EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH ABOUT THE WEB 3.0/CROWDSOURCING ON THE ROMANIAN TOURIST BEHAVIOR

Cristina State
cristina.state@man.ase.ro
Bucharest University of Economics Studies

Dan Popescu
dan.popescu@man.ase.ro
Bucharest University of Economics Studies

Antonio Garcia-Sanchez
a.garciasanchez@upct.es
Universidad Politecnica de Cartagena

abstract

Tourism development is unthinkable without the implementation of digital technologies. Through this research we wanted to see, on the one hand, to what extent are tourism facilities interested in knowing the motivations that may cause the behavior of their customers and, secondly, to find out what options has the consumer of tourism services, so the selection of a destination to be substantiated and possibly to generate his desire to come back to the visited places. To achieve the goal, we used the opportunities offered by the digital age. Thus, Web 3.0/crowdsourcing is a revolutionary tendency which can be used for a better understanding of the consumer behavior. In this context, for the first time in Romania we used two *crowdsourcing* platforms, integrating these two questionnaires: one to test the interest of tourism establishments to attract new customers; the other, to see what are the main reasons behind the decision of the clients in choosing a tourism destination. Our work is the result of an scientific approach conducted over nearly three years of research and analysis following which we concluded that between the demands of tourists and what their accommodation units want to seem are very large differences.

Key-words: web 3.0/crowdsourcing, customers, digital era, tourist behavior

1. introduction

Digital transformation is a continuous complex undertaking that can substantailly shape a company (Matt et al., 2015). The digital transformation is also fundamentally not about technology but about startegy and more specific about strategic thinking (Rogers, 2016).

Web 3.0 is the next generation of World Wide Web, resulting from the expansion of Web 2.0. Web 3.0 is a revolutionary trend introducing transformation activities as, for example, increased use of semantic technologies, extended mobile services and of those based on location, ensuring improved access to information in real time (HSMAI).

In particular, the emergence of the digital in tourism requires new methods of scientific research and study of customer behavior. Tourism information systems support organisation's business processes, and integrate customer relationship management. Currently, there is a gap between the implemented systems and contemporary technologies that the new Web generation brings (Minič et al., 2014). Moreover, as we have seen, they belong mainly from the area of the concerns of teachers and researchers and less of the practitioners.

Finally, all units operating in the tourism industry are dependent on their results, the development of creative products and innovative spirit. In this context, cooperation and networking and digital connections to the environment are particularly important factors for success in business, as a result of the adaptability at the market situations to constant change.

Revenue growth, resistance to a business environment that is constantly changing, calls from any entrepreneur, a more realistic understanding of customer opinion. In this regard, in our study we stopped at an innovative way of knowing the motivations, to consult and to take into account the opinion of the travel agencies' customers: *crowdsourcing*.

Our research is the result of over three years of study, analysis, and econometric tests of information about the tourism field in Romania. Our research also aims to uncover opportunities for Romanian Tourism SMEs to break apart and benefit from the diverse Web 3.0 tools that are not within their reach in order to become successful on the European Tourism markets. On the other hand we explored the impact of Web 3.0/ crowdsourcing for tourism information systems.

We turned to crowdsourcing in the belief that it could be an excellent potential way to know better the motivations for which customers choose a particular hospitality destination (both a locality/area, but also a place to stay).

Crowdsourcing is *"...type of online activity, participatory, in which a person, an institution, a nonprofit organization or a company (commercial - n.a.) proposes to a heterogeneous group of people with different knowledge, by an open and flexible call, the voluntary undertaking of tasks of variable complexity and modularity... The benefit will be mutual: the user will get the satisfaction of a certain type of need (economic or social recognition, self-esteem, developing individual skills etc. while the crowdsourcer will get and use in his interest, all information provided by the user"* (Estellés-Arolas and Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012, p. 8-9).

Turning to crowdsourcing was motivated also by the reality that individuals tend to behave much more open on a specialized website, feeling more secure without the supervision from third parties, of their way of thinking and, especially, to act (Smith, Gharaei-Manesh şi Alshaikh, 2013, p.23).

Technically, through crowdsourcing, entrepreneurs can, on the one hand, to identify new developments in their field and also store them according to the interests they pursue. On the other hand, may entrust on specialized designed platforms "basic tasks" *(task-based crowd)* to exchange information with customers, related with, for example, their satisfaction with the services they received. Finally, crowdsourcing can be an excellent opportunity to know, anonymously, the customer preferences of tourism units and therefore the motivations which determine their economic behavior.

Crowdsourcing is a complex compound of concepts *crowd* and *outsourcing* (Howe, 2006, p. 3) and comes from the words (English) *crowd* and *source*. *Crowdsourcing* differs from outsourcing, last one defining activities from external sources without them being ordered/requested by a group (managerial) inside the beneficiary organization. The outsourcing of services through *crowdsourcing* appeals to online platforms such as, for example, *AmazonMechanicalTurk, Crowdsprings and DesignCrowd.*

2. objectives, hypothesis and methodology

Basically, we wanted to know how it can be improved the tourism agencies activities towards the knowledge of future customer wishes in order to attract and retain them. So, we turned to crowdsourcing to offer the possibility to know and, ultimately, to harmonize the interests of both sides in the direction, on the one hand, of the substantial increase of the professionalism degree of the benefits offered according to guest opinions and, on the other hand in the direction of opening them to a much better cooperation with travel agencies, through the feedback regarding the quality of the services they received.

The work hypothesis which were the basis of our approach to research were:

Hypothesis 1: The managers of tourism does not take a consistent approach of the digital for the substantiation, developing and implementing of an adequate strategy to attract tourists, including by promoting its own image;

Hypothesis 2: The decision to purchase the services is based, primarily, on the documentation undertaken by the clients of tourism units clients and not on the effort made by them in order to know the opinions, motivations, preferences etc. of the consumers.

Methodological, both the professionalism analysis shown by tourism entrepreneurs in promoting their own image as well as the degree of customer satisfaction were made by *crowdsourcing*. As a potential method of qualitative inquiry, the instrument of information collection were two questionnaires, each placed on a specially constituted platform.

Questions of the two questionnaires (one for managers/entrepreneurs in tourism, the other for customers of tourism units) were designed based on surveys models developed and applied in the field. Each questionnaire included 20 questions each, in our research being covered the subsumed of the intended purpose.

Methodologically, in our research the knowledge of the respondents' opinion was made by their free consent to access the *websites* specially created and not as a result of calling the recipients already known. Being announced, through various *social media* ways, on the opportunities to interact with entrepreneurs in tourism units and their clients, respondents accessed, *when* and *where* they wanted (time interval for which we consulted the accessing of the two *websites* was February 15 to August 30, 2014), *online* platforms available to them: http://goo.gl/sgzjU (for assessing the quality of organizational communication in tourism units) and http://goo.gl/JUaLx (to assess customer satisfaction towards the quality of organizational communication in tourism units). We underline that these platforms were permanently operative.

The first questionnaire, the one offering to entrepreneurs from tourism the opportunity to access the platform http://goo.gl/sgzjU, included questions about aspects with character:

a) general concerning the organization and in the broad sense organizational communication; In this context, we sought to identify whether the profile activity is followed at the managerial level or at the one related with some organizational specialized subdivisions (as, for example, the marketing department, department of communication and public relations, etc.);

b) specific, about *who* and *how* performs profile activities and what methods are used to stimulate and facilitate effective networking of tourism units, on the one hand and to ensure the development of training their employees, on the other part. This questionnaire has been accessed by 157 entrepreneurs/managers from tourism. There were some situations where those who accessed the online platform did not answer to all questions.

The second questionnaire accessible at http://goo.gl/JUaLx, offered to any customer of tourism units to formulate opinions on: travel frequency (internal and external) on interest category (private, for business or mixed); the documentary sources called before making the trip and whether they were helpful; their perception about the professionalism of entrepreneurs in tourism, from the perspective of the way to design and conduct organizational communication in accordance with their expectations and, especially, from the effectiveness of customer loyalty programs on tourism units (whether it is tourism accommodation units or the travel agencies). 2 478 was the number of respondents who accessed voluntarily specialized *websites*.

From the methodological point of view, to characterize the degree of professionalism of external organizational communication from tourism units, we used *the analysis of variance - ANOVA* coupled with *SPSS for Windows, version 15*.

Using of *ANOVA* (according to Ostertagova and Ostertag, 2013, p. 256, "... *most often cited research method in the literature of business*") was a logical consequence of the questions used in the questionnaire. In our case, we started from the fact that *ANOVA* is used when:

a. are analyzed differences between groups (tourism units classified by category of classification) from the perspective of one or more variables (each question);

b. the participants (respondents) were tested (interviewed) in the study only once;

c. are compared more than two groups (tourism units).

Briefly, *ANOVA One-Way* procedure (Ostertagova and Ostertag, 2013, pp. 256-261) considered that we have values of the random independent and normal variables (tourism units, by type of classification) $X_{i,j}$, where: $i = 1, 2, …, k$ and $j = 1, 2,…, n_i$, with the *mean* μ_i and with *standard deviation* constant σ, $X_{i,j}$ - $N(\mu_i, \sigma)$. Alternatively, each $X_{i,j} = \mu_i + \varepsilon_{i,j}$, where $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are normally distributed, have values of errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ - $N(0, \sigma)$. Be $N = n_1 + n_2 + … + n_k$ total number of tourism units (n_1 being hotels from first group, with the classification of 5 stars). The parameters of this model are each question

The parameters of this model are each question $\mu_1, \mu_2, …, \mu_k$, standard deviation σ.

Next it is proceeding to testing the *null hypothesis* (H_0):

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_i = \ldots = \mu_k \tag{1}$$

compared to the *alternative hypothesis* (*H1*):

$$H_1 : \exists\ 1 \le i,l \le k, \quad \text{where } \mu_i \ne \mu_l \tag{2}$$

(there is, finally, a pair of unequal values).

Next, we accept that represents the *sample mean i* (*i* = 1, 2, ... , *k*):

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}, \tag{3}$$

$\bar{x}$ is the *high mean*, respectively the average of *all data*:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}, \tag{4}$$

If we accept that s_i^2 represents the *sample variance*:

$$s_i^2 = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2, \tag{5}$$

and $s^2 = MSE$ is an estimation *of the σ^2 variance,* common to all *samples* (tourism units):

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{N - k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) \times s_i^2. \tag{6}$$

then *ANOVA One-Way* is focused around the idea of comparing the difference between groups (levels) and the *sample's variance* by analyzing the differences between them.

If we define the SST - total sum of *squares*, by ESS - total sum of *squared errors* and SSC - sum of *squares between groups*, then we have:

$$SST = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x})^2, \tag{7}$$

$$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) \cdot s_i^2, \tag{8}$$

$$SSC = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \times (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})^2. \tag{9}$$

Let us consider that the *deviation* from a certain level of the *mean* is written as follows:

$$x_{ij} - \bar{x} = (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i) + (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}) \tag{10}$$

Consequently:

$$SST = SSE + SSC \tag{11}$$

The total sum of *squares (MST)*, the one of squared *errors MSE,* and respectively, the one of *squares between groups (MSC)* will be:

$$MST = \frac{SST}{df(SST)} = \frac{SST}{N - 1}, \tag{12}$$

$$MSE = \frac{SSE}{df(SSE)} = \frac{SSE}{N - k}, \tag{13}$$

$$MSC = \frac{SSC}{df(SSC)} = \frac{SSC}{k - 1} \tag{14}$$

Considering that the conditions of the tests are satisfied , *ANOVA One-Way* uses statistical test:

$$F = \frac{MSC}{MSE} \tag{15}$$

Considering the *null hypothesis* (*H0*) as valid, the statistical test has a *Fisher distribution F (k - 1, N -k)*, in which case applies to the testing criteria:

$$F > F_{1-\alpha, k-1, N-k}, \tag{16}$$

where $F_{1-\alpha,\ k-1,\ N-k}$ is (1 - α), respectively, the *quantile* (value taken at regular intervals from inverse of *cumulative distribution function* - CDF - of a random variable) of *distribution function* with *k - 1* and *N - k* degrees of freedom. Consequently, the *null hypothesis* (*H0*) is rejected, having a level α insignificant.

The results of *t* test are presented in the *ANOVA One-Way* table below (table no. 1):

Table no. 1 Model of table *ANOVA One-way*

Source of Variance	Sum of squares SS	Freedom degree df	Mean of squares MS	F - statistical F	Deviation size after F
Between	SSC	k - 1	MSC	MSC/MSE	p value
Within	SSE	N - k	MSE	-	-
TOTAL	SST	N - 1	-	-	-

Source: processing after Ostertagova and Ostertag, 2013, p. 259

3. analyzing research results

After consulting both *crowdsourcing* platforms, analyzing and interpreting the answers to the questionnaires, we found the following:
a) concerning the way in which entrepreneurs and/or managers of tourism units approaches organizational communication: in contradiction with the number of tourism units customers who accessed the online platforms to answer to the launched questions, number that we consider to be important (2478) for an initiative like crowdsourcing, the number of respondents in tourism units may seem very small (157), compared to the existing one. The explanation lies, primarily, in their refusal to collaborate, in refusing the *new* and/or the fear of not approaching issues that they not master.
Related to the way in which tourism entrepreneurs develop and promote their image through organizational

communication, respondents were able to express their views on the question "*Who carries out external communication?*". We found that, with majority, *it is not* in charge of a compartment or a skilled person, but in the one of the director or general manager, which explains the direct proportionality between the classification of the unit and the degree of professionalization of the activities related with internal communication and in particular, of promoting their own images to the environment. In cases where the director or manager assumes, exclusively, responsibilities related with external organizational communication, the correlation coefficient is minimal (F=15.132), compared to the situation where there is a specialized compartment (F=21.719), as follows also from the data presented in table. no. 2. Statistically, *all thresholds of significance* p *are relevant*, which leads to the idea that the *results can be extrapolated to organizational reality*. Normal appears to us that also in the case where it appeals to external consulting ("external partners") the result is higher (F=32.316). The situation is presented with priority for 5 star hotels. Since all values of p are *statistically significant* (p ≤ 0.05) it can be accepted the validity of *hypothesis 1.* In this context, eloquent appears to us that taking "control" on everything that means *organization's image* to the environment and even to its own employees can only have an adverse effect on the adaptability of entrepreneurial initiatives to its demands. We refer to the fact that not knowing the reality from the environment as little subjective as possible, coupled with even disregarding its *feedback*, these are generating, as a result of reliance on experience and intuition, empiricism in action.

By consulting the answers to the question "... *Specify what ways you use in the external communication process and how do you appreciate their effectiveness*", we found that in most tourism units, *internet*, *email* and *social networks* are estimated to be the most effective forms of external organizational communication. In this respect, the fact that F is high (F=41.914, respectively, F=40.693) only confirms the reduced focus placed by entrepreneurs/managers on the *feedback* received from customers. As, again, in all cases, p ≤ 0.05*, is reconfirmed the validity of hypothesis 1*. As a particular aspect, we are really surprised by the confidence of tourism units management given to *social networks*. We consider that it would be more useful to entrepreneurs in tourism, initiatives based on information provided by specialists in the field, context in which *crowdsourcing* can be an excellent alternative, specialized platforms being accessed only by those who are subscribed to them.

To allow us to form a more complete picture on the professionalism of entrepreneurs in promoting their own image, in order to attract and make loyal customers, we addressed the question: "Do you have in your unit, customer loyalty programs?". The responses received were demotivating for at least two reasons: either many entrepreneurs/managers say they don't have such programs or, if the answer "yes", the efficiency is totally insignificant (percentages of maximum 10 to 15 points of loyal customers, as a percentage in total customers). The conclusion is reinforced (table no. 2) also by the fact that the result in ANOVA p=0.534 indicates (p≥0,05), respectively, F=0.824. Practically, is an eloquent proof of the fact that the lack of professionalism in the field is a state of "normality", especially given that customer loyalty through "*other forms*" refers to "relations" of units tourism management with syndicates from different organizations, "relations" whose direct result is to provide a greater degree of occupancy of the accommodation capacity. In this case, as shown in table no. 2, the effectiveness of the 'other forms' is supported, as "effectiveness" by the values of p and F (p=0 and F=5.675). Finally, the question "*If you use internal communication audits, what aspects you follow with priority?*" we were surprised to find out that the majority of respondents are interested in the image to third parties and customer relations, much less their loyalty. In this context, as is apparent from the data presented in table no. 2, the low values of F (F=1.223, F=2.798, respectively, F=1.17) correlated with the high p (p=0.301, p=0.119, respectively, p=0.326) lead to the conclusion of the insignificanty of organizational communication audits. Basically, we are not very clear whether, if indeed in Romanian tourism units (except those with a higher classification, 4 and 5 stars), are made this kind of audit actions.

It becomes obvious, as a preliminary conclusion that the interaction between tourism entrepreneurs is real and not declaratively required. Context in which, we insist that appealing to *crowdsourcing* can prove useful by giving *micro-tasks* to anyone interested in contributing to the development of tourism activities. For example, a variant can be, by providing a *crowdsourcing* platform, nationally, offering, to entrepreneurs from the field (and not only) the opportunity to consult and to propose solutions to problems faced in their work, especially in the restrictive conditions imposed by the environment constantly changing and increasingly less friendly.

Table no. 2: Summary ANOVA results for the managers of tourism

Customer needs	F	p
Comunication Department	21.719	.000
Sales Department	24.617	.000
Marketing Department	21.700	.000
General Manager	15.132	.000
External Partners	32.316	.000
IT&C Tools	**F**	**p**
Internet	41.914	.000
E-mail	13.700	.000
Social Media	40.693	.000
Forms of Customer Loyalty	**F**	**p**
Phone / e-mail	2.988	.013
Special programmes	.824	.534
Other Forms	5.675	.000
Audit purposes	**F**	**p**
Image to third parties	1.223	.301
Customer relationship	2.798	.119
Loyalty customer	1.170	.326
I don't know	1.049	.391

Source: results of data processing by authors in ANOVA

F = ANOVA correlation coefficient

P - significance level

b) referitor la gradul de satisfacţie a clienţilor unităţilor de turism:

Regarding the ways for documentary called by customers when purchasing services from tourism units and the perception of their usefulness, results were convincing as follows:

- the majority (2415 respectively 97,45% of the total) calls, priority, the internet and friends and/or known people (data are presented in Table no. 3).

Table no. 3 The situation of information resources appealed before choosing the tourist destination

Way of informing	Number	Percetage in total (100%)
Internet	2415	97,45
Foldings from agencies	406	16,38
Touristic foldings from postal box	16	0,65
Fairs and exhibitions	213	8,60
Informations from friends/known people	2265	91,40

Source: the results of processing by authors, of the responses given by the tourism units customers on the crowdsourcing platform (http://goo.gl/JUaLx)

ANOVA processing certified the conclusions regarding the appealing by customers of tourism units, to internet and to friends or known people. F and p coefficients validate the second hypothesis (F = 59.607 and p = 0.000, respectively F = 51.893 and p = 0.0071). The data are presented in Table. 7;

- as for the level of customer confidence in the usefulness of information sources appealed, degree reflected in the fidelity towards the facts met in the field, from the data presented in table no. 4 (for 2411 respondents), results that, with priority (2097 respondents, respectively, 86.98% of the total), customers of tourism units have enough confidence in the usefulness of information sources consulted. Only 118 (4.89% of total) have total confidence in it. Again, the results of econometrical processing certified the findings regarding the validation of the second secondary hypotheses (F=91.779 and p=0.000), as follows from the data presented in table no. 7.

Table no. 4 Perception of the confidence degree in the usefulness of information sources consulted

Confidence degree in the source	Number	Percetage in total (100%)
Totally	118	4,89
Pretty much: advertising is the soul of commerce	106	4,40
Pretty much: i have a clear image	2097	86,98
Rather less: i don't trust	87	3,61
Not at all: I am interested to have a shelter	3	0,12
TOTAL	2411	100,00

Source: the results of processing by authors, of the responses given by the tourism units customers on the crowdsourcing platform (http://goo.gl/JUaLx)

- assessing the real usefulness of the information received by the travel units customers is shown in table no. 5. As can be seen, almost 95% of customers have a medium degree of confidence in the usefulness of the information provided by organizations in the tourism and hospitality industry:

Table no. 5 Perception of the usefulness of informational sources consulted

Degree of satisfaction regarding the usefulness of the information	Number	Percentage in total (100%)
Totally	13	0,21
Pretty much	107	4,43
So and so (aproximately)	2261	94,78
Pretty less	23	0,48
Not at all: i am even surprised how can some lie	7	0,10
TOTAL	2411	100,00

Source: the results of processing by authors, of the responses given by the tourism units customers on the crowdsourcing platform (http://goo.gl/JUaLx)

The results of ANOVA processing (table no. 7) validates again the second hypothesis (F = 27.079 and p = 0.000);

- - the overall customer perception on the interest of tourism units to have a significant feedback from their customers is unfavorable, most people who have used online crowdsourcing platform saying they believe that they were

"interviewed" only statistically. Finally, our survey respondents said they did not feel to be treated as customers, just like "tourists" consumers. In this respect, deeply unfavorable for those responsible of tourism units (entrepreneurs, managers, etc.) is the perception of customers that their essential purpose is to "snag tourist". It is quite obvious, also in this case, that the ignorance of the reality perceived by customers can only be deeply unproductive for entrepreneurship in the Romanian tourism. Data for respondents' perception on the possibility of being treated as future loyal customers are shown in table. no 6:

Table no. 6 *Perception of the respondents to the potentiality of being treated as future loyal customers*

Perception	Number	Percentage in total (100%)
Totally	11	0,44
To a small extent; they just want to „pick us"	1971	79,54
They don't know the difference between customer and tourist	61	2,46
No way: almost everywhere I was treated with contempt	428	17,27
I dont know; I can't say	7	0,29
TOTAL	2478	100,00

Source: the results of processing by authors, of the responses given by the tourism units customers on the crowdsourcing platform (http://goo.gl/JUaLx)

The obtained results (see table nr. 7) certifies, once again, *the validity of the second secondary hypothesis* (F=34,961 şi *p*=0,000).

Table no. 7 Summary ANOVA results for customers tourism units

Question / variants	F	p
1. *informational sources consulted before choosing the touristic destinations* *- Internet* *- Friends or known people*	59.607 51.893	.00000 .00171
2. *The situation of the fidelity of informational sources consulted with the reality*	91.779	.00000
3. *The satisfaction degree of travel services beneficiaries*	27.079	.00000
4. *The perception degree of the interest for the customers*	34.961	.00000

Source: results of data processing by authors in ANOVA

Conclusions

The concerns regarding the implementation of Web 3.0/crowdsourcing are very recent. It is obvious that *with the involvement of as many customers in the crowdsourcing activities, their desires and requirements may be established and maintained*.

Currently, worldwide, there are some big *crowdsourcing* projects in tourism, from collecting comments and descriptions relating the experiences of tourists to posting through the digital, images of the places they visited.

Our study is the first of its kind in Romania. A limit of our research could be that the two *online* platforms for data collection and information are just a first attempt of *crowdsourcing*.

However, we believe that with further research, including by making available to those who make decisions in tourism new ideas and potential ways of concrete action, we can raise their awareness in the direction of creating *crowdsourcing* platforms. So, in our opinion, the aim is connecting to *Web 3.0/crowdsourcing* to gather information from customers of tourism establishments. This informations are extremely useful to the management of tourism units. In this regard, examples of how *crowdsourcing* can help to the development of of knowing customer behavior are Wikitravel and Holidaycheck. In Romania this is possible by creating, for example, a portal where customers should express their impressions, evaluations and advices for both prospective customers and entrepreneurs and/or managers in the tourism and hospitality industry.

Our study aims to reveal how *Web3.0/crowdsourcing can contribute to the development entrepreneurial spirit in Romanian tourism*. As a result of analyzing the views expressed by respondents who accessed websites the http://goo.gl/sgzjU and http://goo.gl/JUaLx, we demonstrated that, at present, the approach to organizational communication of units tourism is primarily empirical and based on experience and intuition of the decision makers. As a direct consequence, both entrepreneurs and/or managers from tourism (157 respondents) and the beneficiaries of their services, customers (2478 respondents, of which, to a question answered only 2411 people), are likely to base their decisions on subjective perceptions, respectively on personal effort documentation.

In many of the tourism units from our country there is no consistent scientific approach to activity promotion and development of their image, which should be based on reliable information from beneficiaries of the services offered, this can be improved substantially and decisively by appealing to *crowdsourcing*. Basically, through *crowdsourcing*, entrepreneurs can, on the one hand, stimulate customers of tourism units involvement in the improvement of profile activities and, on the other hand, they can redesign and/or extend development strategies taking into account their opinions.

The results of our research approach (approach which will be extended in a more ample work, first in the domain of methods for improving organizational communication in tourism units from Romania) constitutes a first step towards a new way more constructive, scientifically more rigorous of substantiating the services offered by tourism entrepreneurs to their customers on their expressed *feedback* on *crowdsourcing* platforms.

Finally, we express our belief that appealing to *crowdsourcing* practice is much more than just a necessity, it constitutes itself into an alternative for developing dynamic, viable and sustainable entrepreneurial spirit in Romanian tourism.

REFERENCES

Foxall, G.R., & Sigurdsson, V. (2013). Consumer Behavioral Analysis: Behavioral Economics Meets the Marketplace, *The Psychological Record*, Vol. 63, No. 2, Spring 2013

Perreau, F. (2013). The Forces that Drive Consumer Behavior, Available at: http://www.TheConsumerFactor.com, accessed on September, 6th 2016

HSMAI and TIG Global, Web 3.0: Emerging Insights for Travel Marketers, 2009

Minič, N., Njeguš, A., Tulič-Ceballos, J. (2014). The Impact of Web 3.0 Technologies On Tourism Information Systems, *Singidunum Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2014 Supplement, pp. 781-787

Matt, C., Hess, T., Benlian, A. (2015). Digital transformation strategies. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *57*(5), pp. 339-343

Rogers, D. (2016). *The Digital Transformation Playbook: Rethink Your Business for the Digital Age*. Columbia University Press

Gantz, J., Reinsel, D. (2012). Big Data, Bigger Digital Shadow s, and Biggest Grow th in the Far East, Available at https://www.idc-iview-thedigitaluniverse-in2020/, accesed on September, 7th 2016

Smith, D., Gharaei-Manesh, M.M., Alshaikh, A., 2013. How Can Entrepreneurs Motivate Crowdsourcing Participants? *Tecnology Innovation Management Review* 2/ February [online] Available at: http://www.timereview.ca/article/654/pp.23-30, accessed on August, 27th 2016