Paper: Dissertation Proposal

Style: MLA

Pages: 13

Sources: 11

Level: Bachelor

Web 2.0 and Cultural Institutions

[Name of the Writer]

[Name of the Supervisor]

[Course]

Since the mid 2000s, the topic of Web 2.0 or collaborative Web is becoming increasingly popular in academic, political and economic circles. The term Web 2.0 appeared in 2003. Paternity is generally assigned to the computer expert and entrepreneur Tim O'Reilly. From 2004, it is the subject of an extensive promotional campaign. Social Darwinism seems to have contributed to exorcise evil memories of the bursting of the stock market bubble of the beginning of the decade of 2000. The collapse of the financial value of companies operating in Web appears as a turning point in the history of the Web and as a call to action. It is therefore clear to rescue Web companies threatened with bankruptcy by the bursting of the speculative bubble. It is around the concept of Web 2.0, described as conceptual.

With the advent of web 2.0 a new wave of corporations like Google, Digg, Facebook, YouTube has emerged whose business model entirely depend on the collective intelligence of the users of Internet. This new trend of technology not only influences the consumers but it also affects the enterprises. Different scholars have shown that collaborative work and the level of tacit interaction has significantly increased (Beardsley, Johnson & Manyika, 2006). According to a survey of executives "enterprise 2.0" is more than a simple anecdote (Bughin & Maniyka, 2007). Following facts are:

- Web 2.0 technology are already known to many execututives

- The executives who are aware of Web 2.0 technology says that their companies invest in this new wave of technology

The communication ventures that have been explored by the diverse applications provided by Web 2.0 particularly pose rampant development and progress in the sector of social media which have facilitated the promotion and fostering frontiers (Reactive, 2007) that actually facilitate interactive information sharing, interoperability through which a large number of different and diverse units that are under operation in an organization are able to consolidate their functions in the form of a single unit and entity and a centralized design that has been made for user convenience. In addition to this other prominent examples that can also be considered an outcome of the applications provided by web 2.0 include the communicative ventures that can be explored with the help of blogs, mashups and folksonomies. It has been estimated that people who are posting comments and contents on web are growing at a steady and rapid pace.

O'Reilly (2005) is of the opinion that after amalgamating its operations with the dynamic nature of social media, the use and application of web 2.0 has also increased extraordinarily since it has become a pivotal marketing tool for small and large scale entrepreneurs who intend to advertise their products and services with the help of social media websites like Facebook, twitter and Linkedin. However on the flip side there are also some disadvantages that need to be considered in the entire scenario (Zeervas, 2007).

Similarly, under the banner of Web 2.0 the activities of cultural institutions and communication have gradually getting pace, all of which claim that a user would be the center of all the activities. Certainly, this indeterminacy of the term helped to establish its use. From this point of view, the merit of the concept of Web 2.0 is its vagueness. It is a true "potluck" that everyone can contribute, even if these contributions are different, even in opposition. The fact is

that a virtual world is trying to fit into the category of Web 2.0. This desire for assimilation to Web 2.0 is also a desire to defend the image of the economic actor, not only from users but also from investors and other financial players.

As a sign of openness to the rest of the world, virtual objects created in this virtual world, can be subsequently produced in the physical world. Discourses related to Web 2.0 resume, extend and renew important discourse on cultural institutions, communication, ICT, economic and social integration. By various aspects, web 2.0 is not free of contradictions, these discourses produce representations touting capitalism both socio-economic and societal level. One ways to promote capitalism is to show that Web 2.0 is the symbol of activism and freedom of the liberal user would and the culture of the industrial capitalist integration.

Users' Participation

It is emphasized that through digitization, technical constraints and economic burden on production are largely reduced, allowing everyone becoming content creator. For example, with a digital camera, it is relatively easy and inexpensive to produce moving images. Similarly, trade between users can enrich content. Something strong relationship develops between the musicians and the audience because that's what users want, this is what the residents want.

The cultural institutions become powerless to charge users; moreover, that would offer less creative products with collaborative production. On the occasion of this discount involved in cultural institutions, culture reaches a status and a place in society and the economy that it did not have before, the culture is integrated with process creation, Production, distribution, promotion and enhancement of many product of the economy.

The optimization of its own logistics infrastructure can indeed confer a significant competitive advantage to certain smaller sized companies, especially in the field of video sharing platforms or in application providers and services for blogs. Whatever the actual viability and potential sustainability of these recovery methods, it is important to note that the technical capacity remains undoubtedly a barrier to entry and a cornerstone of market power for many of these intermediate players on the web.

The coexistence of several valuation methods is by no means accidental. One can certainly explain this phenomenon by the diversity of offers available on web 2.0, but beyond that, it should consider this as space simulation in vivo actors in the cultural institutions and observe where they grope for some, with attention increasingly stronger. Therefore, it is important to reaffirm the Ideal-typical character of any categorization of Web 2.0 players. In this perspective, it should also be noted that most of the sites of cultural institutions have not reached the stage of profitability which explains not only the youth of the actors but also by their nature of socio-economic experimentation. Similarly, the actors seem uncomfortable addressing the issue of their membership or non-sphere - though probably recognized and identified - cultural and media industries.

The stand actors on collaborative Web can also be understood by considering the representations that are carried on the cultural institutions, especially the content industries. These are twofold. On the one hand, we encounter speech that highlights agility, responsiveness of small structures of collaborative Web against the "giants rusty" cultural institutions. On the other hand, there is recognition of power and durability of these industry players. Beyond epical images of the pioneer mentality and emotional involvement of actors of Web 2.0, it is interesting

to note that the latter are oriented around the idea of a deep rupture in the form of access to cultural and informational content.

It has been said that among the tourists who rely on feedback from other travelers to book their hotel, the percentage of casual and leisure travelers who have changed their usual reservations according to notices posted online by other consumers is 25% and 33% respectively (Gretzel, 2007). A survey of 823 Italian tourists (Del Chiappa, 2011a) confirms these data, respondents who said that after reading online comments, they sometimes (64.8%), almost always (12%) or each times (0.5%) changed their hotel reservations. In this regard, Del Chiappa (2011a) noted a difference in both sexes, women are making changes ("every time" or "almost always") more frequently (14.8%) than men (9.4%). Another study of 1448 Italian tourists shows that 31.56% of respondents have changed the hotel that had been suggested by a traditional travel agency because of the TOS (Del Chiappa, 2011b).

A survey of 1,900 American tourists who usually buy travel services on the Internet highlights the different effects that Web 2.0 applications have on the behavior of tourists (PhoCusWright, 2009). These applications, in descending order, are: views of online travel agencies (50%), virtual tours / photo created by travelers (43%), websites of expert travel (41%), visits virtual / photo created by professionals (39%), websites reviews (33%), online videos created by tourism professionals (29%), online videos created by tourist travelers (28%) travel blogs (22%), social networking / people you know (22%), social networking / people you do not know (15%) and tourism-related podcasts (13%). Another study (Yoo et al, 2009) conducted among 1,170 American tourists indicates that the TOS seems more credible when it is posted on official websites of tourist offices (41.2%) , websites of travel agencies (36.8%), the third-party websites such as TripAdvisor (33.5%), websites of tourism companies (31.2%), personal blogs

(18 , 1%), personal websites (16.1%), social networking sites (13.2%) and sites for sharing

photos and videos such as YouTube (10.7%). In sum, this study shows that the choice of tourists

are more influenced by the opinions found on the websites of travel agencies online as those

published in social networks related to tourism.

In Italy, similar results to those of the study mentioned above were obtained recently.

According to the male and female respondents of 823 questionnaires analyzed, the online travel

agencies are the most credible sources, thus exerting greater influence in terms of corporate

image and tourism choices. After the online agencies are in order of importance to tourism

related blogs, social networks related to tourism, video sharing, photo sharing, forums, websites

of companies, social networks not related to tourism and micro-blogging (Del Chiappa, 2011a).

Overall, this study partly confirms the results of a previous study in the United States by Yoo,

Lee, Gretzel and Fesenmaier (2009), in which the online agencies were considered the

applications of Tourism 2.0 the most credible, unlike Social networks not linked to tourism, seen

as less reliable. However, sites for sharing photos and videos were viewed as less credible in the

U.S. than in Italy. In addition, in the same study, respondents expressed the view notices posted

online more reliable when the proportion of favorable and unfavorable opinions were the same

(51.2%), or when there was a little unless unfavorable than favorable (39.9%).

Elusive socio-economic model of collaborative Web for consumption was fundamentally

flawed (both because of the management and required artificial scarcity because of the

importance of investments made for the benefit of products whose value remained typically

random). Thus, content industries would simply be "terrified" while some investors institutions

have decided to "let die" instead of assist them in their adjustment to face "new model". This

discourse of profound change is accompanied, moreover, a vision of a representation of the role of these new industrial actors as that of a mediator.

Problems and Impediments

Given the strength of evidence that characterizes the discourse on Web 2.0, it should be noted that ICTs and their implications in the field of culture and creation have historically played the role of dissolving critical reflection. One of the prime disadvantages that are confronted in the entire process is that web 2.0 and the services that this application provides to its customers are still quite embryonic in terms of its progress and development. It is primarily because of this that many information technology companies are still refraining from shifting their entire communication processes and procedures upon the applications of web 2.0 as the program within itself has not been developed to the extent and limit where it can be compatible with the hardcore technological functions of the information technology firms.

The user generated content has a great influence on present era's cultural activities and institutions. According to Wasserman (2006) almost 21% of the people trust the information and content provided through social networking websites. However, the reliability and traceability of the content is the real problem because anybody can write on web. Thus, one of the most important problems is the participation of anyone on the web. For example, applications like Wikipedia are the weak point of Web 2.0 because it generates mistrust due to editorial freedom and the way as it is made.

Perhaps the main criticism is probably the lack of professionalism on the contents of Web 2.0. That is, the fact that most of those involved in Web 2.0 are amateurs. Some authors are of the opinion that it is the hegemony of the amateur since the tools do not provide quality content, and the users of Internet have to limit themselves on the unprofessional and unreliable quality of

the content. Then, from the lack of professionalism, another drawback is the excess information, what is known as "informative noise" and that now, though on the Web can be found almost everywhere. The most important thing is not to find something but to know to find the exact information that the user wants.

Social networking has been expanding at an exponential rate. Facebook has reached a critical size such that, as the first social platform in the world with over 600 million accounts, the first social network size has become an interface must for consumers and businesses. The companies have little choice to direct their marketing in a social sense firmly established itself as an equally inevitable consequence. The motivations may be multiple, since the dominant defensive attitude (be on Facebook in order to interact with potential critics of the company or brand, and defuse a negative word of mouth, to preserve and maintain a minimum an e-reputation) to the total involvement and positive social mainstream marketing strategy itself, not as an element "to replace", but as an integral part of this strategy, or a dimension of the latter. With its implications as content production (brand content), and as such specific presence and appropriate (social media strategy) on the number one social network.

Therefore, it is not possible for cultural institutions like libraries, museums etc. to avoid presentation on Facebook. Knowing that this presence is not, for the first time, designed to be intrinsically a channel transformation or achievement, but one of the focal points of a set of channels constituting a social and relational semantic ecosystem around the institution to facilitate and possibly induce the transformation. Presence on Facebook is not comparable to the physical presence. Nevertheless, many cultural institutions are still very cautious against this new relationship to the consumer. Because it induces a real culture change and model transition from a uni-directional communication with a bidirectional communication, and even multi-directional.

Facebook and other social media networks empower not the institution but the users. In short, social media introduces a new situation with regard to which social and cultural institutions need to ensure their own survival, to become effective and relevant. Facebook crystallizes all the more these issues as it is the first social network.

There arise a question that, is there a gap exists between users' expectations with respect to cultural institutions on social media and with which they interact, and analysis by the same cultural institutions of the supposed expectations of users. On the other hand, marks placed at the forefront of what they considered to be the so-called expectations, product information 71% and general information 73% (Beardsley, Johnson & Manyika, 2006).Such a reversal of perspective is a real divorce in relationships between users and cultural institutions due to the advent of social networks. One would think that the deployment of interactivity on social media contribute to social networks in general and the first one in particular, a reference, in the case of having relevant information for the user, who is seeking information about a product or service of cultural institutions. However, Google also has 90% market share in the "search"; that means for consumers, Google is considered a source of relevant and reliable information.

Failing to establish itself as a primary source of information, web 2.0 could then maybe get its game in terms of influence (the big word is out) precisely because of the social dimension. After all, why should this virtual community, the millions of friends from "Like" pages of brands and businesses, interacting with each other. This socialization of perception does play a role in creating a value used by the user. The user needs expertise and guaranteed independent objectivity. The user needs feedback and confrontation of views. It is certainly sensitive to word of mouth. He finds his contacts as real friends. Thus he trusts their opinion.

On the other hand, it is also true that the user listens to what others users say but does not always believe and trust in the reliability of the source. User can both be an actor on social networks and completely disconnected from them when he seeks expert advice on the product or information intended. That is why some people believe that social networks have only limited influence in the extreme and are not credible for the user (Wasserman, 2006).

Conclusion

If social networks like Facebook should be for cultural institutions seeking to reach their target users and convert, reliable sources of information for users, so its expertise should be preferred. But how to articulate expertise and interactivity? How not to "break" the logic of mutual commitment by returning to wrong and in violation of the specificity of social media at a uni-directional communication on behalf of the needed expertise? How to invent the relationship between supply expertise, exchange, viral marketing, and societal extended semantic field, values, commitment? This is perhaps the questions to be answered which enables more productive the presence of cultural institutions on social networks and web 2.0.

Now web 2.0 including user generated content and social networking sites like Facebook, are still in their infancy, even though the startup is dazzling, need to enter a phase of maturity, and with them the cultural institutions often poorly positioned respect of social media. Hence the obvious distrust of the time consumers. This trend is however also a trend. This does not reverse the order of the sources to determine which influence the consumer, or with what level of reliability is done. But which will give web 2.0 a relevance that makes them no doubt now default to consumers. Virtual socialization of all economic relations do not let the cast doubt on the role that social networks are required to serve to the consumer.

Bibliography

Beardsley, S., Johnson, B. & Manyika, J., 2006, Competitive advantage from better

Interactions, *McKinsey Quarterly,* 2.

Bughin, J., 2007, *The World according to YouTube —Understanding the rise of social media, to*

appear in: Advances in E-commerce research, Nova Publishers, NY

Del Chiappa, G., 2011a, Trustworthiness of Travel 2.0 applications and their influence on

tourists' behaviour: An empirical investigation in Italy, in R. Law, M. Fuchis & F. Ricci
(Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2011*, Vienne,
Autriche: Springer.

Del Chiappa, G., 2011b, Disintermediation of hotel reservations: the perception of different

groups of Italian online buyers, in proceedings of TTRA Europe and AFM Conference
2011, *Creativity and innovation in tourism,* Archamps: Avril 11-13.

Gretzel, U., 2006, Consumer Generated Content – Trends and Implications for Branding, *e-*

Review of Tourism Research, 4 (3), pp. 9-11.

O'Reilly, T., 2005, *What Is Web 2.0?: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next*

Generation of Software, O'reilly Network, Retrieved on 25th April 2013 from

http://www.oreillynet.com/lpt/a/6228

PhoCusWright, 2009, *Consumer Travel Report.*

Reactive, 2007, *Web 2.0 for the Tourism & Travel Industry*, Reactive, Melbourne.

Wasserman, T., 2006, Consumers Don't Trust Blogs, *Brandweek*, 47 (31), p. 10.

Yoo, K.H., Lee, Y., Gretzel U. & Fesenmaier D.R., 2009, Trust in Travel-Related Consumer

Generated Media, in W. Höpken, U. Gretzel & R. Law (Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2009, 49-59.* Vienne, Autriche: Springer.

Zeervas, Quentin, 2007, *Practical Web 2.0 with PHP,* Springer Publications