

The Long Way of Organizational Communication in Tourism: From Theory to Practice

Cristina STATE¹

ABSTRACT

Organizational communication has become a topic on which increasingly more specialists express their views. Very few succeed, however, to move from theory to practice, so that their attempt to be beneficial to it. Moreover, as a proverb (anonymously) very well reveals, "... we communicate increasingly more, but we understand increasingly less" ... In this context, based on available statistics (which surprised and confused us in equal measure) I aimed to analyze the extent to which beneficiaries of tourism units' services are satisfied with the correspondence between their offer and the reality on the ground. Methodological, I turned in a first step to crowdsourcing. This is an alternative to get, as a result of outsourcing, required services and/or ideas by seeking contributions from large groups of people and/or communities turning to online resources and not to traditional employees or suppliers. This is the context in which I launched through a website accessible to all willing to participate in our research, a questionnaire aiming to evaluate the quality of organizational communication from tourism facilities. In a second step, I proceeded to the interpretation of the received responses checking, econometrically, through analysis of variance (ANOVA), the research hypotheses. Basically, I investigated the existing biunivocal relationship between the tourism facilities and the beneficiaries of their services, in order to identify and improve some external organizational communication trends, potentially generating performance effects as a direct result of improving customer relationship management.

At the end of the work I formulated two proposals designed to reveal how and in what way can be reduced the distance (still huge) that separates managerial theory from the practice of customer relationship in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry.

Keywords: *organizational communication, crowdsourcing, the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry, tourism units*

JEL Classification: *J4, L84, M3, M5, M21.*

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, organizational communication has become more and more important. Surprising is the fact that, although with each passing day we communicate increasingly more but we understand increasingly less.

Theoretically, growing the efficiency of tourism organizations depends on the image that they create for themselves through activities like organizational communication. In practice, both internal and external organizational communication develops and propagates the image of any

¹ Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, cristina.state@man.ase.ro

organization toward its environment in general and especially toward its clients. The absence of adequate and concrete tools for monitoring and assessing organizational communication can adversely influence the sustainability of the economic-financial results, including within the framework of the tourism organizations. *Crowdsourcing* is one of the most efficient tools for monitoring and assessing organizational communication, tools that can reduce the long way of organizational communication in tourism, from theory to practice.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

The heterogeneity of tourism statistics as a direct result of poor external organizational communication in the industry units is one of the main reasons of my research. For example, I have asked myself the question: why, given that, as we learn from the *media*, Romanians and foreigners spend on our country in order to feel good, millions of euro, their money had a low contribution in GDP (around 780 mil. euro), in the year 2013? Very quickly, however, I was tempted to abandon my approach because other online sources (like, for example, <www.bzb.ro>, accessed 08/27/2014) presented a completely different situation in the (excessively) positive sense: *"The tourism had in 2013, a total contribution of 5.3% to GDP, which places Romania 154 in the world, from 184 countries, behind Albania (16.7% of GDP), Bulgaria (13.3%), Hungary (10.6%), Czech Republic (8.4%) and Slovakia (6%), according to a report of (WTTC) ... Also, foreign visitors have generated in the year 2013, 42.1% of tourism businesses versus 57.9% of domestic tourism."* By World Travel and Tourism Council (<www.wttc.org>, accessed 09/07/2014) however, tourism contributes to the same year 2013, with 1.4% to GDP, so more than twice the amount advanced by the INS and almost three times less than the opinion expressed on <www.bzb.ro>. Overall, only slightly over 20% of the *arrivals* were represented by foreign tourists, while *net use of accommodation places* was 18.1% of the total tourist accommodation structures. So, finally, it is quite clear: with varying degrees of intensity, each of us is marked by a large and complex *change* process (Popescu, State et al., 2012, p. 1). In this context, the change in the sense of improving the organizational communication, generates the image of each tourism unit to third parties. Secondly, as experience proves it, how a tourism organization communicates both inside and outside of it depends, crucially, the quality of its relationships with customers.

In order to improve customer relationship management in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry, I turned to *crowdsourcing*. In North American practice, to *crowdsourcing* appeals, increasingly often, organizations pursuing subdivision of exhausting work processes and entrusting them to volunteers and/or part-time workers eager to ensure the achieving through such method, of some additional revenue (Howe, 2008, p. 17). Analyzing over 40 definitions from the literature, Estellés-Arolas and Ladron-of-Guevara gave what is considered to be the most comprehensive definition of crowdsourcing *"type of online participatory activity, where a person, institution, a nonprofit organization or a company (commercial - n.a.) proposes to a heterogeneous group of people with different knowledge through an open and flexible call, a voluntary undertaking of a task of varying complexity and modularity ... The benefit will be mutual: the user will get the satisfaction of a certain type of need (as, for example, economic or social recognition, self-esteem, developing individual skills etc.); the crowdsourcer will obtain and use in his own interest, all the information provided by the user"* (Estellés-Arolas et Ladron-of-Guevara, 2012, pp. 8-9). Through *crowdsourcing*, organizations aim to reduce their costs, providers of outsourced activities being paid with prices per unit, the amount of which is lower than would have resulted if the activities would have been carried out by their employees. At the individual level, those who turn to crowdsourcing have two reasons: *intrinsic* - social interaction, intellectual stimulation through

competition etc. - and *extrinsic* - financial gain - (Howe, 2008, p.19; Henk van, 2010, p.8; Brabham, 2012, pp. 27-28). From another perspective, *crowdsourcing* may be both an excellent source of stimulating entrepreneurial phenomenon but also an attractive form of promotion and its manifestation. As typology, *crowdsourcing* may include, for example: *crowdvoting*; *crowdfunding*; *microwork*; creative *crowdsourcing*; etc. (Howe, 2008, Saxton et Kishore, 2013 Lombard, 2013. Brabham, 2012).

Through my initiative, I offered a new option for customer relationship management, respectively, to conceive and conduct business in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry not only based on tradition and/or on the experience of the profile units' management, but also based on their *feedback* provided via *crowdsourcing*, by those who are the direct beneficiaries of the services provided: *customers*.

2. OBJECTIVES, HYPOTHESIS AND METHODOLOGY RESEARCH

2.1 The main objective

The main objective of my applied research was *to outline how the implementing of crowdsourcing can help to improve customer relationship management of the tourism units*, with favorable direct effects on their performances. In this context, given that, so far, in Romania, there isn't any work in the analyzed fields, I focused my research on how it is designed and built the external organizational communication of the tourism units.

The applicative approach was made from the perspective of the need to improve customer relationship management as a result of changing the way of thinking, perceiving and treating them not as mere consumers of products and/or services, but as *customers* whose loyalty can contribute significantly to increasing the performance of those units.

2.2 The main hypothesis

The main hypothesis: *Between the offer and the reality seen by the customers of the tourism units at destination there are significant differences.* They are due primarily to the fact that managers of establishments in this industry carry out the design and organizational communication empirically based, primarily, on experience and intuition. This is likely to generate, ultimately, extremely tough confrontation between *to be* and *to seem*, a confrontation *between the services offer and/or the perceived reality* by the customers of tourism units.

The two *secondary hypotheses* relevant to the role of organizational communication *in and for* the obtaining of some sustainable economic results for the units in the tourism and hospitality industry as a direct result of an efficient management of customer relationships, are:

- a) **The managers of tourism units do not adopt effective measures for the improvement and/or development of its human resources training.** Basically, through the lack of concern for the professional development of subordinated human resources, managers of the tourism units generates lack of professionalism in their activities;
- b) **The quality of the tourism units' relationships with their customers is liable of major improvement, especially because the substantiation and the decision to purchase certain services is generally determined by documenting undertaken by the beneficiaries and not by the external organizational communication (promoting own image) of tourism establishments.**

My applied research was conducted in the range between February 2012 and May 2015 and included the following *steps*:

1. *identification of the actual situation of tourism units records* (both travel agents and accommodation units) *from Romania, its formalization and setting the research hypotheses*;
2. *design and distribution (both physical and online, in crowdsourcing system) of a questionnaire regarding the quality of organizational communication in Romanian tourism units*;
3. *collecting and econometrical interpreting of the results provided by respondents*.

2.3 The identification of the actual situation of Romanian tourism units' record

Inexhaustible source of newly created value, but also of profound spiritual satisfaction for every citizen, tourism remains one of the perennial values of any nation. It is the context in which, thinking both to his own good but also to the satisfaction of the loved ones, each of us prepares meticulously, almost every detail of future displacements and then, looking forward not only for holidays but also to any opportunity to "escape" from the daily stress of the tumult still unnaturally aberrant.

The decision of our choice for a given destination is decisively determined by what we learn from friends and family which have been in such destinations or by travel agents who compete in attractive offers, whether we make inquiries by calling the *Internet* or social networks.

We choose the destination, but only now beginning to be more ... confused. Of the seaside, in season, it is best to stay away ... For example, because we learn from the media that in the season, every weekend, Romanian coastline is invaded by more than 200 thousand tourists ... While the maximum accommodation places are, in the most optimistic case, according to the same sources of information (<<http://www.protv.ro>>, accessed 7/20/2014) with just over 100 thousand places (including the offer made to them by locals for private rooms/ "occasion"). On the other hand, according to data from the Romanian Ministry of resort (<<http://www.accommodaties.info>>, accessed 06/23/2014), in Romania there are 8763 hotels and 1633 travel agents. Data provided by NATA (<<http://www.anat.ro>>, accessed 23/06/2014) claim, however, that in our country there are 3427 licensed travel agencies and 10008 classified accommodation structures). According to NIS, (<<http://www.ins.ro>>, accessed 6/23/ 2014), I found out that in our country there are only 5821 hotels and hostels, of which (attention! ...) 4251 were opened in December 2013! ...

My documentation in this direction, carried out over a period of two years (09.01.2012 - 12.02. 2014) led me to the identification of **3212 travel agencies** and **10414 accommodation/reception of tourists' units**.

So, analyzing and comparing the two sets of data, I formulated the following *conclusions* regarding *the actual situation of Romanian tourism units' records*:

1. *in terms of the number of travel agencies, it is generally the same, around 3200 units. In my opinion, comparing the two lists, I found that, in general, also their nominal content is almost identical*;
2. *I registered significant differences in terms of the number of accommodation units. Thus, my records include, in addition, over 400 units. In this regard, I need to mention that in the thesis author's opinion, some confusing issues (as, for example, those relating to ignorance of the real situation of the accommodation units and their*

classification) do nothing but to encourage the possibility of maintaining a state of facts which make possible tax evasion in tourism facilities;

3. *even by the way in which the hostels are classified is encouraged and/or is facilitating and permitting law violations, meaning that in the classification of MDRT and NATA, are stipulated pensions classified both with stars, but also with flowers and daisies as well. This situation is liable to create serious confusion among customers' pensions, inducing them in an error when choosing their destination. Multiple classification of the pensions (on stars, flowers and daisies) allows the practice of prices non conform with the reality of assigning a tourism classification imposed by law to the tourist accommodation structures;*
4. *in the MDRT and NATA's view regarding the accommodation units, they are not grouped, clearly, by county/geographic regions, letting the tourists to choose to identify the geographical area of belonging to the accommodation unit which they will opt for. Hence some questions and/or confusion that may arise for customers of tourism units, especially in case of identification of accommodation units with similar or even identical names. I insists that, as we have noticed, not infrequently some tourism units turn to the various methods of "communication" to present an own image different often from the reality. This correlated with the display of a confused tourist classification categories (stars, flowers or daisies) has the effect of misleading customers (tourists) and that is not as a general rule, sanctioned by the authorities in the field.*

Following the formulation of these preliminary conclusions, I set *the working hypotheses*. *The main hypothesis* of the scientific endeavor aims the applied research and is proven by practice: *the decision for a tourism destination is influenced primarily by personal documenting carried by customers of travel units and not by the offer of this units as a reflection of effective organizational communication.*

The situation is caused, in my opinion by the fact that (and these are secondary hypotheses):

1. *there is a low degree of professionalisation of external organizational communication in tourism;*
2. *the impact of the implementation of modern communication technologies on attracting customers, although strong, it is not found in creating loyal customers and repetitive.*

The used questionnaire was an effective way to research issues related to organizational communication in the Romanian tourism units.

The questions of the questionnaire were designed based on models of developed and applied questionnaires in the field (Fuller, 2000 by Veert, 2007 cited. Deaconu et al., 2014, p.698) and collaboration with reputed specialists (academics) in psychology.

From **methodological** point of view, knowing respondents' opinion was carried out by their free consent to access the created *website*, and **not** as a result of calling the recipients already known and included questions about issues with character:

- a. *general, concerning the organization and organizational communication in a broad sense; In this context, I sought to identify whether the specific work is being followed at the managerial level or at the specialized organizational subdivisions (as, for example, at the departments: marketing, communications and public relations, etc.);*

- b. *specific*, about who and how performs profile activities and what methods are used to stimulate and promote effective networking of tourism facilities on the one hand and to ensure the development of professional training of their human resources , on the other hand.

This questionnaire has been accessed by **1408** entrepreneurs/managers from tourism. There were more than 90% of cases in which those who have accessed the online platform did not answer to all questions, something which, *in my opinion*, is not necessarily a limitation of the research.

From the **methodological** point of view, to characterize the degree of professionalism of the organizational communication in tourism facilities I used *the analysis of variance - ANOVA*, coupled with *SPSS for Windows, version 15* and *the theory of correlation and linear regression*. In this context, before the description of the applicative part, I considered useful to present some brief theoretical and methodological considerations from the field.

Using ANOVA (in the opinion of Ostertagova and Ostertag, 2013, p. 256, "... *the research method most often cited in the business literature* ") was a logical consequence of the questions used in questionnaires.

In our case, we started from the fact that ANOVA is used when:

- are being analyzed differences between groups (tourism units classified by category of classification) from the perspective of one or more variables (each question);
- the participants (respondents) were tested (interviewed) in the study only once;
- are being compared more than two groups (tourism units).

Briefly, ANOVA *One-Way* procedure (Ostertagova and Ostertag, 2013, p. 256-261) considered that we have values of the random independent and normal variables (tourism units, by type of classification) X_{ij} , where: $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$, with the *mean* μ_i and with *standard deviation* constant σ , $X_{ij} - N(\mu_i, \sigma)$. Alternatively, each $X_{ij} = \mu_i + \varepsilon_{ij}$, where ε_{ij} are normally distributed, have values of errors $\varepsilon_{ij} - N(0, \sigma)$. Be $N = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$ 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 $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_k$, standard deviation σ .

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

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_k \quad (1)$$

compared to the *alternative hypothesis* (H_1):

$$H_1 : \exists 1 \leq i, l \leq k, \text{ where } \mu_i \neq \mu_l \quad (2)$$

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

Next, we accept that represents the *sample mean* \bar{x}_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$):

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}, \quad (3)$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

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:

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

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

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

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

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

Consequently:

$$SST = SSE + SSC \quad (11)$$

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

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

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

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

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

$$F = \frac{MSC}{MSE} \quad (15)$$

Considering the *null hypothesis* (H_0) as valid, the statistical test has a *Fisher distribution* F ($k - 1, N - k$), in which case applies to the testing criteria:

$$F > F_{1-\alpha, k-1, N-k}, \quad (16)$$

where $F_{1-\alpha, k-1, N-k}$ is $(1 - \alpha)$, 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* (H_0) is rejected, having a level α insignificant.

The results of t test are presented in the *ANOVA One-Way* table below (table 1):

Table 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
<i>Between</i>	<i>SSC</i>	$k - 1$	<i>MSC</i>	MSC / MSE	<i>p value</i>
<i>Within</i>	<i>SSE</i>	$N - k$	<i>MSE</i>	-	-
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>SST</i>	$N - 1$	-	-	-

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

3. RESEARCH RESULTS

Regarding *the theory of correlation and linear regression* (through Microsoft Office - Excel 2013 - n.a.), I used it to establish a number of causal links that exist between factors that can influence and/or influence the quality of internal and external organizational communication in Romanian tourism facilities and also the intensity of these links. Here, I used the regression function (Y):

$$Y_e = a + bX, \quad (1)$$

where I noted with:

Y_e - the estimated value for the dependent variable;

a - constant (free) term of the regression line (value for X being 0 - zero -);

b - regression coefficient (the amount by which Y changes when X changes with one unit);

X - the value of the independent variable.

Using the method of *the smallest squares*, we obtain:

$$b = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{X})(y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sum (x_i - \bar{X})^2}, \quad (2)$$

and:

$$a = \bar{Y} - b \cdot \bar{X} \quad (3)$$

The standard deviation of the estimated values (with the residual value s) will be: *Deviația standard a valorilor estimate* (cu valoarea reziduală s) va fi:

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (y_i - y_{ei})^2}{n - 2}}, \quad (4)$$

where y_{ei} is estimated through the regression equation for x_i .

The correlation coefficient *Pearson* (r) is defined by the relationship:

$$r = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{X})(y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum (x_i - \bar{X})^2 * \sum (y_i - \bar{Y})^2}} \quad (5)$$

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE RESEARCH RESULTS

Following the interpretation of responses to the questionnaire *on the ways in which the management of the tourism units approaches organizational communication, I am making the following remarks:*

- a) *in my opinion* in general, *the management of the tourism units prove erroneous perception on the role and, especially, on the organizational communication mission, understanding, thereby a simple and ordinary information transmission.* Basically, just as experience demonstrates, in the view of the management of many tourism units, **to communicate** means **to transmit**. Obviously, this situation can be neither favoring nor favorable for the financial results achieved by the units in *the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry*, for at least two reasons, namely:
 - to transmit informations (whether they are perceived as useful or not) is not a mere *communication-information action* of the tourism establishments' receptors (customers). And usually, this action is undertaken from the perspective in which *the issuer* is considered to be the most important in its field of competence. Consequently, I consider that *important are*, primarily, the resultants involved in this action, namely, *increasing the attractiveness of the tourism act and therefore the customer loyalty.* Fidelity which must be not only declared, but also proven ...;
 - *both internal and external organizational communication must generate attitudes, concrete reactions and not just mere statements of intentions.* For this reason, I emphasize that it is **important not as a (potential) client to be and/or to declare himself satisfied with the result of the organizational communication in tourism units, but to prove his loyalty to them, returning to the visited places;**

On the other hand, *extremely important is the quality of the information transmitted both within own organization and to its environment.* Especially, given that, as the research revealed, the image sent to customers is not overwhelmingly favorable, *which is one of the main weaknesses consisting basically in misinformation or "truncated", "sequential" information proven to be useful to their customers;*

- b) although, apparently, the 1408 respondents hold a small share of the total of almost 14,000 (about 10% of the total registered travel units in Romania - both accommodation units and travel agencies -) *in my opinion*, the number is very high, given the reluctance of the travel units' management towards questionnaires and in general its reluctance in offering informations about their activity. I am considering, in this context, besides the fact that *crowdsourcing* is a proposal in *an implementation phase, being space for more improvements*, not only of conceptual-methodological nature but of an operational nature also the reality that, just as I found, there is a major worry and even a refusal, *a priori*, for everything that is *new*. I am constantly a fervent supporter of removing them, giving up to the principle (proved, unfortunately by practice) that *"...it is important to "catch" the tourist, then, we will see how we handle this year too."* Especially in the context in which *decisive to guide future actions of the management in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry must be the opinions expressed by their customers, only able to confirm or deny the usefulness of the services offered by tour operators;*
- c) related with the manner in which managers of the tourism units design and promotes their image through organizational communication, the answers the question *"Who carries out the external communication?"* led me to the conclusion that in majority, it is not in the responsibility of a department or skilled person, but to the director or general

manager, which explains including the direct proportionality between the existing tourism units' classification and the degree of professionalisation of communication and related activities, essentially in the way of promoting their image. In cases where the director or general manager assumes, the responsibilities related with the external organizational communication, the correlation coefficient (F) is the smallest (F = 15,132) compared with the situation where there is a specialized department (F = 21.719), as resulted from the data presented in tab. no. 1. From the statistical point of view, as all thresholds of significance p are relevant, this means that the results can be extrapolated to the organizational reality. Normal appears the fact that, even if is relying on external advice ("external partners") for the design and execution of the organizational communication, the obtained result is higher (F = 32.316). The situation is present, especially in the 5 stars hotels. Given that all values of p are *statistically significant* ($p \leq 0.05$) is accepted **the main hypothesis validity**. In this context, important is that taking "control" over all that means *image of the organization* for the environment and even to its own employees, may only have unfavorable (negative) effects on the adaptability of the managerial initiatives to specific requirements of a performant management. More specifically, I am referring to the fact that *the ignorance of the environmental reality or its "distorted" knowledge, coupled with the cancellation of the customer feedback are likely to generate, as a direct result of reliance on the experience and intuition, empiricism and even amateurism in the undertaken actions;*

- d) by consulting the answers to the question "... Specify what ways you use for the external communication process and how would you assess their effectiveness", I found that in most tourism organizations from our country, *the internet, email and social networks* are seen as the most effective forms of external organizational communication. In this context, the fact that F has high values (F = 41.914, respectively F = 40.693) confirms the reduced emphasis placed by management on the *feedback* received from customers. As, in all cases $p \leq 0.05$, **is reconfirmed the validity of the main hypothesis**. However, in this context, significant values of F (as they result from tab.nr.1) confirmed **the validity of the first secondary hypotheses**;
- e) in order to have a more complete overview on the management professionalism in promoting its image in order to attract customers and make them loyal, I asked the question: *"Is there, in your unit, any customer loyalty programs?"*. Responses were demotivating at least in two ways, as follows:
- many managers (497 people, representing 35.63 percentage points from the total of 1395 respondents) say they do not have such programs. Following informal discussions that I conducted with over 150 managers of tourism establishments, I found that, indeed, the loyalty of tourists (basically, the customers of these units) is primarily a declarative matter, many entrepreneurs/managers in the field pursuing "survival" from one year to another. Or, in many cases, in the existence based, primarily, on the (occasional) events and not on actions that would, indeed, generate the (ardent) desire for customers to return year after year, with maximum pleasure in the destinations they like;
 - if they answer "yes" (as I pointed out, is the case of 898, respectively, 64.37% of the 1395 respondents) the effectiveness of actions aiming at customer loyalty appears as totally insignificant (10- 15% regular customers). The attempt to "survive" from one year to the next, can only bring major harm any tourism unit. The conclusion is reinforced (from the data presented in tab.nr.1) by the fact that the result in ANOVA $p = 0.534$ indicates ($p \geq 0.05$), respectively, $F = 0.824$. Consequently, we should not

be surprised at all that the lack of professionalism in the field becomes a state of "normality", especially given that appealing, for customer loyalty, to "other forms" is specific to "relations" which are encouraged and even developed by the travel units' management with the trade unions of different organizations, "relationships" whose direct result is to ensure a greater degree of occupancy of the accommodation capacity. In this case, as it results from the data contained in tab.nr.1, the "other forms" procedure effectiveness is supported by the values of p and F ($p = 0$ and $F = 5.675$);

Table 2. Summary of ANOVA results for entrepreneurs/managers of tourism units

Question / options	Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Responsible for org. com. (OC) is: - OC Department - Sales Department - Marketing Depart. - General Manager - External Partners	<i>Between groups</i>	32061.266	4	8015.317	21.719	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	56465.037	1403	369.053		
	Total	88526.304	1407			
	<i>Between groups</i>	30910.003	4	7727.501	24.617	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	48027.927	1403	313.908		
	Total	78937.930	1407			
	<i>Between groups</i>	32674.120	4	8168.530	21.700	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	57595.051	1403	376.438		
	Total	90269.171	1407			
	<i>Between groups</i>	20603.242	4	5150.810	15.132	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	52079.296	1403	340.388		
	Total	72682.538	1407			
	<i>Between groups</i>	24188.007	4	6047.002	32.316	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	28629.493	1403	187.121		
	Total	52817.500	1407			
2. Used form of OC: - Internet - E-mail - Social networks (Facebook, Twitter etc.)	<i>Between groups</i>	66185.687	1	16546.422	41.914	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	60399.832	1402	394.770		
	Total	126585.5	1403			
	<i>Between groups</i>	20540.830	2	5135.208	13.700	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	57347.885	1170	374.823		
	Total	77888.715	1172			
	<i>Between groups</i>	44226.029	4	11056.507	40.693	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	41571.060	1272	271.706		
	Total	85797.089	1276			
3. Forms of customer loyalty - Phone or e-mail - Loyalty programs - Other forms	<i>Between groups</i>	11318.678	2	2263.736	2.988	.013
	<i>Within group</i>	115173.5	1382	757.721		
	Total	126492.2	1384			
	<i>Between groups</i>	1442.637	3	288.527	.824	.534
	<i>Within group</i>	53226.122	1392	350.172		
	Total	54668.759	1395			
	<i>Between groups</i>	11388.568	5	2277.714	5.675	.000
	<i>Within group</i>	61006.122	1173	401.356		
	Total	72394.690	1178			

Question / options	Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
4. Aspects covered by audit - Image to third parties	Between groups	2055.255	5	411.051	1.223	.301
	Within group	51079.606	412	336.050		
	Total	53134.861	417			
- Customer relationships	Between groups	10828.872	2	2165.774	2.798	.119
	Within group	117648.0	421	774.000		
	Total	128476.8	423			
- Creating customer loyalty	Between groups	2899.195	1	579.839	1.170	.326
	Within group	75310.754	11	495.465		
	Total	78209.949	12			
- I don't know	Between groups	2681.119	1	536.224	1.049	.391
	Within group	77734.457	4	511.411		
	Total	80415.576	5			

Source: results of data processing by the author in ANOVA

- applying the theory of correlation and linear regression, I examined the correlation between the efficiency of the external communication methods and the bookings situation made through some of these methods by the guests of the travel units. Specifically, I sought to determine, for example, whether the use of the *website*, the email and / or phone that they has and/or may have, as a result, the directly accessing of those by the customers.

Analyzing the data series available through questionnaire responses, we obtained the following results:

- when using the *Internet* as a means of external organizational communication, the correlation with those who make of bookings through it, in *online* regime is represented by the function:

$$y = 0,744709 x + 63,03452 \quad (6)$$

where the very high regression coefficient ($r = 0.989632$) reinforces the major effectiveness of this communication method between the accommodation facilities and the customers performing reservations through it. Finally, as the experience proves, the *Internet* has become a very commonly way appealed for effective organizational communication (and not only). The characteristics with reference to practices of tourism establishments' clients are going to be detailed, in the fifth chapter of the thesis. Here its important to reveal also that use of the *intranet* as a means of internal communication is still in very early phase;

- if using the *phone/e-mail* as a means of communicative relationship with the environment, the correlative report with those bookings through it, is represented by the function:

$$y = - 0,05245x + 289,6183 \quad (7)$$

in which the negative regression coefficient close to zero ($r = - 0.06441$), shows the low efficiency and/or ineffectiveness of using those ways in organizational communication. Using, in the accommodation units, the *e-mail* as a means of external organizational communication does not have the expected effects, the number of those booking by *e-mail*, although seemingly important (1172 people) it is not reflected in a major efficiency of the *tourism act*. More specifically, in this case, I am referring to the reality that the bookings made by *e-mail* are a subjective direct consequence of their unipersonale decision, after consulting the *websites* of the accommodation facilities

and not of the efforts of these organizations in the direction of improving communication with their customers. I will return to this issue, but more detailed in the next chapter of the thesis, dedicated to analyzing the quality of organizational communication in terms of customer satisfaction for the services they benefited in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry;

- in terms of appealing to social networks (Facebook, Twitter etc.), processing data series generated the function:

$$y = 0,189348x + 142,2783 \quad (8)$$

where the average regression coefficient ($r = 0.440082$) shows a weak correlation between organizational communication efforts to create effective relationships with tourists and the reality on the ground. More specifically, as I have emphasized, appealing to *social networks* as a means to attract and/or make customers loyal can not have a high efficiency because you can not build a communication strategy and, furthermore, a sustainable and viable relationship with customers based on accessing some *websites* where anyone can intervene *when* and, especially, *as* desires, not any information being scientifically verifiable;

*These conclusions lead me, in addition to **reconfirming the main hypothesis**, also to the confirmation of **the two secondary hypotheses' validity**, namely:*

- *there is a low degree of professionalisation of the external organizational communication in tourism;*
- *although powerful, the impact of the implementation of modern communication technologies on attracting customers has, as a direct consequence, customer loyalty.*

- f) to the question "*If you use internal communication audits which issues you track, with priority?*" I was very surprised to find that most respondents are primarily interested in organization's image to third parties and customer relations, and much less in their loyalty.

In this context, as resulting from the data in tab. 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, $p = 0.326$) concluded *the insignificance of the organizational communication audit practice*.

Basically, I am not yet clear whether, indeed, in the tourism units from our country (except those with a higher classification) audits are also practiced.

In my opinion, most of the respondents answered *yes* to this question from fear or ignorance, and why not, even by... shame. The findings have led me again at the conclusion of **the validity of the second secondary hypotheses**.

It becomes obvious that the dynamic and operational interaction between the managers of tourism units is absolutely necessary. In this manner, using *crowdsourcing* can prove its usefulness by entrusting *micro-tasks* to anyone interested in contributing to the development of tourism activities. For example, an option could be, by providing a platform for crowdsourcing, nationally, offering to profile managers (and others) the opportunity to consult among themselves and to propose viable solutions to some basic problems facing in their work, especially in the restrictive environment constantly changing and increasingly less friendly. Especially that our practice of "complaining" every year, on

the "harsh" conditions, the lack of funds, lack of understanding and involvement of the authorities, the "incoherent" legislative framework, the "unpredictability" of the future, etc. can not be than just ephemeral excuses for perpetuating a bad management, generating economic and financial results not always positive (especially in terms of generating revenue from the state budget).

From the presented content are resulting the *two proposals* that I formulate in the attention of the responsible decision makers in the field:

1. *appealing, in order to seek a more real opinion of the customers of tourism units, at crowdsourcing, as the main form of feedback. By crowdsourcing, the managers of the profile units can hold extremely useful information for the improvement of their activities;*
2. *creating a database (both at national and at regional and/or local levels) containing the main trends of customers in choosing destinations and the criteria for substantiation of their decisions. It's a new way to improve own activity, crowdsourcing proving, once again, the usefulness of customer relationship management for improving the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was co-financed from the European Social Fund through Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013, project number POSDRU/159/1.5/S/142115, project title "Performance and Excellence in Doctoral and Postdoctoral Research in Romanian Economics Science Domain".

REFERENCES

- Bardhan, D.A., Kroll, C. (2003). *The New Wave of Outsourcing*, Berkeley: Fisher Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics, University of California
- Bendor-Samuel, P. (2000). *Turning Lead into Gold: The Demystification of Outsourcing*, Provo, Utah: Executive Excellence **Publishing**
- Brabham, D. (2012). The Myth of Amateur Crowds: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Crowdsourcing Coverage, *Information, Communication & Society Review*. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2011.641991
- Brabham, D. (2008). Crowdsourcing as a Model for Problem Solving: An Introduction and Cases (PDF), în *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 14(1), 75–90
- Dawson, R., Bynghall, S. (2011). *Getting Results from Crowds*, San Francisco: Advanced Human Technologies
- Estellés-Arolas, E., Ladrón-de-Guevara, F. (2012). Towards an Integrated Crowdsourcing Definition, *Journal of Information Science*, 38(2), 189–200
- Fieldman, M. (2013). *Socialized! How the Most Successful Businesses Harness the Power of Social*, Brookline, MA: Biblimotion
- Howe, J. (2008). **Crowdsourcing: Why the Power of the Crowd Is Driving the Future of Business**, New York: The International Achievement Institute
- Howe, J. (2006). *The Rise of Crowdsourcing*, Wired Magazine, Issue 14.06, www.wired.com (accessed July 27th, 2014)
- Kittur, A., Nickerson, J. et al. (2013). *The Future of Crowd Work*, www.hci.stanford.edu/publications/2013 (accessed August 20th, 2014)

- Kotter, J., Cohen, D. (2012). *The Heart of Change: Real-Life Stories of How People Change Their Organizations*. Boston, Harvard Business Review Press
- Lombard, A. (2013). *Crowdfynd: The First Place to Look*. www.time.com. (accessed July 28th, 2014)
- Miettinen, V. (2011). *Crowdsourcing global development: working theories. Short Stories About Tiny Tasks*, www.microtask.org (accessed June 30th, 2014)
- Oshri, I, Kotlarsky J., Willcocks L. (2009). *The Handbook of Global Outsourcing and Offshoring*. New York: Palgrave McMillan Publishing
- Patton, R. (2004). *Change Management*. London: SAGE Publications
- Popescu, D., State, C. (2015). Crowdsourcing: an alternative for the dynamic development of entrepreneurship in Roumanian tourism. *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, 17 (38), 165-182
- Popescu, D., State, C. (2014). From the science of influencing to the art of manipulation. Bucharest: The Bucharest University of Economic Studies Publishing
- Popescu, D., State, C. et al. (2012). Change management - condition of the organizational sustainability in small and medium enterprises from IT & C, *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, XIV (32), 246-255
- Saxton, Oh., Kishore, A. (2013). „Rules of Crowdsourcing: Models, Issues, and Systems of Control”, in *Information Systems Management*, (30), 2-20
- Toffler, A., Toffler, H. (2006). *Revolutionary Wealth*. New York: Knopf
- Van Henk, E. (2010). Crowdsourcing: how to find a crowd, in *ARD/ZDF Akademie*, Berlin, 99