# New Faces of Marketing In The Era of The Web: From Marketing 1.0 To Marketing 3.0

Nozha Erragcha[1], Rabiaa Romdhane[2]
[1]Faculty of Law, Economics and Management of Jendouba-Tunisia
Postal Address: 50, City Ennacim, 7100 El Kef, Tunisia
erragcha@yahoo.fr
[2]Institute of Business and Accounting of Bizerta University of Tunis Carthage.
Postal Address: 117, Street Port Saïd, city Bougatfa 2, 7053, Bizerta, Tunisia
rabiaa.romdhane@yahoo.com

**Abstract**- *In the new economic and social environment, the development of new technologies coupled with the evolution of the Internet, had a deep impact on the lifestyles of the consumers and consequently on the concepts and the practices of the Marketing. Understanding the changes undergone by the marketing with the development of digital social networks and Web 3.0 technology is essential and the way in which the marketeurs can exploit this new technology. This contribution highlights mutations of marketing techniques to align the evolution of the Internet and the changes introduced by the passage of Web1.0 Web 3.0*

**Keywords-***Marketing 1.0; Web 2.0; Digital social network; Web 3.0; Marketing 3.0*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, deep changes have taken place in the field of marketing, especially with regard to the emergence of Internet or digital social networks. With the advent of online social networks, events took a new dimension for both consumers and businesses and therefore for the practice of marketing. All these new changes directly impact the traditional marketing model where the need for a reconsideration of the concepts and tools of marketing. There is then a move from a mass marketing approach via standardized products to a more personalized marketing approach that proposes tailored and specific individual offers. The consumer has changed his/her behaviour. Now, he took on a new status. The consumer has become more demanding and volatile. Marketing should adapt and cope with this new digital media to be closer to their customers and, at the same time adapt itself to their needs, if not it will lose its relevance. As a result, these changes have significantly affected Marketing as Philip Kotler (Kotler, 2012), one of the fathers of marketing, had put it. Whereas marketing 1.0 focused on product management, marketing 2.0 is based on the predominance of communitarianism. It became participatory with the advent of tools together under the label Web 2.0. While extending collaborative and participatory Web 2.0, a transition to Web 3.0 is of an order. This new age is expressed in cooperation of participants (Barassi and Trerè, 2012). Hence, a new marketing approach has been developed and implemented: Marketing 3.0. Here, this new approach lends itself to a cultural and spiritual collaborative vision (Kotler, 2012), which is characterized by the ubiquity and intelligence of

the network (Mayol, 2011). The impact of 3.0 Web on marketing was not systematically analysed in the literature. This article examines the effect of Web 3.0 on marketing and the way marketing experts may exploit this new technology. In this context, this contribution puts an emphasis on the changes in marketing techniques to align the discipline with Internet progress and with the changes introduced by the movement from marketing 1.0 to marketing 3.0.

## 2. EVOLUTION OF MARKETING

Marketing is a constantly changing discipline. It has evolved over time (Kotler, 2012). Following various additional changes in the marketing approach, its key concepts have been marked by numerous innovations and contributions in their structures and nature (Kotler 2012; Dussart and Nantel, 2007). Marketing moved from "brand equity" to "customer capital" to finally focus on "business capital" as pointed out by Dussart and Nantel (2007). Initially, the main function was then supporting the production while taking into account the financial and human resources components. The marketing mix, developed by Borden in 1965 and described by the "four Ps" by McCarthy (1964), summarizes the actions and practices related to product management (Bennett, 1997). The proposed consumer offer is a combination of a multitude of components: product development, pricing, promotion and distribution (Goi, 2009). At this stage marketing is only tactical (Vandercammen, 2012). Uncertainty of economic context, scarcity of demand and change in consumer behaviour made it difficult managing

the offer using only the four Ps. Marketers have then developed new concepts (Kotler, 2012). They understood that the concept "product" should be put aside to focus on the concept "customer". Segmentation, targeting and positioning should then precede the four Ps. Marketing abandoned the tactical component to join the strategic, which paved the way for modern marketing. Globalization and development of information technology and Internet made merketing highly responsive and scalable. In this context, consumers can interact and share information made ubiquitous via Internet. They are well informed thanks to the benefits of mouth-to-electronic ear phenomenon (Cheung, 2008). It is no longer possible to reach the customer through traditional marketing tools. Human emotions have become the marketing defence tool against these changes (Mayol, 2011). New marketing concepts such as emotional marketing, experiential marketing (Kotler, 2012) emerged.

## 2.1 Marketing 1.0

According to Kotler, Marketing 1.0, which refers to the first marketing approach, appeared as an outcome of the development of production during a new industrial revolution (Kotler, 2012) based on the rise of new information technologies and communication and especially following the burst of the Internet bubble. Thus, in these lines that the first Web application called "Web 1.0" application which Scheid and his colleagues (Scheid et al., 2012) called "replicative Web", whose basic principle is to provide products and services of offline businesses. The user in this case is passive and his/her mission is to browse commercial web sites pages by clicking hyperlinks. In the era of web 1.0, marketing adapts a commercial approach of unidirectional communication. Dissemination of content is mainly of a vertical type like sending messages to online consumers, the application of static banners, exchange links between partner sites, and sending newsletters. In such a situation, the main objective of the company is simply to produce more rather sell or not worry about consumer expectations. It is the economics of supply as product availability ensures its sale. The product was the heart of marketing. Marketing 1.0 is based on the "four P's" of Marketing Mix. It considers an approach based on targeting. It rests on segmentation, marketing mix elements, and the one-way contact with the target. Communication is unidirectional through traditional channels (mail, TV and radio ads). The objective of Marketing 1.0 is still the short-term processing of the transaction. In conclusion, marketing 1.0 is anonymous, intrusive, focused on mass transactions and structured around the "four Ps".

## 2.2 The origin of Marketing 2.0: Web 2.0

The Web 2.0 also known as Community Web era started in 2004 by Tim O'Reilly at a conference organized by O'Reilly and Medialive International (2004). It was a revolution of the new Web paradigm. In contrast to the first generation of Web, Web 2.0 is based on a wide variety of active tools that provide true interactivity

between users based on pooling of individual knowledge and information sharing. Web 2.0 technologies covers a dynamic and interactive aspect of content and combines both social and technical aspects (Poynter and Lawrence, 2008), hence "social web" (Weber, 2007). This relationship values the power of social context in creating affective, intellectual relationships, membership groups, reference groups and virtual communities. It is the bidirectionality of information which takes over unidirectionality (Poynter et Lawrence, 2008), symbolised by top-of-the edge applications and publication tool like blogs, collaborative plat forms like the Wiki, offering production possibilities, diffusion and content consumption. This new version of the Web rests on social media (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010) whose main characteristic is "User Generated Content" (UGC) (Ye et al. 2011), provided by "User Generated Media" (UGM) (Poynter and Lawrence, 2008) based on *crowdsourcing* processes: defined by use of intelligence and innovation of many people to create content. They generate a new continuous and interactive dialogue between users who become true collaborators and producers of goods and services. This phenomenon uses participation and collaboration architecture between the different users and promotes exchange, creativity, responsiveness, innovation and flexibility (O'Reilly, 2005). It is through added value of different users' individual actions that collective intelligence "IC" (Levy, 1997) emerges. In this regard, Lévy (2010) proposes the construct of social computing as a consequence of the development of collective intelligence. Indeed, the implications of Web 2.0 for marketing researchers are becoming clearer through control of communication channels and information flow in online environments (Mazurek, 2009). This phenomenon directly affects marketing and traditional communication processes by modifying media structure and the relationship between the advertiser and its targets (Mazurek, 2009). Therefore, Web 2.0 phenomenon marks the emergence of a new communication paradigm. Marketing communication in this context has become a dialogue rather than a monologue. It is thus reflected in this movement from interactivity to interaction contributing to the construction of networks that are no longer based on the simple information exchange but on knowledge sharing. The user becomes active and interactivity is no longer between consumers and brands, but between users themselves. Internet users become a "consum'actor» also called "prosumer" (Kotler, 2012) or «post- consumer" (Cova and Cova, 2009). In this case, they play a proactive role in the development of supply via virtual communities and Digital Social Networks (DSN) (Turcotte- choquette and Parmentier, 2011). It publishes information online (Blogs) , shares content, videos and pictures (eg, Youtube, Flickr ), discusses real-time or instantaneously (eg , forums , Yahoo Messenger , Skype, Google Talk ), review and publish (Facebook, Twitter).In this context, participatory marketing offers a different communicative space for consumers while relying on a

more conversational and interactive frame and in an atmosphere of closeness and complicity. Consequently, in addition to the "one-to-many" model, Web 2.0 helped to construct new bidirectional communication patterns in which control is provided by users such as:- The one to one (email, instant messaging ...);- The one to few (blogs, personal pages of social networks....);- The one to many (consumer reviews posted on specialized sites ...);- The many to many (wikis ...).

### 2.3 Digital social network

Web 2.0 as a new Web paradigm is at the origin of the advent of Social Networks Digital. It is important to note first that this concept is expressed in different ways depending on the perspective taken by authors. Some refer to the term "digital social networks", community sites dedicated to networking (Mercier, 2008), others use the term "socio-digital networks" (Coutant and Stenger, 2009). Web professionals can not agree on a common definition of "digital social networks." Several definitions have been offered, a summary of them has been proposed by Girard and Fallery (2009). Stenger and Coutant (2010) proposed a definition of RSN that seems to perfectly describe this concept. They consider RSN as web services that allow individuals: (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a system, (2) maintain a list of users with whom they share a link, (3 ) to view and navigate on their list of connections and those established by others within the system, and (4) base their attractiveness mainly on the first three points and not on a particular activity. Digital social networks (RSN) are a tool that allows for the formation of contact networks, and provides users a connection with their online friends with whom they share different content and applications and creates a network of private or professional relationships. Socialization is the central value of Digital Social Networks. Customers are grouped into virtual communities or tribes around a common interest or passion, identical culture and way of life. This leads to self-controlling of their members who constantly discover some shared interests or ideas. Digital social networks are an information infrastructure, invisible to users and international (Zammar, 2012).

## 3. MARKETING 2.0: THE TRANSITION FROM ACTION TO INTERACTION

Marketing has experienced very rapid development since the advent of Internet, both in the way it communicates, in its communication support and in its very definition. An effort to adapt was made and it even touched the marketing approach. This has resulted in the emergence of Marketing 2.0. Marketing 2.0 can be summarized as a combination of three concepts, namely: Webmarketing, Web 2.0 and social media (Mayol, 2011). The fundamental principle of marketing 2.0 is to integrate consumers at all levels of the marketing approach and considers them as an active player in the marketing process and not a single receiver (Bressolles, 2012). These changes require the development of tools that allow consumers to interact in order to

improve the management of the relationship with existing customers. Scheid et al (2012) reported that marketing 2.0 affects traditional marketing in two ways: - Enhance the functions of traditional marketing effectively and efficiently.- Transforming marketing strategies: creating new business models. Similarly, marketing 2.0 has to move away from "transactional marketing" to a new approach that could be characterized as "marketing facilitator" (Pelet, 2011). Such an approach is focussed on sharing knowledge with customers and on enabling knowledge sharing between clients (Pablo et al, 2006). The integration of customer in companies' marketing procedures and communication as a key player in some cases is essential. Consumers can then be active participants in the product design process or improvement. They can even participate in the construction of advertising messages (Mencarelli and Pulh, 2009).Indeed, we can identify consumers attitudes towards brands through their interaction the Web: blogs, forums, social networks (Facebook, Twitter), online citizen media . Therefore, the myth of "customer is king" (Regnault, 2003) becomes a reality on the Web 2.0. Indeed, the customer becomes the true master of the situation, he decides.In sum, the major changes that have affected traditional marketing due to the emergence of marketing 2.0 are:- The transition from an action strategy to an interaction strategy.- Decentralization of value creation on a network of sites. Web 2.0, as proposed by O'Reilly (2005), is quickly left behind to be replaced by what is suggested by Web3.0 application developers based on user participation (Fuchs et al. 2010 Harris, 2008; Tasner, 2010). This new wave of technology-based social media is the main initiator of Marketing 3.0.

## 4. WEB 3.0 AND SEMANTIC WEB: A NEW ERA OF OPPORTUNITIES

This term is shaped by new age business models and Web developers. Researchers agree that Tim Berners is the father of the Web and a great defender of Web 3.0 (Berners -Lee, 1998; Giustini, 2007). According to him «Web 3.0 will be able to read and understand content and context ».Web 3.0 has been defined in different ways, often not reaching a consensus. Some have adopted a broad vision to define Web 3.0. According to this view, the new landscape of the Web is associated with the idea of Semantic Web (Hendler, 2009). In this case, the key is to understand the meaning of information that perfectly meets our needs rather than present and display page contents. For some, this new figure is not synonymous with Semantic Web. But it is largely characterized by semantics. Its emergence is based on three crucial components: Semantic Web, Web 2.0 applications and artificial intelligence (Kwanya et al, 2012).Web 3.0 is the third version of the Web (2010-2020) that added value for users who use a more intelligent Web, enabling them to have a better experience ( Hendler, 2009; Jastram, 2008). It consists of organizing the enormous amount of available

information, taking into account the context and the personal needs of each user (Giustini, 2007). It is a Web whose ambition is to make sense of data.Web 3.0 is a new online environment, integrating user-generated data to create a new meaning. Unlike Web 2.0, which is based on user participation, Web 3.0 is based on users' cooperation (Fuchs et al, 2010. Harris, 2008; Tasner, 2010, Watson, 2009). Web3.0 connects objects and data. Therefore, semantic web simplifies the users choices in seeking information by filtering irrelevant content.Web 3.0 is also called intuitive Web, i.e. a Semantic Web that allows for cross-interactions between web services. Web 3.0 will be individualized and behavioural.The mission of Web 3.0 is to open a new era of an extended immersive experience. In this era, it is possible to identify new venues for a value chain which will not be limited to the Web. Users' shopping experience will be more immersive but also more extended to other fields. Marshall and Shipman (2003) suggested that most deployed efforts have been influenced by the need to organize and order overflowing and chaotic information found on the Internet, maturity of artificial intelligence and the desire to eliminate redundant elements and selecting or prioritizing others according to the needs of each user.

## 5. GOOD BYE MARKETING 2.0 WELCOME MARKETING 3.0

Emergence of marketing 3.0 is favoured by deep changes in consumer behaviour that needs the combined intervention of collaborative, cultural and spiritual marketing (Kotler, 2012). A highly sophisticated customer orientation, in which the customer claims a collaborative, cultural and spiritual marketing approach, is needed: Marketing 3.0. According to Kotler (2012) and Mayol (2011) collaborative marketing is the first cornerstone of marketing 3.0. Transparency and consistency imposed by the new Web 3.0 practices on entrepreneurs and brands calls for a new environment. Communication is no longer a question of persuasion or conversation; it became immersive. In this context, companies are forced to collaborate with their customers, employees, partners, and investors. All these parties should be aware of what role they play. Marketing 3.0 is the result of collaboration between a group of entities, adopting all the same values.The new technology wave has been the source of globalization. Therefore, globalization paradoxes, particularly the socio-cultural paradox affects among other things consumers who have found themselves under pressure to manage a difficult dilemma: to be a local citizen and a global citizen. Cultural issues are then relevant that companies should consider. Marketing 3.0 puts the cultural dimension at the centre of the economic model of a business that addresses the diverse communities surrounding it. Technology development also leads to increasing the role of creative people in society. These people make extensive use of social media. They are collaborative co-creators convinced unlike Maslow

proposed in his needs pyramid that personal fulfilment is a critical need. For them "spirituality and its quest" is paramount. Lifestyles and attitudes of these people affect the way humans perceive their needs and wants (Kotler, 2012). "The psycho- spiritual benefits are therefore the essential need of consumers" (Melinda 2002). Companies should be aware of this new trend.Marketing 3.0 is defined by Kotler (2012) as a marketing "centred on values and the search for meaning". Companies are evaluated not only with respect to the profit they generate but also in terms of their behavior towards Humans and the Planet. It is a way of incorporating business in society. Values-orientated marketing means constraints and additional costs, a classic marketing strategy oriented towards specific causes and integrative of values in the DNA of the brand according to Kotler (2012).

## 6. CONCLUSION

In order to be more competitive and creative, marketers can no longer ignore this new development when defining their marketing strategy. Welcome to the era of marketing 3.0. It is therefore not surprising that facing these evolving consumption practices, enormous changes in consumers and markets, fragile company borders and the skills and expertise necessary for developing new projects are thereby also changed. However, repositioning themselves in their socio-technical context leads to approaching marketing from a the perspective of managing the value created by users. Companies abandon the consumer as the centre of interest to look at the human, and where profitability and the social component of the company should level of as reported by (Kotler,2012). This latter needs both a cultural and spiritual collaborative marketing (Kotler, 2012).In the marketing 3.0 era, consumers have changed. They become more sensitive to the concerns of society. In such context, companies should anticipate or adapt themselves to new trends to meet this new context, finally abandoning the limits of marketing 1.0 and 2.0 and launch themselves into a new era of Marketing 3.0.In a digital world, interconnected and open, we should develop new techniques. To achieve its objectives, companies should focus primarily on improving its core business and making it coherent with the values sought by the community.

## 7. REFERENCES

[1]     Barassi, V., Treré, E. 2012. Does Web 3.0 come after Web 2.0? Deconstructing theoretical assumptions through practice. New media & society 0(0), 1 –17

[2]     Bennett, A. R. 1997. The Five Vs - A Buyer's Perspective of the Marketing Mix. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 15(3), 151-156.

[3]     Berners-Lee, T. 1998. Semantic web roadmap. http://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/Semantic.html.

[4] Borden, N. H. 1965. The concept of the marketing mix. In Schwartz, G. (Ed), Science in marketing. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 386-397

[5] Bressolles, G. 2012. L'e-marketing. Dunod. 128p

[6] Cavazza, F. 2008. Panorama des médias sociaux. FredCavazza.net. http://www.fredcavazza.net/2008/05/19/panoramades- medias-sociaux/

[7] Cazals, F. 2007. Web 2.0 et Marketing. Cahier de la Recherche de l'ISC Paris, N° 18.

[8] Cheung, Christy, M.K. 2008. The impact of electronic word-of-mouth: The adoption of online opinions in online customer communities. Internet Research, Vol. 18, No. 3, 229-247

[9] Coutant, A., Thomas S. 2009. Les configurations sociotechniques sur le Web et leurs usages : le cas des réseaux sociaux numériques. 7ème Colloque du chapitre français de l'ISKO, Lyon, 24 – 26 juin, 27-34.

[10] Cova, B., et Cova . 2009. Les figures du nouveau consommateur : une genèse de la gouvernementalité du consommateur. Recherche et Applications en Marketing, vol. 24, n° 3/2009

[11] Dussart, C. , Nantel, J. 2007. L'évolution du marketing . Gestion , Vol 32, No 3, 66 -74.

[12] Fuchs, C. 2010. Social software and Web 2.0: Their sociological foundations and implications. In: Murugesan S (ed.) Handbook of Research on Web 2.0, 3.0, and X.0: Technologies, Business, and Social Applications, vol. II. Hershey, PA: IGI-Global, 764–789.

[13] Fuchs, C., Hofkirchner, W., Schafranek, M., Raffl, C., Sandoval, M. and Bichler R. 2010.Theoretical foundations of the web: cognition, communication, and co-operation. Towards an understanding of Web 1.0, 2.0, 3.0. Future Internet, Vol 2, No 1, 41-59.

[14] Garrigos-Simon, F. J, Alcamı, R.L, Ribera, T. B. 2012.Social networks and Web 3.0: their impact on the management and marketing of organizations", *Management Decision*, Vol 50, No 10, 1880 -1890.

[15] Girard, A., et Fallery B. 2009. Réseaux Sociaux Numériques : revue de littérature et perspectives de recherche. Accessible en ligne : http://www.reims-ms.fr/events/aim2009/pdf/Papier%2066.pdf: consulté le 20 octobre 2013.

[16] Giustini, D . 2007.Web 3.0 and medicine. Brirish Medical Journal. 335, 1273–1274.

[17] Goi, Chai L. 2009. A Review of Marketing Mix: 4Ps or More? Internation Journal of Marketing Studies, Vol 1, N°1, 1 - 15.

[18] Harris, D. 2008. Web 2. 0 Evolution into the Intelligent Web 3. 0: 100 Most Asked Questions on Transformation, Ubiquitous Connectivity, Network Computing, Open Technologies, Open Identity, Distributed Databases and Intelligent Applications, Newstead, Australia: Emereo Publishing.

[19] Hendler, J. 2009. Web 3.0 emerging. Computer, Vol 42, No 1, 111-3.

[20] Jastram, I. 2008. Library 3.0. disponible sur : http://pegasuslibrarian.com/2008/08/library-3-0.html

[21] Kaplan, A. Met Haenlein, M. 2010. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. Business Horizons 53, 59 – 68.

[22] Kotler, P, Kartajaya . H, Setiawan.I, 2012. Marketing 3.0 : produits, clients, facteurs humains, Edition De Boeck

[23] Kwanya, T., Stilwell C., and Underwood Peter G. 2012. Intelligent libraries and apomediators: Distinguishing between Library 3.0 and Library 2.0. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 45(3), 187–197

[24] Langheinrich, M., Karjoth, G. 2010. Social networking and the risk to companies and institutions. Information Security Tech. Report, Vol 15, N°2, May 2010, 51-56.

[25] Laurent, F., Bellanger, P. 2008. Marketing 2.0 l'intelligence collective. M21 Editions, Paris.

[26] Lévy P. (2010), « Vers une science de l'intelligence collective». Accessible en ligne. <http://www.ieml.org/IMG/pdf/00-2-vers-sci-lC.pdf> Consulté le 28 septembre 2013.

[27] Lévy, P. 1997. L'intelligence collective : pour une anthropologie du cyberspace. la Découverte

[28] Marshall, C.C., Shipman F.M. 2003. Which semantic web?. disponible sur http://www.csdl.tamu.edu/~marshall/ht03-sw-4.pdf.

[29] Mayol, S. 2011. Le marketing 3.0, Editions Duno

[30] Mazurek, G. 2009. Web 2.0 Implications on Marketing, Management of Organizations: Systematic Research, 51, 69-82.

[31] Mc Carthy, E. J. 1964. Basic Marketing. IL: Richard D. Irwin

[32] Mencarelli, R., Pulh, M. 2009. La communication 2.0 : un dialogue sous conditions , Décisions Marketing, No. 54 (Avril-Juin 2009), 71 -75

[33] Mercier, P.A. 2008. Liens faibles sur courants faibles : Réseaux sociaux et technologies de communication. Informations sociales.147, 20-31.

[34] Mercklé, P. 2004. Sociologie des réseaux sociaux. La Découverte, 2004

[35] O'Reilly, T. 2005. What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. Disponible sur : http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html

[36] Pablo, E., Desouza K.C., Schäfer-Jugel A., Kurzawa M. 2006. Business customer communities and knowledge sharing: exploratory study of critical issue. European Journal of Information Systems, 15, 511-524.

[37] Pelet, J.E. 2011. Le e-commerce renforcé par les réseaux sociaux numériques : résultats d'une application expérimentale de la méthode Delphi.

Disponible sur : http://hal.univ-nantes.fr/docs/00/65/26/00/PDF/final_4.pdf.

[38] Poynter, R. et Lawrence, G. 2008. Insight 2.0 : Nouveaux médias, nouvelles règles, nouvelle vision approfondie. Revue Française du Marketing, Juillet 2008, p 25 – 38.

[39] Rayan, D., Jones C. 2009. Understanding Digital Marketing, Marketing strategies for engaging the digital generation, editions Kogan.

[40] Regnaud, D. 2003. Le trompe-l'œil du client roi, pour une vraie relation de service dans les services "grand public. Lettre de CISTE N° 35, Novembre 2003, 1- 6.

[41] Scheid, F. Vaillant, R. & De Montaigu, G. 2012. Le marketing digital : développer sa stratégie à l'ère numérique, Ed Eyrolles.

[42] Stenger, T. et Coutant, A. 2010. Les réseaux sociaux numériques : des discours de promotion à la définition d'un objet et d'une méthodologie de recherche. Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 44, janv-20

[43] Tasner, M. 2010. Marketing in the Moment: The Practical Guide to Using Web 3.0 to Reach your Customers First. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

[44] Turcotte-choquette, A. & Parmentier, M-A. 2011, Le web 2.0 : mieux le comprendre pour mieux l'utiliser. Cahier de recherche n° 11-02.

[45] Vandercammen, M. 2012. Marketing: l'essentiel pour comprendre, décider, agir, 2émé édition, Deboeck.

[46] Watson, M. 2009. Scripting Intelligence: Web 3.0 Information, Gathering and Processing" (Apress Series: Expert's Voice in Open Source). New York: Springer Publishing.

[47] Weber, L. 2007. Marketing to the social web: how digital customer communities build your business. Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey.

[48] Zammar, N .2012. Réseaux sociaux numériques : essai de catégorisation et de cartographie des controverses. Thèse de doctorat en sciences de l'information et de la communication, Université Rennes 2.