives a more relevant indicator of the impact of the papers since older papers have a better chance of achieving higher citations. By applying cites per year as a criterion for determining the impact of the papers, a list of the six most important papers was constructed, however, the order (impact) of the papers changed. The most influential work remained Belk [13], followed by Martin [50], Ert et al. [27], Bardhi and Eckhardt [8], Belk [12] and Möhlmann [55]. Finally, the largest number of citations per author, presented in the last column of Table 4, was identified for single-authored papers Belk [13] and Belk [12].

Based on the above, it can be unequivocally concluded that the most authoritative paper in the field of sharing economy is Belk's [13] paper, with 878 citations and 146.33 citations per year. As the author of this paper, Belk Russell, has had the most decisive influence on the development of the research area with a total of 1,535 citations. The results of the citation analysis are in line with the research of Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28], which determined that Belk Russell is the author with the highest local citation (citation within the sample) in the research, which was focused on sustainability-related topics and investigated conference papers, books, editorials and book chapters. The results also support the findings within Lima and Carlos Filho's [47] research highlighting that the Belk's study [13] had the largest number of citations, although only citations obtained in the Scopus database were counted. In addition, their research had no limitations in terms of scientific fields and research time-lag (as they covered a wide range of scientific fields and the period from 1978 to January 2017). However, due to the application of different criteria, the list of the remaining most influential papers differs entirely to the study conducted by Lima and Carlos Filho [47], with the sole exception of the work of Möhlmann [55].

The second part of the citation analysis aimed to identify the most important journals in the field of economics, business and management with regards to the topic of the sharing economy (Table 5).

Table 5: Distribution of the citations across the journals

Journal	Crossref
Ecological Economics	500
Journal of Consumer Behaviour	519
International Journal of Hospitality Management	339
Journal of Services Marketing	20
International Journal of Consumer Studies	33
Local Economy	7
Journal of Consumer Research	**1,312**
Transportation Research Part B: Methodological	8
Journal of Business Research	**878**
Organisation & Environment	282
Review of International Political Economy	12
Tourism Recreation Research	130
American Economic Journal: Applied Economics	133
Tourism Management	333
Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism	48
Journal of Business Strategy	3
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	6
Journal of Consumer Marketing	13
Psychology & Marketing	15
Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society	32
Journal of Business Ethics	2
European Journal of Political Economy	9
Technological and Economic Development of Economy	7
Total	4,641

Source: Authors

Based on the 23 journals analyzed, the greatest contribution to the development of the research area was provided by the *Journal of Consumer Research* and the *Journal of Business Research*, with a cumulative share of 47% of the total number of citations. At the other end of the scale, in the context of importance, are the *Journal of Business Ethics* and the *Journal of Business Strategy*, whose combined share of the total number of citations is only 0.1%.

Comparative analysis of WoS and Scopus databases

In the last part of the research, a comparative analysis of the WoS and Scopus databases was performed to determine coverage, overlap and dispersion of journals and papers across these databases. The intention was to reveal which of the following index bases better covers the field of the

sharing economy and is a more comprehensive source of modern scientific knowledge on the issues researched.

In the first step of the comparative analysis, the distribution of journals across the WoS and Scopus databases was determined (Table 6), followed by the calculation of the Meyer index, traditional overlap and relative overlap.

Using the Meyer index, the coverage of the topic within journals referred to in WoS and Scopus was assessed.

$$Meyer\ index_{WoS\ Sources} = \frac{\Sigma\ WoS\ Sources * Weight}{Total\ Sources} = \frac{18 * 0.5}{23} = 0.39 \quad (7)$$

$$Meyer\ index_{Scopus\ Sources} = \frac{\Sigma\ Scopus\ Sources * Weight}{Total\ Sources} = \frac{5 * 1 + 18 * 0.5}{23} = 0.61 \quad (8)$$

The values of the Meyer index, after weighting, showed that WoS covers 39% of the sharing economy, while Scopus accounts for the remaining 61%. With regards to single journals, WoS had none (0%) and Scopus had 22%, which indicates the undoubtedly greater singularity of the Scopus index base, but also the fact that Scopus is a more comprehensive source of scientific knowledge on the topic. These results are in line with the conclusions of the previous research that also confirmed that Scopus has a broader coverage of social sciences journals [59], tourism journals [65], library and information science journals [1], oncological journals [49] and journals in the field of earth and atmospheric sciences [9]. The greater singularity of the Scopus index base, in terms of having more exclusive journal titles, was also found by Fabregat-Aibar et al. [29], Falagas et al. [31] and Mongeon and Paul-Hus [56].

In order to determine the similarity and mutual coverage of the WoS and Scopus databases within the sharing economy research, traditional and relative overlap were calculated, and the results are included below.

Table 6: The WoS and Scopus distribution of the journals

WoS*	Scopus**
Ecological Economics	Ecological Economics
Journal of Consumer Behaviour	Journal of Consumer Behaviour
International Journal of Hospitality Management	International Journal of Hospitality Management
Journal of Services Marketing	Journal of Services Marketing
International Journal of Consumer Studies	International Journal of Consumer Studies
	Local Economy
Journal of Consumer Research	Journal of Consumer Research
Transportation Research Part B: Methodological	Transportation Research Part B: Methodological
Journal of Business Research	Journal of Business Research
Organisation & Environment	Organisation & Environment
Review of International Political Economy	Review of International Political Economy
	Tourism Recreation Research
American Economic Journal: Applied Economics	American Economic Journal: Applied Economics
Tourism Management	Tourism Management
	Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism
	Journal of Business Strategy
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services
	Journal of Consumer Marketing
Psychology & Marketing	Psychology & Marketing
Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society	Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society
Journal of Business Ethics	Journal of Business Ethics
European Journal of Political Economy	European Journal of Political Economy
Technological and Economic Development of Economy	Technological and Economic Development of Economy

* journals indexed in WoS with an impact factor in Economics, Business or Management
** journals indexed in Scopus (Q1 or Q2)
Source: Authors

$$\%TO_{Sources} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Sources} \cap Scopus_{Sources}|}{|WoS_{Sources} \cup Scopus_{Sources}|} \right) = 100 * \frac{18}{23} = 78\% \quad (9)$$

In the case of journals as a source of literature on the topic, the overlap is 78% and indicates high similarity between the index databases. This data shows that the sampled journals referred to in WoS and Scopus match in 78% of cases, which implies that a search of any of the index databases would identify at least 78% of literature sources on the sharing economy. Interestingly, the traditional overlap of WoS and Scopus in Sánchez et al.'s [65] study of wine tourism, was only 34%.

$$\%Overlap_{WoS_{Sources}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Sources} \cap Scopus_{Sources}|}{|WoS_{Sources}|} \right) = 100 * \left(\frac{18}{18} \right) = 100\% \quad (10)$$

$$\%Overlap_{Scopus_{Sources}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Sources} \cap Scopus_{Sources}|}{|Scopus_{Sources}|} \right) = 100 * \left(\frac{18}{23} \right) = 78\% \quad (11)$$

Finally, the values of relative overlap indicate that the Scopus index base fully covers WoS resources, while the WoS index base covers 78% of the sources of the Scopus index base for the topic. The complete coverage of WoS journals by the Scopus index base was also acknowledged by López-Illescas et al. [49] for the oncological discipline, while lower percentages of coverage of 84% and 65% were found by Gavel and Iselid [35] and Sánchez et al. [65] respectively.

In the second step of the comparative analysis, attention is focused on the distribution of papers across the WoS and Scopus databases (Table 7).

The evaluation of coverage, overlap and dispersion of articles across the WoS and Scopus index bases was performed using the same indicators as previously: Meyer index, traditional overlap and relative overlap.

$$Meyer\ index_{WoS_{Articles}} = \frac{\Sigma\ Articles * Weight}{Total\ Articles} = \frac{25 * 0.5}{31} = 0.40 \quad (12)$$

$$Meyer\ index_{Scopus_{Articles}} = \frac{\Sigma\ Articles * Weight}{Total\ Articles} = \frac{6 * 1 + 25 * 0.5}{31} = 0.60 \quad (13)$$

The values of the Meyer index, after weighting, showed that even in the case of published papers, the Scopus index base covers most of the area of the sharing economy (60%) compared to the WoS index base (40%). Moreover, WoS had no unique articles in comparison to Scopus, which had 19% single articles (unique papers). These data confirm the previous conclusion that Scopus

Table 7: The WoS and Scopus distribution of the papers

WoS	Scopus
Albinsson & Perera (2012)	Albinsson & Perera (2012)
Bardhi & Eckhardt (2012)	Bardhi & Eckhardt (2012)
Behrend & Meisel (2018)	Behrend & Meisel (2018)
Belk (2010)	Belk (2010)
Belk (2014)	Belk (2014)
Cadarso et al. (2012)	Cadarso et al. (2012)
Cheng (2016)	Cheng (2016)
	Christie & Gibb (2015)
Cohen & Kietzmann (2014)	Cohen & Kietzmann (2014)
DeVore & Weiss (2014)	DeVore & Weiss (2014)
	Dredge & Gyimóthy (2015)
Edelman et al. (2017)	Edelman et al. (2017)
Ert et al. (2016)	Ert et al. (2016)
	Forno & Garibaldi (2015)
Guyader (2018)	Guyader (2018)
Hofmann et al. (2017)	Hofmann et al. (2017)
Laamanen et al. (2015)	Laamanen et al. (2015)
	Lichtenthaler (2016)
Lindblom et al. (2018)	Lindblom et al. (2018)
Martin (2016)	Martin (2016)
Martin et al. (2015)	Martin et al. (2015)
	Mittendorf (2018)
Möhlmann (2015)	Möhlmann (2015)
O'Sullivan (2015)	O'Sullivan (2015)
Ravenelle (2017)	Ravenelle (2017)
Roos & Hahn (2017)	Roos & Hahn (2017)
	Skerratt & Hall (2011)
Sordi et al. (2018)	Sordi et al. (2018)
Tridimas (2011)	Tridimas (2011)
Wang & Nicolau (2017)	Wang & Nicolau (2017)
Wilson & Rezgui (2013)	Wilson & Rezgui (2013)

Source: Authors

is a more comprehensive source of literature on the topic of the sharing economy. Similar Meyer index values were also found by Fabregat-Aibar et al. [29] when examining the coverage of socially responsible funds-related literature by Scopus and WoS, while the greater singularity of the Scopus index base at the article level in the field of social sciences was in line with Norris and Oppenheim [59] and Sánchez et al. [65].

$$\%TO_{Articles} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Articles} \cap Scopus_{Articles}|}{|WoS_{Articles} \cup Scopus_{Articles}|}\right) = 100 * \frac{25}{31} = 81\% \quad (14)$$

The high level of similarity between the WoS and Scopus databases in the field of the sharing economy was also confirmed by the traditional high overlap of articles (81%). This data shows that a search of any of the index databases (WoS and Scopus) finds at least 81% of the sampled papers on the topic of sharing economy. The similarity of the index databases at article level in the field corresponds to the percentage of diversity of these databases in the field of wine tourism [65]. Thus, it could be concluded that the level of WoS and Scopus match may differ significantly depending on research area.

$$\%Overlap_{WoS_{Articles}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Articles} \cap Scopus_{Articles}|}{|WoS_{Articles}|}\right) = 100 * \left(\frac{25}{25}\right) = 100\% \quad (15)$$

$$\%Overlap_{Scopus_{Articles}} = 100 * \left(\frac{|WoS_{Articles} \cap Scopus_{Articles}|}{|Scopus_{Articles}|}\right) = 100 * \left(\frac{25}{31}\right) = 81\% \quad (16)$$

Finally, the values of relative overlap indicate that the Scopus index database refers to all papers from WoS, while WoS covers 81% of the papers in the Scopus index database on the topic. The comprehensive coverage of WoS articles by the Scopus index base was also acknowledged by López-Illescas et al. [49] in the field of oncology, while lower coverage percentages of 73.3% and 60% were found by Fabregat-Aibar et al. [29] and Sánchez et al. [65]. Interestingly, Sánchez et al. [65] found that WoS covers only 37% of articles on wine tourism referred to in Scopus, which is accounted for by the fact that Scopus encircles journals which specialize in wine tourism, with a large number of papers that were not referred to in WoS.

It can therefore be concluded that Scopus is a more comprehensive index base in terms of journals and papers as sources of literature on the topic of the sharing economy. Essentially, Scopus covers the topic more comprehensively and accordingly, is a more comprehensive source of contemporary scientific knowledge about the sharing economy in comparison to WoS. However, the Scopus index base's greater coverage should not necessarily be considered as being of greater importance and impact, as journals and papers which refer exclusively to Scopus cannot boast a significant number of citations, with the exception of *Tourism Recreation Research* (Table 5) and Dredge and Gyimóthy [24] (Table 4). The low-citation impact of journals and papers on the topic of the sharing economy corresponds to the results of research conducted by Barnett and Lascar [9] in the field of earth and atmospheric sciences and López-Illescas et al. [49] in the field of oncology.

Finally, since all of the sampled WoS journals and papers on the topic are referred to in Scopus, and since journals and papers from Scopus are characterized as having a low citation impact, it is concluded that in terms of this discipline, WoS acts as a subset of Scopus, which complements the research conducted by López-Illescas et al. [49] in the field of oncology.

Conclusion

The paper presents a contemporary bibliometric analysis of literature on the topic of sharing economy within the fields of economics, business and management. Using a two-stage approach: evaluative bibliometric analysis and comparative analysis of WoS and Scopus databases, the following conclusions were made:

In the sharing economy discipline within the predefined research field, Europe is leading geographical area led by the UK, a country that has managed to undertake the dominant role of USA. The dominance of Europe follows the Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx research [28] findings, while

the dominance of UK collides with the findings from the same study;

Within the research area, there is a large scientific production dispersion established by Lima and Carlos Filho [47], which indicates that the sharing economy is far from the stage of maturity and completeness;

There was a slight increase in the share of co-authored papers in comparison to the results of previous research (e.g. Lima and Carlos Filho [47]), thus indicating a growing collaboration of authors within this field;

The dominant research niches within the sharing economy knowledge were the application of this concept in consumption, sustainable development, management and tourism, with a pronounced implementation of various theories within the sharing economy bibliography pointed out by Hossain [42];

The most authoritative paper in the field of sharing economy was Belk [13], while author of this paper, Belk Russell, had the strongest influence on the development of the research field. Although the conclusion was made in line with research conducted by Ertz and Leblanc-Proulx [28] and Lima and Carlos Filho [47], the list of remaining most influential papers differs completely to the previous studies, except for Möhlmann [55];

Among the journals in the field of economics, business and management, the greatest contribution to the development of the research field, in terms of the largest share in the total number of citations, was achieved by the *Journal of Consumer Research* and the *Journal of Business Research*;

Scopus database covers the research issue more comprehensively, which in no way diminishes the importance of the WoS database, represented in this study as an outstanding subset of Scopus, supporting the earlier arguments acknowledged in the field of oncology [49].

The theoretical contribution of the paper comes as a result that, to the best of the authors' knowledge, it represents the first bibliometric analysis of contemporary sharing economy literature from an economic perspective exclusively. Also, the paper complements the existing research related to the WoS and Scopus databases comparison that has been made in other disciplines [31], [56], [59]. Moreover, practical implication of the study relates to the enhanced understanding of the concept of sharing and therefore encourages its wider application in practice and solving practical problems.

The main limitation of the research, which at the same time unequivocally indicates the potential direction of future research was reflected in the fact that the paper did not conduct content analysis and social network analysis (SNA) that would provide deeper insight into the intellectual structure, particularly level of collaboration between the authors within the analyzed phenomena.

References

1. Abrizah, A., Zainab, A. N., Kiran, K., & Raj, R. G. (2012). LIS journals scientific impact and subject categorization: a comparison between Web of Science and Scopus. *Scientometrics*, *94*(2), 721–740. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0813-7
2. Acedo, F. J., Barroso, C., Casanueva, C., & Galan, J. L. (2006). Co-authorship in management and organizational studies: An empirical and network analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*(5), 957–983. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00625.x
3. Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T., & Pinkse, J. (2017). Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: An organizing framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *125*, 1–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.07.006
4. Albinsson, P. A., & Perera, B. Y. (2012). Alternative marketplaces in the 21st century: Building community through sharing events. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *11*(4), 303-315. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1389
5. Albort-Morant, G., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2016). A bibliometric analysis of international impact of business incubators. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(5), 1775–1779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.054
6. Andrés, A. (2009). *Measuring academic research – How to undertake a bibliometric study*. Oxford, UK: Chandos Publishing.
7. Apriliyanti, I. D., & Alon, I. (2017). Bibliometric analysis of absorptive capacity. International Business Review, *26*(5), 896–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2017.02.007
8. Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G.M. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *39*(4), 881-898. https://doi.org/10.1086/666376
9. Barnett, P., & Lascar, C. (2012). Comparing unique title coverage of Web of Science and Scopus in earth and atmospheric sciences. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, *70*. http://doi.org/10.5062/F4W37T8C
10. Bearman, T. C., & Kunberger, W. A. (1977). *A study of coverage overlap among fourteen major science and technology abstracting and indexing services*. Philadelphia: National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services.
11. Behrend, M., & Meisel, F. (2018). The integration of item-sharing and crowdshipping: Can collaborative consumption be pushed by delivering through the crowd? *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, *111*, 227-243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2018.02.017

12. Belk, R. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *36*(5), 715-734. https://doi.org/10.1086/612649
13. Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(8), 1595-1600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001
14. Cadarso, M.-Á., López, L.-A., Gómez, N., & Tobarra, M.-Á. (2012). International trade and shared environmental responsibility by sector. An application to the Spanish economy. *Ecological Economics*, *83*, 221-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.05.009
15. Camelia, D. (2015). Grey systems theory in economics – bibliometric analysis and applications' overview. *Grey Systems: Theory and Application*, *5*(2), 244–262. https://doi.org/10.1108/gs-03-2015-0005
16. Cheng, M. (2016). Sharing economy: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *57*, 60-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.06.003
17. Cherry, C. E., & Pidgeon, N. F. (2018). Is sharing the solution? Exploring public acceptability of the sharing economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *195*, 939–948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.05.278
18. Christie, L., & Gibb, K. (2015). A collaborative approach to event-led regeneration: The governance of legacy from the 2014 Commonwealth Games. *Local Economy*, *30*(8), 871-887. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094215603953
19. Cohen, B., & Kietzmann, J. (2014). Ride on! Mobility business models for the sharing economy. *Organization & Environment*, *27*(3), 279-296. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026614546199
20. Costa, D.F., Carvalho, F. de M., & Moreira, B.C. de M. (2018). Behavioral economics and behavioral finance: A bibliometric analysis of the scientific fields. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *33*(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12262
21. De Bakker, F.G.A., Groenewegen, P., & Den Hond, F. (2005). A bibliometric analysis of 30 years of research and theory on corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance. *Business & Society*, *44*(3), 283–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650305278086
22. DeVore, M.R., & Weiss, M. (2014). Who's in the cockpit? The political economy of collaborative aircraft decisions. *Review of International Political Economy*, *21*(2), 497-533. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2013.787947
23. Dimitrovski, D., Leković, M., & Joukes, V. (2019). A bibliometric analysis of Crossref agritourism literature indexed in Web of Science. *Menadžment u hotelijerstvu i turizmu – Hotel and Tourism Management*, *7*(2), 25–37. https://doi.org/10.5937/menhottur1902025D
24. Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015). The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *40*(3), 286-302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2015.1086076
25. Eckhardt, G.M., Houston, M. B., Jiang, B., Lamberton, C., Rindfleisch, A., & Zervas, G. (2019). Marketing in the sharing economy. *Journal of Marketing*, *83*(5), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919861929
26. Edelman, B., Luca, M., & Svirsky, D. (2017). Racial discrimination in the sharing economy: Evidence from a field experiment. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *9*(2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20160213
27. Ert, E., Fleischer, A., & Magen, N. (2016). Trust and reputation in the sharing economy: The role of personal photos in Airbnb. *Tourism Management*, *55*, 62-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.01.013
28. Ertz, M., & Leblanc-Proulx, S. (2018). Sustainability in the collaborative economy: A bibliometric analysis reveals emerging interest. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *196*, 1073–1085. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.095
29. Fabregat-Aibar, L., Barberà-Mariné, M.G., Terceño, A., & Pié, L. (2019). A bibliometric and visualization analysis of socially responsible funds. *Sustainability*, *11*(9), 2526. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092526
30. Fahimnia, B., Sarkis, J., & Davarzani, H. (2015). Green supply chain management: Are review and bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *162*, 101–114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.01.003
31. Falagas, M. E., Pitsouni, E. I., Malietzis, G. A., & Pappas, G. (2007). Comparison of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar: Strengths and weaknesses. *The FASEB Journal*, *22*(2), 338–342. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.07-9492lsf
32. Ferreira, J. J. M., Fernandes, C. I., & Ratten, V. (2016). A co-citation bibliometric analysis of strategic management research. *Scientometrics*, *109*(1), 1–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2008-0
33. Forno, F., & Garibaldi, R. (2015). Sharing economy in travel and tourism: The case of home-swapping in Italy. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, *16*(2), 202-220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1528008x.2015.1013409
34. Ganapati, S., & Reddick, C. G. (2018). Prospects and challenges of sharing economy for the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, *35*(1), 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2018.01.001
35. Gavel, Y., & Iselid, L. (2008). Web of Science and Scopus: a journal title overlap study. *Online Information Review*, *32*(1), 8–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14684520810865958
36. Geissinger, A., Laurell, C., Öberg, C., & Sandström, C. (2019). How sustainable is the sharing economy? On the sustainability connotations of sharing economy platforms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *206*, 419–429. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.196
37. Gluck, M. (1990). A review of journal coverage overlap with an extension to the definition of overlap. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 41(1), 43-60. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199001)41:1<43::AID-ASI4>3.0.CO;2-P
38. Guyader, H. (2018). No one rides for free! Three styles of collaborative consumption. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *32*(6), 692-714. https://doi.org/10.1108/jsm-11-2016-0402
39. Hall, C.M. (2011). Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.07.001
40. Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *67*(9), 2047–2059. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23552
41. Hofmann, E., Hartl, B., & Penz, E. (2017). Power versus trust – what matters more in collaborative consumption?. *Journal of*

Services Marketing, *31*(6), 589-603. https://doi.org/10.1108/jsm-09-2015-0279

42. Hossain, M. (2020). Sharing economy: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *87*, 102470. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3536188
43. Kwiatek, P., Dženopoljac, V., & Abdul, R. (2021). Loyalty program value: Give me more or treat me better? *Menadžment u hotelijerstvu i turizmu – Hotel and Tourism Management*, *9*(2), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.5937/menhottur2102011K
44. Laamanen, M., Wahlen, S., & Campana, M. (2015). Mobilising collaborative consumption lifestyles: A comparative frame analysis of time banking. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *39*(5), 459-467. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12190
45. Lichtenthaler, U. (2016). Six principles for shared management: A framework for the integrated economy. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *37*(4), 3-11. https://doi.org/10.1108/jbs-03-2015-0029
46. Lim, W. M. (2020). The sharing economy: A marketing perspective. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, *28*(3), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2020.06.007
47. Lima, S., & Carlos Filho, F. de A. (2019). Bibliometric analysis of scientific production on sharing economy. *Revista de Gestão*, *26*(3), 237–255. https://doi.org/10.1108/rege-01-2019-0018
48. Lindblom, A., Lindblom, T., & Wechtler, H. (2018). Collaborative consumption as C2C trading: Analyzing the effects of materialism and price consciousness. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *44*, 244-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.07.016
49. López-Illescas, C., de Moya-Anegón, F., & Moed, H. F. (2008). Coverage and citation impact of oncological journals in the Web of Science and Scopus. *Journal of Informetrics*, *2*(4), 304–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2008.08.001
50. Martin, C. J. (2016). The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism? *Ecological Economics*, *121*, 149-159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.11.027
51. Martin, C. J., Upham, P., & Budd, L. (2015). Commercial orientation in grassroots social innovation: Insights from the sharing economy. *Ecological Economics*, *118*, 240-251. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.08.001
52. Meyer, D. E., Mehlman, D. W., Reeves, E. S., Origoni, R. B., Evans, D., & Sellers, D. W. (1983). Comparison study of overlap among 21 scientific databases in searching pesticide information. *Online Review*, *7*(1), 33-43. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb024120
53. Miller, A. N., Taylor, S. G., & Bedeian, A. G. (2011). Publish or perish: Academic life as management faculty live it. *Career Development International*, *16*(5), 422–445. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431111167751
54. Mittendorf, C. (2018). Collaborative consumption: The role of familiarity and trust among Millennials. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *35*(4), 377-391. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcm-12-2016-2040
55. Möhlmann, M. (2015). Collaborative consumption: Determinants of satisfaction and the likelihood of using a sharing economy option again. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *14*(3), 193-207. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1512
56. Mongeon, P., & Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: A comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, *106*(1), 213–228. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1765-5
57. Mora, L., Bolici, R., & Deakin, M. (2017). The first two decades of smart-city research: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Urban Technology*, *24*(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2017.1285123
58. Nisonger, T.E. (2000). Use of the journal citation reports for serials managementin research libraries: An investigation of the effect of self-citation on journal rankings in library and information science and genetics. *College & Research Libraries*, *61*(3), 263-275. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.61.3.263
59. Norris, M., & Oppenheim, C. (2007). Comparing alternatives to the Web of Science for coverage of the social sciences' literature. *Journal of Informetrics*, *1*(2), 161–169. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2006.12.001
60. O'Sullivan, S. R. (2015). The market maven crowd: Collaborative risk-aversion and enhanced consumption context control in an illicit market. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32*(3), 285-302. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20780
61. Puschmann, T., & Alt, R. (2016). Sharing economy. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *58*(1), 93–99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-015-0420-2
62. Ravenelle, A. J. (2017). Sharing economy workers: Selling, not sharing. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, *10*(2), 281-295. https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsw043
63. Roos, D., & Hahn, R. (2017). Understanding collaborative consumption: An extension of the theory of planned behavior with value-based personal norms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *158*(3), 679-697. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3675-3
64. Samiee, S., & Chabowski, B. R. (2011). Knowledge structure in international marketing: a multi-method bibliometric analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *40*(2), 364–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0296-8
65. Sánchez, A. D., de la Cruz Del Río Rama, M., & García, J. *Á. (2017). Bibliometric analysis of publications on wine tourism in the databases Scopus and WoS*. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *23*(1), 8–15. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2016.02.001
66. Skerratt, S., & Hall, C. (2011). Management of community-owned facilities post-acquisition: Brokerage for shared learning. *Local Economy*, *26*(8), 663-678. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094211422210
67. Sordi, J. D., Perin, M. G., Petrini, M. de C., & Sampaio, C. H. (2018). Construal level and collaborative consumption: An exploratory approach. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *42*(2), 264-273. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12420
68. Standing, C., Standing, S., & Biermann, S. (2019). The implications of the sharing economy for transport. *Transport Reviews*, *39*(2), 226–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2018.1450307
69. Strandberg, C., Nath, A., Hemmatdar, H., & Jahwash, M. (2018). Tourism research in the new millennium: A bibliometric review of literature in Tourism and Hospitality Research. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *18*(3), 269–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358416642010
70. Sutherland, W., & Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). The sharing economy and digital platforms: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, *43*, 328–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.07.004
71. Tridimas, G. (2011). The political economy of power-sharing. *European Journal of Political Economy*, *27*(2), 328-342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2010.10.002

72. Wang, D., & Nicolau, J. L. (2017). Price determinants of sharing economy-based accommodation rental: A study of listings from 33 cities on Airbnb.com. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *62*, 120-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.12.007

73. Wang, N., Liang, H., Jia, Y., Ge, S., Xue, Y., & Wang, Z. (2016). Cloud computing research in the IS discipline: A citation/co-citation analysis. *Decision Support Systems*, *86*, 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2016.03.006

74. Wilson, I. E., & Rezgui, Y. (2013). Barriers to construction industry stakeholders' engagement with sustainability: Toward a shared knowledge experience. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 19*(2), 289-309. https://doi.org/10.3846/20294913.2013.799105

Miljan Leković

is an associate professor at the Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, University of Kragujevac, where he teaches Principles of Economics, National Economy, Economic Policy and Tourism Policy and Planning. He is an author of numerous papers published in national and international journals and proceedings. He is the president of the Faculty Council, the head of the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities and the executive editor of the scientific journal Hotel and Tourism Management. He is a reviewer of the scientific journals International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction (SSCI), Economics of Agriculture (ESCI), Economic Horizons (Scopus), Economic Alternatives, Ekonomika, Oditor, Law – Theory and Practice and BizInfo (Blace). His research interest is focused on the financial economics and macroeconomics.

Darko Dimitrovski

is an associate professor at the Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, University of Kragujevac. He has been involved in postdoctoral fellowship at University Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro (UTAD), Portugal. He is associate editor of Hotel and Tourism Management, and an editorial board member of Tourism Management Perspectives (SSCI Master Journal List; IF 1.779), European Journal of Tourism Research (ESCI, SCOPUS), Journal of Global Business Insights (published by University of South Florida) and Social Sciences & Humanities Open (Elsevier). He has authored several of articles in the leading peer reviewed international journals. His research interest is largely focused on special interest tourism, with special focus on event tourism. He was engaged as a researcher in several international cultural tourism related projects.

Tanja Stanišić

is an associate professor at the Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, University of Kragujevac, in the field of General Economics and a senior research associate. She has published numerous papers in scientific journals and thematic proceedings and one monograph. She is a member of the editorial and publishing boards of several domestic and foreign scientific journals, participant in the implementation of international and national projects, participant in Cost action CA16121. Tanja Stanišić is the president of the Commission for Master Academic Studies of the Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja and member of several other commission of the faculty. She is a member of the Commission for Standards and Related Documents KS A228 – Tourism and Related Services of the Institute for Standardization of Serbia. Special fields of her scientific interest are competitiveness, tourism, protection of competition and control of state aid.