THE INTEGRATION OF INTERACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE TOOLS 2.0 IN WEBSITES OF MICRO AND SMALL ENTERPRISES

DOMENICO CONSOLI
Business Institute "C. Battisti" – Fano, Italy

Received: *May 27, 2013* Accepted: *January 27, 2014* Online Published: *February 12, 2014*

Abstract

Nowadays also micro and small companies use interactive web sites that integrate some tools 2.0 (chat, blogs, forums, ...) and links to social networks, such as Facebook and Twitter, to interface with the external environment. By these new tools companies can interacts with all stakeholders of the supply chain and in particular with customers to improve their products/services. In this way between customers and company a bidirectional channel is established and a process of co-creation and co-production of products/services is stimulated. Small enterprises should take advantage using these technological channels to increase the competitiveness. In this paper we analyse the state of the art about the use of interactive and collaborative tools in websites of micro and small companies that have introduced some experimentations in this direction. The analysis is oriented to understand if entrepreneurs or managers think that these new digital channels are important in reaching business goals.

Keywords: web 2.0, enterprise 2.0, web-oriented technology, micro and small enterprises, innovative technologies.

1. Introduction

In Italy, like to european countries, the entrepreneurial context consists of many Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) operating in local and international markets. Regarding the information technology, in recent years, the basic computerization of SMEs is growing. Internet and PC are present in almost all small enterprises.

SMEs to be more competitive, must invest in innovation and technology. The Information Communication Technology (ICT) and in particular web technologies are a source of innovation and a great opportunity for the development. Enterprises must develop quality products that meet customers requirements to acquire new market shares and competitive advantages. To create an interactive channel with customers and gather their opinions and suggestions on products/services companies could use web 2.0 tools (e.g. chat, forum, blog) and social media (e.g. facebook, youtube, twitter, flickr). The aim of this paper is to analyse the business environment of micro and small companies to understand if they use this new technology to interact with the market and in particular with customers.

Scientific questions are the following:

- Are corporate websites of SMEs just showcases that illustrate the company, products/services and business contacts?
- In websites, are there some elements of interactivity in exchanging information with all stakeholders?
- Are web 2.0 tools used in business activities?
- Can be websites of SMEs considered as a context of co-creativity and co-production with customers?
- Do entrepreneurs/manager unterstand potentialities of web 2.0 technology?
- For the adoption of the web 2.0 is it important the technological pre-existing environment?

In our research to answer to these scientific questions we use a quantitative method. After a literature review on the web 2.0 channel adopted in SMEs, we have considered a sample of enterprises and we have analysed their websites and administered a questionnaire to entrepreneurs/managers to unterstand their viewpoint on these new interactive technologies.

The paper is structured as follows: in the next section we show a literature review on the web 2.0 technology and its use in micro and small contexts. Then we describe a reserch methodology and illustrate the results of this research. At the end, analysing the results, some conclusions are drawn.

2. Literature Review

The concept of Web 2.0 was born, in 2005, during a brainstorming session of a conference on the web (O'Really, 2005). In this conference many participants affirmed that the web is more important with new interesting applications that involve online collaboration among users.

Subsequently an enterprise that uses web 2.0 tools was defined, from Andrew McAfee (2006), Enterprise 2.0. The author affirms that "Enterprise 2.0 is the use of emergent social software platforms within companies, or between companies and their partners or customers". An Enterpise 2.0 is an organizational and technological model based on active participation of all stakeholders (customers, suppliers, sponsors, business partners) who share knowledge. It represents a breakdown of traditional organization models towards an open and cooperative architecture of a social enterprise. The features of this new model are: bottom-up, open, interconnected and agile and the keywords are: sharing, cooperation and interactivity.

With collaborative and cooperative tools the enterprise is more efficient and flexible to listen partners and in particular customers. In the web there are various sites that collect customer reviews (Cho et al., 2002): epinions.com, planetfeedback.com, cnet.com, ciao.it, complaints.com, dooyoo.it, ecomplaints.com.

By web 2.0 tools it is possible to create an interactive bi-directional channel among people, customers and suppliers. A process of co-creation and co-production is activated. Customers and suppliers become co-producers and partners in the conception/design of product/service. The customer becomes prosumer, consumer and producer at the same time. In the literature the figure of prosumer has been emphasized in the book "The Third Wave" (Toffler, 1980). With this therm Toffler predicted the fusion of the roles of producers and consumers in the new figure. In the Cluetrain Manifesto (Levine et al., 2001), the authors affirm that "markets are conversations" and with the digital revolution there was a change of role of consumer from passive consumer to active prosumer. In the best seller "Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything" (Tapscott and Williams, 2006), the authors develop the concept of prosumer coining the related term of prosumption (production/consumption) that refers to the creation of products and services by the same consumers.

In Time Magazine, Grossman (2006) affirmed that Time's Person of the Year, for 2006 , is 'You' "for seizing the reins of the global media, for founding and framing the new digital democracy, for working for nothing and beating the pros at their own game".

Contents' production is no longer the prerogative of the media centers, press and traditional producers but everyone can participate in the production of contents by simple platforms.

This phenomenon is indicated by terms User Generated Content (UGC) (Strobbe et al., 2010) or Consumer Generated Media (CGM) (Sumi, 2008). These terms born, in 2005, in the areas of web publishing and new media to indicate the material available on the web produced by users rather than specialized companies.

Web 2.0 tools allow to implement a virtual community where owner-managers and customers can communicate, collaborate, co-producer together and improve product/service. The concepts of Enterprise 2.0, User Generated Content, Prosumer and Wikinomics are connected among themselves in a context of co-creativity and co-operation that allows to companies to gain competitive and strategic advantages.

Micro and small enterprises, which are normally deep-rooted in the territory, may take advantage of web technologies to expand them in a wider geographic market and even in a global market. Integrating, in their websites, an e-commerce section may be useful to expand geographical boundaries of the market and to sell abroad products/services. By social channels, the customer can be reached anywhere (Consoli, 2012a).

Micro and small enterprises can use channels 2.0 to implement projects of open innovation (Chesbrough, 2003, 2006; Chesbrough et al., 2008), thus compensating the lack of internal research labs. They can exploit the crowdsourcing phenomenon (Howe, 2006a, 2006b; Stewart et al., 2009) or broker intermediaries to launch the application on the web to find a solution for a technical problem and accept ideas that come from external solvers. Small companies can use the professional social network LinkedIn to consult public curriculum of candidate employees for the recruitment. Some small enterprises use Linkedin to search business partners to implement shared projects (contract projects). This happens especially in the sector of furniture for offices/shops, where they are looking for partners of electrical components or for masonry works, so that it is possible to deliver to the customer a complete end product (turnkey).

A survey, conducted in 2009 (Finotto e Micelli, 2010), taking into account the adoption of Web 2.0 technologies on a sample of 1,003 small and medium-sized enterprises operating in the Made in Italy. In the research they monitored the adoption of management software, web sites and the presence of companies on major social networks and contents aggregators.

By search results, authors deduced that the adoption of Web 2.0 technologies is not dependent on previous experience in the use of management software like Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) or Enterprise Content Management (ECM). The skill on the management of virtual spaces is independent of the know-how of traditional ICT (legacy).

The second edition of Iulm Observatory (2011) on the use of social media by Italian companies showed that small enterprises that use social channels increased from 9.8% (2010) to 43% (2011), with a reduction in the gap compared to medium and the large companies that increased activities 2.0 of a smaller percentage (medium companies increased from 32.3% (2010) to 47.2% (2011) and large companies from 57.9% (2010) to 58.4% (2011)).

Like the first edition (made in May-November 2010), the research has considered six areas of economic interest: fashion, food, hospitality, government, banks and furniture. For each sector were analysed 120 companies (for a total sample of 720 cases), segmented by size (40 large, 40 medium and 40 small). The attribution of the dimension was made in relation to the turnover, with differentiated classes for each sector analysed.

.

3. The Research

3.1 Research Methodology

In the paper we analysed the websites of 48 micro and small enterprises on the use of web 2.0 tools and we administered a questionnaire to entrepreneurs or managers in sectors like ICT/Marketing/Communication.

The analysis of the website has been useful for monitoring tools and interactive channels used by the company and to see if these tools were integrated in a coherent and coordinated design inside the website.

To define the sample of companies to analysis, at first, we spoke with representatives managers of professional associations that represent the Italian micro and small enterprises (Confartigianato and CNA). Taking in consideration their suggestions and other sources, like the website and the press, we have selected no. 48 local small enterprises that have activated, inside, some experiments 2.0. These companies operate in diversified sectors: mechanical-electronic (19%), furniture (25%), fashion-artistic (23%), food and wellness (17%) and services-communication (16%).

In the selected sample we can distinguish companies belonging to sectors of low information intensity, such as mechanical and electrical engineering, medium information intensity, such as furniture, fashion or artistic and high information intensity, such as services/ communication. The difference depends on the content of "information" inherent the specific product/service that represents the core business of the company.

In the sample we consider both companies that produce for the industrial market (B2B - Business-to-Business) and for end customers (B2C - Business-to-Consumer). Inside B2B companies there are enterprises that produce for the retail market and have also a brand for end customers (B2B2C – Business-to-Business-to-Consumer).

The selected sample takes into account companies belonging to different size classes: from individual companies without employees to company with 50 employees. In particular, within the sample, the distribution of companies for dimensional classes is the following: companies with no more than 2 employees (35%); companies with a number of employees between 3 and 10 (23%); companies with a number of employees between 11 and 30 (25%) and with a number of employees between 31 and 50 (17%).

We have assigned a greater weight to companies with less than 3 employees because this type of enterprises, in implenting the model of Enterprise 2.0, do not have yet been studied in the literature to better understand their dynamics and the phenomenon 2.0.

After selecting the sample of enterprises, a first important step was to analyse the websites of various companies under investigation. Compared to a study of a few years ago on a wider sample of companies belonging to an Association of Small Businesses, it was noted that today a greater number of companies has a website and that almost all have some interactive channels to interchange information with customers, such as contact forms or web 2.0 tools (blog, chat, forum, social networks).

The website analysis was useful also to formulate a questionnaire for entrepreneurs/managers to understand who manage the website, the channels 2.0, the strategic planning and future trends. In the administration of the questionnaire several companies interviewed have expressed their intentions to update the website.

3.2 The profile of the sample of companies

The selected sample of 48 companies operates in the following sectors (Table 1):

Table 1 - Business sector of companies.

Business Sector (code)	Description	Number of companies
F	Furniture	13
FA	Fashion/Artistic	11
SC	Services/Communication	8
FW	Food/Wellness	9
ME	Mechanical-Electronic	7

The first 4 sectors of Table 1 are high information-intensive (they can take advantages by information technologies), while the sector mechanical/electronic is low information-intensity. Virtual channels and web technologies promote very well furnitures (F sector) or tailored clothes/artistic objects (FA sector) and not mechanical-electronic devices (ME sector).

The analysed companies, based on the number of employees, may be grouped into the following classes (Table 2).

Table 2 - Company employees.

No. employees for company	No. of companies
<=2	17
>2 e <=10	11
>10 e <=30	11
>30 e <=50	9

As we can see from Table 2, in the choice of companies, we have given more weight to micro enterprises with two employees (an entrepreneur with an employee or two entrepreneurs) than to companies more structured having from 30 to 50 employees. The reason is due to the desire to investigate the phenomenon 2.0 inside micro companies that do not have yet been investigated from this point of view.

The companies analysed were 48 and their profile (identification code, sector, market, company representative who responded to questionnaire, number of employees) is shown in Table 3. If the number of employees is 0 it means that only the entrepreneur works in the company.

Among the 48 selected companies, 23 are B2B, 8 are B2C and 17 are both B2B and B2C companies that provide retailers and have their own brand for the end customer. We can identify these companies as B2B2C. B2C companies are generally those more interested in opening a dialogue with end customers.

Table 3 - Profile of analysed companies.

Identification Code	Sector	Market	Company representative	Number of employees
Agme15	ME	B2B	marketing manager	15
Mtam2	F	B2B	entrepreneur	2
Mosc	SC	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	0
Smma	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	0
Lpam20	F	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	20
Abma32	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	32
Fpam16	F	B2B	entrepreneur son	16
Fbab46	FW	B2B	entrepreneur	46
Cume7	ME	B2B	entrepreneur	7
Egab15	FW	B2B	marketing manager	15
Acam27	F	B2B	entrepreneur	27
Clam8	F	B2B	entrepreneur	8
Kcab3	FW	B2C	entrepreneur	3
Siam16	F	B2B	communication manager	16
Saab8	FW	B2B	entrepreneur	8
Omma	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	0
Inme50	ME	B2B	marketing manager	50
Cmme16	ME	B2B	entrepreneur	16
Fbma2	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	2
Mhsc7	SC	B2C	entrepreneur	7
Msam48	F	B2B	ict manager	48
Kaam6	F	B2B	entrepreneur	6
Aaam15	F	B2C	entrepreneur	15
Tfsc12	SC	B2C	entrepreneur	12
Deme1	ME	B2B	entrepreneur	1
Gcam11	F	B2B B2C	entrepreneur daughter	11
Ccma20	FA	B2B	entrepreneur	20
Coma1	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Tcab7	FW	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	7
Ptma	FA	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	0
Vaam1	F	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Tcab1	FW	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Pcsc	SC	B2B	blogger	0
Dvab1	FW	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Rome41	ME	B2B	community manager	41
Cisc2	SC	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	2
Elsc1	SC	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Phma3	FA	B2C	entrepr. and web marketing consultant	3
Fmam49	F	B2B	sales manager	49
Dram50	F	B2B	communication manager	50
Pisc1	SC	B2B B2C	entrepreneur	1
Masc	SC	B2C	entrepreneur	0
Ilcs	SC	B2B B2C	web manager	0
Alsc5	SC	B2B	entrepreneur	5
Bmam42	F	B2B	ict manager	42
Gdsc	SC	B2C	entrepreneur	0
Brma8	FA	B2B B2C	communication manager	8
Doma50	FA	B2B	community manager	50

3.3 Analysis of websites

Nowadays for a company, small or large, the website is a very important space. For customers it is important that companies have an easily navigable website, rich in contents, that describes and communicates very well products/services and references (main customers). The corporate website is useful to expand markets, customize and build consumer loyalty.

The goal in building a website (Dubini P., Garavaglia M, 2009) can be summarized in the following points:

- *Inform*: present and promote products/services to customers;
- *Provide*: provide to customers additional product information
- *Entertain*: be sure that the navigation through contents of the website is pleasant
- *Build loyalty*: endear the visitor in order to entice him to come back to visit the website
- *Interact*: exchange information with customers to satisfy them and improve the product/ service

In particular, in the website analysis we focused on the following features:

- *Languages (Lang.)*. A website, in multiple languages, indicates that the company operates also in foreign markets and then in a global contexts. It is a company that needs to communicate a lot and so it can be involved in using social media. In the column of the Table 4 "1" means that the website is developped only in Italian language.
- *Multimedia (Mult.)*. It takes into account the integration of various elements like text-graphics-images-audio and video. There are websites with only pictures and websites with also movies. An enterprise that use multimedia element is predisposed to use interactive tools.
- *Contact Form/reserved area*. We tried to understand if the website contains points of contacts with customers and in particular if there is a contact form or a restricted area to communicate with customers, to attract them on its website and to stimulate some contributions.
- *Presence of tools 2.0*. To see if the company uses specific interactive and collaborative tools and if it is ready to start some trials of type 2.0.
- *Extra communication (E.com.)*. If the company, in promoting its products and services, takes in consideration other topics such as the culture and emerging issue/opportunities of the territory. It is important the richness of contents of the website and the ability to collect, organize and update information.

The results obtained from the analysis of websites of the sample of companies are shown in Table 4.

In Table 4 tools 2.0 are marked with a single character enclosed in parentheses: Facebook (f), Blog (b), Forum (r), Chat (c), Wiki (w), Twitter (t), Linkedin (l), Youtube (y), Flicker (k), Pinterest, (p), News (n), Skype (s), Rss (r), Mail (m), E-commerce (e), Tg Aziendale (a), Google+ (g), Issuu (i).

Table 4 - Analysis of features of websites

Company	Lang. (no.)	Mult.	Contacts	Tools 2.0	E. com.
Agme15	1	yes	yes	y,f,l,k	no
Mtam2	5	images	no	f	no
Mosc	1	images	yes	f	no
Smma	5	images	no	f,l,s	yes
Lpam20	1	images	no	f,e	no
Abma32	5	yes	yes	f,e	yes
Fpam16	1	images	no	f, s	no
Fbab46	1	yes	yes	b,f,y,p	yes
Cume7	4	images	yes	s	no
Egab15	1	yes	yes	f,y,p	no
Acam27	4	yes	yes	f,t,y	no
Clam8	2	images	yes	f	yes
Kcab3	1	yes	yes	f,y,b,t	yes
Yesam16	3	yes	yes	f,y,s	no
Saab8	1	images	yes	f	no
Omma	2	images	yes	b,f	yes
Inme50	5	Yes	no	f,t,l	no
Cmme16	2	images	no	f	no
Fbma2	2	images	yes	f	no
Mhsc7	5	yes	yes	f,t,k,l,e	yes
Msam48	2	images	yes	l,y,t,g+	no
Kaam6	2	images	no	f,y	no
Aaam15	2	images	no	f	no
Tfsc12	1	images	no	b,f,y	yes
Deme1	3	yes	yes	y	no
Gcam11	2	images	yes	f,t,y	no
Ccma20	1	yes	no	b,f,y,t,pc,k	yes
Coma1	1	images	no	f	no
Tcab7	1	images	no	b,f	no
Ptma	3	images	yes	f,n	no
Vaam1	1	images	yes	f,e	no
Tcab1	3	images	no	b,f	no
Pcsc	1	images	no	b,t,f,l	yes
Dvab1	2	yes	yes	y	no
Rome41	1	yes	no	b, r,f,t	yes
Cisc2	1	images	yes	b,f,t,y	no
Elsc1	1	yes	yes	f,t,l	no
Phma3	1	images	yes	f,t,y,g+	no
Fmam49	5	images	no	f,y	no
Dram50	5	images	yes	f,y,n	yes
Pisc1	1	images	no	f,t,l	no
Masc	1	images	yes	f,s	no
Ilcs	1	images	no	f,l,t	no
Alsc5	1	images	no	f,t	no
Bmam42	2	images	yes	f,t,i	no
Gdsc	1	images	no	b,f,t,y	no
Brma8	3	yes	yes	f,b,f,t,y	no
Doma50	2	yes	no	b,f,r,t,l,y	yes

Data obtained can be summarized as follows (Table 5).

Table 5 - Summary of results.

Item	Value
Companies with a website	100%
Websites with 2 or more languages	52%
Website with only a language	48%
Websites with pictures and movies	31%
Websites only with pictures	69%
Absence of multimedia elements	0%
Interactivity with customers	56%
Richness of contents	25%
Presence of elements 2.0	86%

From Table 5 we can see as different companies (52%) present the website at least with another language (usually English). All 48 companies analysed have a website and all show some media elements.

A high percentage of companies use some elements 2.0 (86%). However the presence of tools 2.0 does not necessarily make the company more interactive. Often, in fact, these components are inserted in websites because it is a trend without an active use.

From a previous research (Consoli, 2010), made in 2009-2010, on 270 companies belonging to an Italian association of small enterprises, the following results were obtained (Table 6 and Table 7).

Table 6 - Percentage of enterprises with websites. Source: own.

SMEs	Percentage of enterprises
With websites	72,41% (2,30% with only contacts page)
Without websites	22,99%
Invisible on the web	4,60%

Table 7 - Presence of elements 2.0 in the website. Source: own.

Presence of elements 2.0 in the website	Percentage
Nothing (showcase website)	95,79%
Some elements 2.0	4,21%

As we can see from Table 6, the percentage of enterprises with websites was quite low (72.4%) and there was still 4.6% of companies that had not yet a web space.

From Table 7 it is possible to see that the majority of companies, about 96% had not yet incorporated in their website elements of web 2.0. So over a period of 2-3 years, the situation has considerably improved.

3.4 Analysis of the answers to a questionnaire

This session will analyse the responses to the questionnaire sent to companies of the sample. Entrepreneurs or marketing/communications/ICT managers replied to the questionnaire and in few cases, the community manager. In almost all examined companies, websites have been developed by an external agency. Sites that use the Content Management System (CMS) technology are structured in separate sections easily accessible by appropriate credentials (username and password) and modifiable/upgradeable both in contents and in pictures.

Several companies in our sample manage and update their websites inside, although they have been developed by external experts.

In next paragraphs we describe the main findings from the questionnaire responses provided by the companies.

Who manages the corporate website? The results to this question are shown in Table 8.

Table 8 - Subjects who manage the website.

Subject	**Percentage**
Administrative	0 %
Marketing	5,8%
Commercial	1,9%
Sales	0,0%
Employee	5,8%
CIO	13,5%
Entrepreneur	25,0%
Family of entrepreneur	5,8%
Communication	1,9%
External consultant	32,7%
Foreign agency	1,9%
Web master	3,8%
Nobody	1,9%

As we can see from Table 8 the subjects inside/outside the company who manage the website are: Consultant/external agency (32.7%), Entrepreneur (25%), Chief Information Officer (CIO) (13.5 %), family of the entrepreneur (5.8%), employee (5.8%), marketing area (5.8%), internal web master (3.8%), commercial area (1.9%). The percentage of owner is high because in this research many micro enterprises with only the owner without employees or composed by the owner and a few employees have been analysed. Many enterprises commit the development and the management of the website to a web agency or an external consultant. In the case of an internal management, this is made by the son/daughter of the owner or by an internal employee, who works in a marketing/communication/ICT area.

The management of the website, in 34.6% of companies, is made outside (external consultant or foreign agency), while the remaining 65.4% is made inside the company. The 54% of analysed companies invests on SEO (Search Engine Optimization), that optimizes the research on the web via specific keywords. Nowadays the investment in SEO it is important especially if the company wants attract visits to website (lead generation). Google uses semantic algorithms increasingly complex to lead enterprises in the first lines of searching pages. To achieve this goal a good SEO consultant is necessary.

The 80% of companies has some elements of web 2.0, the 11% will invest in the future in virtual channel 2.0, the 9% is still not convinced to invest. These results differ slightly from the value of the 86% that we obtained from the direct analysis of the website. This depends on the fact that the person who answered to the questionnaire may not be aware of the fact that on the corporate website there is a link to some interactive channels.

Who manages the Web 2.0? The results obtained from the responses of the companies that use elements 2.0 in their corporate websites are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 - Subjects who manage social channel 2.0 of the website.

Subject	Percentage
Administrative	0%
Marketing	12%
Commercial	8%
Sales	0%
Generic Employee	7%
CIO	4%
Entrepreneur	27%
Family member	8%
Communication	4%
External consultant	17%
Web master	2%
Nobody	11%

As we can see from the Table 9, the elements of web 2.0 are managed in most cases by owner (27%), external consultant (17%), marketing manager (12%), son/daughter of the entrepreneur (8%), trade manager (8%) or by employees working in other areas. In the sample of 38 companies that use elements of web 2.0, 34 internally manage these virtual channels and only 4 have an external consultant.

Even if some communities 2.0 are initially developed from external web agencies, the management of these interactive and collaborative tools is made inside the company. These values are different from the case of external consultants who manage websites. This modality suggests that social media are interfaces more user-friendly.

Regarding social media most used in different websites, the results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10 - Percentage of social media more used.

Tool	Percentage	Tool	Percentage
Facebook	79%	News	4%
Twitter	37%	Rss	4%
Youtube	37%	Chat	2%
Blog	25%	Google+	2%
Linkedin	19%	Issuu	2%
Skype	10%	Picasa	2%
E-Comm	8%	Wiki	0%
Flicker	6%	Mail	0%
Pinterest	6%	Tg Aziendale	0%
Forum	4%		

As we can observe from Table 10, social media most used are Facebook (79%), Twitter (37%), YouTube (37%), Blog Company (25%), Linkedin (19%).

Interactive tools considered most efficient are the following (Table 11).

Table 11 - Percentage of interactive tools more efficient.

Tools	Percentage	Tools	Percentage
Facebook	88%	Skype	2%
Youtube	44%	Mail	2%
Twitter	29%	Picasa	2%
Blog	25%	Chat	0%
Linkedin	17%	Wiki	0%
Flicker	6%	E-Comm	0%
Forum	4%	Enterprise TV	0%
Pinterest	4%	Google+	0%
Rss	4%	Issou	0%
News	2%		

In the first places, as more efficient tools, there are Facebook (88%), YouTube (44%), Twitter (29%), Linkedin (17%).

The reasons of the companies that use social media (Table 12) are mainly due to the desire to acquire new customers (73%), to make promotions (54%) and to increase the company's visibility (50%).

Table 12 - Motivations for companies to use social media.

Motivation	Percentage
Interactive channel	6%
Visibility	50%
Promotion	54%
Customers	73%
Merchandising	2%
E-Commerce	6%
Contacts	8%
Foreign	2%
Communication	0%
Low Cost Investiments	0%
Increase of ranking	0%
Curiosity	4%

In the future, many enterprises think to consolidate its presence in social networks (67%) and in some cases to start with some experiments of e-commerce (29%) or to enhance the advertising (15%) (Table 13).

Other data obtained from the research are the following: the 69% of enterprises said to have interactive channels with customers and mostly use e-mail, phone, newsletter and Facebook, the 31% claimed to not have yet activated virtual channels with customers, the 40% claims to have contact with customers even after the sale while the 60% is not active in sales service. The 38% makes some statistics on consumer preferences and tastes but nobody still uses specialized software of opinion mining to analyse customer reviews. Few people think to do so in the future. The 63% of respondents uses mobile devices for business activities. The 85% of enterprises said to not be afraid of online reputation. Most of the companies has not yet implemented web 2.0 tools into their websites.

Table 13 - Future actions of enterprises.

Future actions	Percentage
Consolidation of social networks	67%
Advertising	15%
E-commerce	29%
Facebook in other languages	2%
Youtube	2%
Integration of various websites	2%
Sales	0%
Do not enter in social channels	0%
Marketing	0%
Customer care	6%

4. Discussion on Questionnaire Responses

The results of the questionnaire show an interest, in companies, to the potential offered by Web 2.0 (development of new products, opening of new sales channels, management of the relationship with customers before and after the sale). Build and manage relationships and dialogues with customers on the network is not easy and it is necessary to dedicate time and resources. For many enterprises, despite the willingness to interact and collaborate, the communication is still one-way and not two-way and interactive. Most of companies of the sample use web channels as an extension of traditional channels and then as a communication channel to promote their offer.

It is not always true that the most advanced companies that use social channels are those that have experiences in network technologies. These tools, however, are definitely more used by enterprises that have, as target, younger customers who use a lot social networks.

B2B companies, sometimes uses virtual interactive channels to raise the ranking or the position on search engines (cases: Alsc5, Bmam42, Inme50). Small enterprises, generally, are supported by external agencies in developing the website and the structure of Facebook and Flickr communities but a lot of these companies, gradually, manage by themselves, virtual channels because are very user-friendly (cases: Kaam16, Siam16, Ptma, Gcam11, Fbma2, Kcab3). Instead the management of static websites, especially those traditional non-CMS is always entrusted to a web agency or to an external consultant (cases: Ccam20, Alsc5, Vaam1, Dvab1, Cume7, Dmme3, ...).

Several companies begin to experiment and to include in their websites some interactive elements 2.0 (cases: Agme15, Mtam2, Fbma2, Cisc2, Acam27), some enterprises think to invest in these tools in the future (cases: Cume17, Clam8, Saab8) and others are not interested (cases: Dmme3, Elme17, Mcme20). This last case is relative to companies that operate in the B2B market. The most of the companies analysed, except for a few cases (Cmma1, Dmme3), is convinced of the high potential of the website and social networks. Some company plans to implement in the future the model 2.0 (cases: Cume7, Acam27).

Many companies are beginning to invest in SEO and optimize search keywords to associate to the “announcements" of the website (cases: Doma50, Phma3, Alsc5, Bmam42, ...).

The reason of the company to enter in social networks are: visibility, promotion, advertising, acquisition of new leads (lead generation) (Gahan, 2012) for transform them in

future customers. A restriction which all companies of the sample manifest is to not understand how many of contacts are transformed in real customers.

In the future many people think to consolidate its presence on social media, others think to associate virtual channels in the activation of e-commerce section.

Most companies give a small weight to post-sale (no. 21/48); some companies, for this goal, use e-mail, phone, newsletter and others have implemented a private community to increase the customer loyalty (case: Doma50).

At this stage of the questionnaire, many enterprises claim to not be afraid of online reputation. Most of these companies think to implement the model of Enterprise 2.0 in the future.

The more structured companies have a Chief Information Officer (CIO), which manages social media (cases: Mhsc7, Brma8, Cmm16, Bmam42, Fmam49), in other cases the manager is an employee/manager of marketing, communications, commercial areas (cases: Doma50, Egab15, Siam16, Agme15) or the owners'son/daughter (cases: Ptma, SmmA, Mhsc7, Abma32, Gcam11). In the case of social networks, the size of company is not important. There are larger companies of the sample that do not use web 2.0 channels (cases: Inme50, Msam48) and other ones smaller which use them (cases: smma, ptma, pcsc, masc, gdsc).

Smaller companies, without organizational-bureaucratic constraints, create and manage in-house social network, while larger companies are supported from consultants and care more the content and the management of virtual communities.

In small companies, it is also easier the integration of mobile devices such as tablets, smartphones (IT consumerization) for the lack of restrictive policies in their information systems. In larger companies, the integration is more difficult to achieve for the presence of more restrictions in the authorized access.

5. Conclusions

The new Enterprise 2.0 (Consoli 2012b, 2013) is a model that, at present, is in embryonic stage, even in large enterprises. It is a model still in an experimental state almost unknown scientifically, from the point of view of dynamic processes, methods and variables to consider. It is a model "in progress", in developing methods to assess performances and the Return on Investment (ROI). It is based on revolutionary concepts such as sharing, collaboration and co-creation, and then on a new philosophy of doing business.

Since it is not yet an established model it is evident that there is not a large academic literature on the topic and there are not yet present interpretative models which contextualize the topic in its entirety.

The previous models of performance evaluation and measurement of ICT readiness (Balocco et al., 2006; Spinelli, 2009) consider the ICT maturity (infrastructure and software) inside the company and the ICT strategic vision. In future, in the new business model of Enterprise 2.0, will be important to take in consideration the dimension of interactive and collaborative tools of web 2.0 that support the exchange of information with all stakeholders (suppliers, customers, other companies).

The analysis of cases (by websites and questionnaire), in a sample of micro and small enterprises, has highlighted as the model of Enterprise 2.0 can also be applied in this type of companies. The analysis shows that small enterprises have understood the potentiality of Web 2.0 and increasingly feel the need to be present on social networks, although this awareness does not always imply the mastery of logic and languages of these channels. For the implementation of the new business model, it is not enough to integrate some web 2.0 tools (chat, forums, blogs, social media, ..) on the corporate website, but it is necessary to introduce a series of changes in the company from the point of view both organizational and

technological. The central problem, is to use these tools in a coordinated and correct way and, for this reason, it is necessary to develop an integrated Enterprise 2.0 model based on an efficient organizational structure.

A large size or a pre-existing technological equipment inside the company does not imply a good implementation of the model. Instead it is important the involvement of entrepreneur or manager and the presence of an internal expert facilitator ("pivot") who stimulates the adoption and the use of these interactive channel starting from a specific limited area of the company.

If micro and small enterprises monitor and control all stages of a correct use of these interactive and collaborative tools they, for its flexibility and thinness in internal business processes, could gain a competitive advantage over the medium and large companies.

Data obtained in this research analysis can be used as a starting point for further quantitative investigations involving a larger sample of companies and using specific statistical tools. In this way it will be possible to validate and generalize some assumptions regarding the correct use of social media 2.0, by micro and small enterprises, in reaching business goals and so it will be possible to design a new business model based on the concept of an interactive and dynamic enterprise.

References

Balocco, R., Mainetti, S. & Rangone, A. (2006). *Innovare e competere con le ICT*, Il Sole 24 Ore, Milano

Chesbrough, H. (2003). Open *Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*, Harvard Business School Press, Harvard.

Chesbrough, H. (2006). *Open Business Models: How to Thrive in the New Innovation Landscape*, Harvard Business School Press, Harvard.

Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., Kalvet, T. & de Jong J. P. (2008). *Policies for open innovation: theory, framework and cases*, Technical Report, Helsinki.

Cho, Y., I.Im, Hiltz, R., & Fjermestad, J. (2002). An analysis of online customer complaints: implications for web complaint management. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, IEEE, pp. 2308–2317.

Consoli D, Del Prete W (2013). *A best practice of Enterprise 2.0: the Photoviva case study.* In: Spagnoletti P, De Marco M, Pouloudi, N, Te'eni D, vom Brocke J, Winter R, Baskerville R . Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organisation (LNISO), vol. 2, p. 145-153, Springer,

Consoli D. (2012a). The integrated software platform in the implementation of an Enterprise 2.0 model. In *Proceedings of International Scientific Conference "ICT for competitiveness"*, Karvina, Czech Republic, February 2-3, 2012, pp. 59-66.

Consoli D. (2012b). *A Collaborative Platform to Support the Enterprise 2.0 in Active Interactions with Customers*, in Informatica Economica Journal, Issue Topic: Stock Exchange Information System, Vol. 16 No. 3/2012, pp. 37-49.

Consoli, D. (2010) *Analysis of The Use of Web 2.0 Technology in Small and Medium Companies to Implement an Enterprise 2.0 Model* , Economics and Management: Current Issues and Perspectives Review, Vol. 20, n.4, pp. 13-20, Siauliai 2010.

Dubini, P. & Garavaglia, M.(2009) *Social Media monitor:cento aziende nella rete,* Retrieved: http://www.stampa.unibocconi.it/editor/archivio_pdf/socialmediamonitor20090923164231.pdf, Research 2009, Bocconi University.

Finotto, V. & Micelli, S. (2010). *Web e Made in Italy: la terra di mezzo della comunicazione d'impresa*. Mercati e Competitività, vol. 4, pp. 101-119

Gahan D. (2012). *The Book of Home Business Lead Generation Methods: Generating Internet Traffic*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform , USA.

Grossman, L. (2006). *Time's Person of the Year: You, (2006)*. Time Magazine. Retrieved from: http://www.imli.com/imlog/archivi/001051.html.

Howe, J. (2006a). *Crowdsourcing: A Definition, Crowdsourcing: Tracking the Rise of the Amateur*. Retrieved on http://crowdsourcing.typepad.com/cs/2006/06/crowdsourcing_a.html

Howe, J. (2006b). *The Rise of Crowdsourcing*. Retrieved from: http://beyondcreativity.blogs.com/mblog/files/iadis_mobile_learning_dublin_ahonen_syvnen_creativity_portfolios_final.pdf.

Levine, R., Locke, C., Searls, D & Weinberger D. (2001). *The Cluetrain Manifesto: the end of business as usual*. Perseus Books.

McAfee, A.P. (2006). *Enterprise 2.0: the dawn of emergent collaboration*, MIT Sloan Management Review, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 21-28.

O'Reilly, T. (2005): *What is Web 2.0. Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software*, Retrieved from: http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what- is-web-20.html.

Spinelli R. (2009). *La valutazione e l'impatto della "prontezza ICT" nelle piccolo e medie imprese*, Impresa Progetto – Rivista on line del DITEA, n. 2., pp. 1-24.

Stewart, O., Huerta, J. M. & Sader, M. (2009). *Designing crowdsourcing community for the enterprise*. In Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Human Computation (HCOMP '09), Bennett, P. et al. (Eds.). ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp. 50-53.

Strobbe, M., Van Laere, O., Dauwe, S., Dhoedt, B., De Turck, F., Demeester, P., van Nimwegen, C., & Vanattenhoven J. (2010) *Interest based selection of user generated content for rich communication services*. J. Netw. Comput. Appl. Vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 84-97.

Sumi, K. (2008) Anime de Blog: animation CGM for content distribution. In *Proceedings of the 2008 International Conference on Advances in Computer Entertainment Technology Yokohama*, pp. 187-190.

Tapscott, D. & Williams, A.D. (2006). Wikinomics. *How mass collaboration change everything*, Portfolio.

Toffler, A. (1980). The Third Wave, Bantam Books, US.