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Abstract:
Can social networks, such as Facebook, be a good communication platform to initiate, stimulate or help this transitional experimentation of sustainable consumption? Do the inhabitants have sufficient skills to use Web 2.0 technology? What kind of community management is required to succeed in the task of environmental education? All these questions revolve around the participatory approach: What kind of communication devices and services are best suited to enhance public participation? What would this participation look like? First of all, we will address the crisis in institutionalised participation in France. Finally, we will deal with the role of ICT in stimulating eco-citizen consumption through an experimental Facebook page at a local level.
INTRODUCTION

In May 2011, the French Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Transport and Logistics (MEDDTL) launched the MOVIDA Programme and made a call for funding research projects to understand the levers behind sustainable consumption. The aim of the MOVIDA Programme is to assist the government in developing policy around consumerism taking into account environmental factors. As part of our research, we focused on consumption practices in a suburb of Dijon (Burgundy, France) called Fontaine d’Ouche. This area is a mix of condominiums, tower blocks, residential areas with individual houses and green spaces. With its 10 000 inhabitants, Fontaine d’Ouche is home to an underprivileged population. The area is associated, in the media, with social deprivation. This interdisciplinary research program gathers psycho-sociologists, economists and geographers. The main issue to consider is the role of communication tools in mobilising inhabitants to adopt sustainable consumption practices\(^1\). Our project developed firstly from this funding program in 2011 and then scientific work began in January 2012.

Our research program addresses the key question of eco-responsible consumption. The project brings together over ten researchers from Burgundy and Franche-Comté working in the areas of economy, geography, urbanism, social psychology and SIC. The operational and strategic outputs are expected to provide input into public policies on sustainable consumption. The issue of socio-ecological transition, which touches every sphere of human activity, is a major issue at all levels of government. Faced with climate change and depletion of natural resources, public authorities are calling on social and human scientists to answer a series of complex questions: what anthropological changes will allow us to preserve the planet, while reconciling this with social progress and economic performance (ref. The Stiglitz commission report\(^2\))? From now on, how can we encourage citizens to adopt eco-responsible behaviour, in particular in their consumption habits? We put forward the general hypothesis that communities in areas of social deprivation, in urban areas which are stigmatised, show resilience and, more generally, demonstrate a form of social innovation. The ability of the inhabitants to problem-solve provides fertile material for sharing economy experiments - more, indeed, than social and environmental scientists could possibly dream of.

Our research on Web 2.0 tools is part of a participatory and co-constructive approach. It aims to involve all stakeholders in the creation and dissemination of eco-citizen consumption practices in the field of mobility, leisure (sport and culture) and food. In terms of its social utility, the project supports the implementation of concrete initiatives as known as transition experiences. For Rob Hopkins, “[...]

transition experiences represent a new evolutionary approach to sustainability for a community [...]. Although peak oil and climate change are undoubtedly enormous challenges, they carry with them the possibility of an economic, cultural and social innovation. We will see a blossoming of local businesses, local solutions and skills and an explosion of creativity and cunning.” Obviously, we cannot predict the development of these micro-level initiatives in local areas. The solutions expected by Hopkins are mainly concerned with micro-level actions. It is the accumulation of small and spontaneous experiments, which must be generalized to enhance social innovation through the socio-ecological transition rules. This is a global change from a ‘top-down’ to a ‘bottom-up’ approach. Can social networks, such as Facebook, be a good communication platform to initiate, stimulate or help
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\(^1\) This research was led jointly with Dr. Cyril MASSELOT (Université de Franche-Comté), CIMEOS laboratory, with the contribution of Dr. Franck DUBOIS (Université de Bourgogne, MSH Dijon).

this transitional experimentation to sustainable consumption? Do the inhabitants have sufficient skills to use Web 2.0 technology? What kind of community management is required to succeed in the task of environmental education? All these questions revolve around the participatory approach: What kind of communication devices and services are best suited to enhance public participation? What would this participation look like? Why is it so important to involve inhabitants and stakeholders in such a debate? How does one facilitate discussions around this topic and yet respect the ethics of communication (Habermas, 1987)?

First of all, we will establish the link between the call or injunction to play an active role as eco-citizen and call to participate online. We will address the crisis in institutionalised participation in France. Finally, we will deal with the role of ICT in stimulating

**A double injunction for eco-citizenship online participation**

This paper highlights the role of a participatory approach in achieving best practice in sustainable consumption. Through our research field, we consider the ideology of democratic participation through a double injunction of the internet as a ‘participatory tool by nature’ and sustainable development as a ‘participatory ideology’. On the one hand, we have identified, in a previous research focused on e-community ideology (Galibert, Lepine-Nguyen, Pelissier, 2011) an injunction for internet users to get involved in an online discussion process. On the other hand, all the international charts, like the Agenda 21 principles, deal with the starring role of participative process in enhancing the eco-citizenship.

Sustainable development is very often a question, according to Isabelle Pailliart, “*territorial communication*”. The study of territorial communication includes the identification, analysis and understanding of the discourse of politicians, councillors, local government, civil society (e.g. local organisations) and inhabitants. ICT is a key aspect of local government communication strategies and their dissemination in local communities is obviously part of territorial communication. The interactive possibilities provided by the internet are used, of course, to raise awareness among inhabitants but also to engage them in public online debate prior to decisions taken at local government level. As Isabelle Pailliart says, “[…] the use of ICT in consultation exercises is an attempt by politicians to respond to current changes in society.” (Paillart, 2006). And in these changes to society, we have to take into account the broad appropriation of social networks. The discursive qualities of 2.0 tools seem to be, in the eyes of politicians, communication tools capable of mobilising local stakeholders and reviving the utopian vision of a local and digital direct democracy. The image of participatory users of ICT led by politicians is an idealised and, in our view, a fanciful representation of the internet and of participatory democracy.

The environmental question is traditionally a theme at the heart of online debates at the behest of public authorities, and notably in France by the Ministry of Ecology (Marcoccia, 2003, p. 14). This online presence seems to us a consequence of the strong link between the environment and local democracy, now known as the concept of environmental democracy which translates the fact that “the participation of stakeholders, or relevant people and groups, has become the norm of public environmental action.” (Barbier, Rémi & Larrue Corinne; 2011; p.67). This consensus around environmental democracy is notably present in urban regeneration policies, where environmental problems go hand in hand with traditional urbanism issues, such as insecurity, inequality or increased
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consumption. So it seems “ [...] easier to deal with the pressures on the cities who lean towards sustainable development when local institutions, in particular government, appear to be transparent, participative and responsible.” (Assadourian Erik & Renner Michael, 2012, p. 477).

As Thierry Libaert reminds us, “[...] communication is a necessity for sustainable development and will be more and more so.” (Libaert, 2010, p.26). Discursive and participative communication is also a key aspect. For instance, in the framework of Article 40.25, Agenda 21 cites the, “use of diverse initiatives to create digital networks to support information sharing, to access to databases and other sources of information, to facilitate communication to achieve wider objectives [...]” 5. Communication is a pillar of sustainable development, but we note, above all, the implication of its capacity to mobilise all society’s actors to tackle the socio-ecological problem of the future. And the idealised vision of ‘transparency’ and ‘participation’ of all. As the sociologist Salvador Juan confirms, in his proposal for communication action plan in support of sustainable development, the need for “[...] information beforehand, moderated debate, consultation with a devise value, positions evolving in relation to participation.” 6

Today, the call for participative environmental action is no longer the sole prerogative of the public authorities. The call is also led by militant ecologist from civil society, notably through the so-called Transition movement. For Rob Hopkins, who is the founder of this movement, “[...] transition initiatives constitute an new evolving approach to sustainability at a community level [...]” 7. As he says, “although peak oil and climate change are without doubt enormous challenges, they carry the possibility of an unprecedented economic, cultural and social renaissance. We will see a blooming of local businesses, skills and solutions, and an explosion of cleverness and creativity.” (Hopkins, op. cit., p187)8. The solutions suggested by Hopkins concern principally the micro-level. Through the accumulation of little experiences, broader social innovation will arise. It’s about breaking the ‘top down’ vision of government and enabling a ‘bottom up’ approach to governance. Clearly, we cannot predict the flowering of these micro-initiatives at the level of whole territories.

The involvement of everyone in actions and decisions linked to eco-citizen initiatives comes on the back of the imagined powers of the ICT, and in particular those of the internet. It is interesting to note that these two imaginary forms of communication are inspired by the same model: Jürgen Habermas’s theory of Public Sphere. If the public sphere, in its universal political dimension, is something beyond our reach for Habermas, he has higher hopes for the emergence a fragmented public space, composed of local, national, or transnational online spaces, in which civil society can debate on small scale crucial questions of how we live together in society. Moreover, the argumentative logic, key in political initiatives of deliberative communication, should not hide forms of non-rationalist engagement that can mobilise citizens in eco-citizenship and eco-citizen consumption. Following the work of Hans Joas, we could, for example, imagine including in a theory of creative action “[...] the multiples forms of expression that make the claim of citizen’s ‘truth’.”9. Even if there are multiple forms of citizen participation, they nonetheless seem to be in crisis, or at least very difficult to activate. This crisis, in its bottom up and environmental educational nature, can play an important role in propagating eco-responsible consumption. So what of all this, can we see in action in our community area?

**A virtual community as a response to the crisis in eco-citizen participation?**

In the area of Fontaine d’Ouche, we have observed a form of crisis of traditional engagement in citizenship. Local groups and charities are seeing their numbers ageing. Young people seem to invest less time in this type of institutional activity. In France, local community or “loi 1901” organisations give the legal and democratic basis for community engagement in activities for the common good. These organisations have a Board of Directors, which is democratically elected by the membership. The Board of Director chooses its own President, Company Secretary or Treasurer. This is the only type of organisation in France, which is able to obtain from governmental or other types of grants, whether from public or private sources. The failure of such organisation to generate interest in matters of common good among the younger generation raises questions on a number of levels. Should we conclude that there is a crisis in local participative democracy? Should we highlight a growing fracture in citizen engagement or simply conclude that latter is taking on new forms of organised or spontaneous activity, beyond the confines of the traditional French models of structured community engagement? The usual ‘bottom up’ approaches to local or national government, on which urban and environmental policies to engage citizens are based, is heavily reliant on the representatively and dynamism of 1901 type organisations. So, if this model only partially represents the population, how is it possible to inform, education and mobilise the inhabitants of a community about eco-responsible production and consumption?

In parallel to these local organisations, Comités de quartiers (Neighbourhood Commissions) have been set by the Dijon Council to galvanise input from citizens on local questions. It is striking that these Neighbourhood Commissions involve those citizens who are already active with other local organisations. We are talking about a sort of dynamic ‘super-citizen’. Often retired, these people find that extra community activities bring them a form of social recognition that motivates them to continue with such institutional citizen engagement; a trend which hides a certain level of disenchantment with or under-representativeness of local democracy as imagined by the public authorities.

Several hypotheses can be used to explain this crisis in institutional engagement by citizens. Firstly, one can cite commonplace arguments such as the lack of time available to citizens who work. But what then to say about young adults and adolescents, who have time at their disposal but who, with the exception of sports or cultural organisations, do not seem to engage with other community stakeholders? In our view, the crisis in more akin to a deeper calling into question of the institution, which could be qualified as a crisis of democracy and political representatively. It is difficult to empirically evaluate this assessment apart from through a constant low electoral turnout. But the inability of public authorities to provide jobs and security in these ‘marginal’ communities like Fontaine d’Ouche has a long-term demotivating effect on the inhabitants, especially the young, and does not help regenerate institutional engagement. On the basis of interviews carried out with a large number of the local community organisations in Fontaine d’Ouche, we observed that the leaders of these organisations bemoan the lack of citizen-engagement in their organisations, and the lack of renewal of their active members. The most ‘marginal’ populations (ethnic minorities, recently arrived in France; people in socially precarious situations, young unemployed, etc.) do not seem to relate to this community activity. The problem is complicated and cannot be put down to one simple reason. The lack of citizen engagement, as we saw above, has an adverse effect on education and action for the
environment. Indeed, all politicians, who want to see the development of green behaviour, call on participation at the level of local or governmental organisations. Only an institutional approach to eco-engagement seems to be the order of the day. From now on, how should we involve or encourage the citizen to adopt eco-responsible habits of consumption?

The temptation is to rely on the post-modern community-building potential of communication platforms such as social media, discussion fora and other blogs. These virtual communities of citizens seem to be a possible means to organise the shared activities of citizens. The myth of ‘collective intelligence’ (virtual communities for action or learning) combines with ideology of an electronic democracy (virtual discussion communities). One can also consider the idea that such platforms constitute a sort of digital footprint leaving visible signs of an emerging form of non-institutional citizen engagement. But this type of digital engagement finds itself appropriated by public authorities which see it as a miraculous means to set up participatory governance in their areas, or even as political communication tools to roll out (like a 2.0 marketing model) to persuade the population of the sound basis of political and environmental action.

The creation of a virtual community for the development of eco-responsible consumption.

After a study of the media environment of Fontaine d’Ouche’s population, we observed that no local online community initiatives existed on the question of socio-ecological transition. The only local online presence is a Facebook page of the newspaper Dijon Média 21, which informs the inhabitants about local life, contributing to a positive image of the area. Given the absence of a local virtual community to address the ecology theme, we decided to create our own socio-digital initiative as part of an action research project. The strategic objective of this initiative is to create the community for sustainable development and eco-responsible consumption in the area. Following a questionnaire completed by a representative sample of over 400 inhabitants about their communication habits, we chose to develop a Facebook page10. This page, put online in April 2013, has drawn together, at the end of the yearlong experiment, more than 550 users-members, of whom two thirds are inhabitants of the area. Following the logic of a ‘bottom up’ approach, it was important to involve the greatest number of local inhabitants and stakeholders from the area. We chose, therefore, to draw up a pilot committee made up of representatives from local organisations, specialists in eco-citizenship and sustainable development, local council and community leaders, and experts in community management. This pilot committee is responsible for leading on the community management policy, developing and expanding the membership of the community and providing expertise on the theme of socio-ecological transition. The pilot committee also enables the imitative to gather information from the pages and websites of its membership. Such an approach follows the 2.0 logic of aggregation and the viral propagation of information. The committee also gives a certain legitimacy to the work of moderating the page.

Beyond these elements, our experiment raises a series of ethical and scientific questions, to which we will try here to give a few answers based on empirical observation:
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Ethical questions linked to the phenomenon of the digital divide.

Are we not guilty of discrimination given that not all the inhabitants of the Fontaine d'Ouche area have access to ITC and the Internet? The IT skills are a key indicator. The digital divide can be considered as indicator of social mistrust (Granjon, 2012). But with the development of Internet use at home, one could think that the notion of digital divide is not longer pertinent in French society. Over 80% of the population in France use the Internet, and almost half the population use Facebook\textsuperscript{11}. These figures mirror an almost equivalent picture amongst the population of Fontaine d'Ouche.

Inequalities do persist however. Given the importance of written communication in the initiative (via the intensive use of e-mail, for example), literacy difficulties (grammar, spelling, vocabulary) are a handicap. In the context of our study, we found it necessary to call on non-literacy-based contributions. Laurence Monnoyer-Smith suggests freeing citizen-participation from the rationalist paradigm and, following Hans Joas in a theory of creative action, calling for "[...] multiple forms of expression which could aspire to the truth of citizens." (Monnoyer-Smith, 2011, p. 202). Our experimental Community Management took into account all modes of expression within the scope of Facebook\textsuperscript{12}. Not everyone, as we saw above, has the literacy skills or capacity to reason. Indeed, many people are more 'acclaiming' (likes) or deeply playful (commentaries which aim to provoke a reaction from user-participants, use of comic stickers, etc.).

Equally, managing communication 2.0, and its coherence with social networks, is very complex and requires digital competences, which are more and more sophisticated. Being able to collect the right information, analyse it and share it with one’s network is a way of obtaining valuable digital recognition. But complex research techniques and data analysis are equally discriminating factors. Understanding this digital recognition requires a level of media knowledge that presupposes a significant cultural capital. Mastering communication 2.0 is as discriminating a factor today as was (un)familiarity with e-mail and (lack of) Internet access at the end of the 1990s.

Scientific questions linked to the virtual community model.

Does the normative model of the virtual community have the capacity to engage inhabitants and other actors of an area through an online exchange platform? In the framework of previous research (Galibert, 2003, 2014), we identified a group of norms which, we consider, gives structure to the form of social liaison online. Such links, that we could compare to social logics,

\textsuperscript{11} 54 473 474 internet users, 83% of the French population; 68% of French citizen are signed up on social media; 28 million active uses of Facebook, which 42% of the French population (Chiffre « We are Social » http://fr.slideshare.net/wearesocialsg/social-digital-mobile-around-the-world-january-2014 )

\textsuperscript{12} The Facebook platfor was chosen because it is the most used by inhabitants of the area, following a survey of a representative sample of the population (400 questionnaires treated).
form an ideal of a virtual community that we describe as a ‘normative model of the virtual community’. This model supposes a community bond as a sort of an ideal of emancipation. The community bond online is based on virtuous circles of giving, the possibility to counter mistrust and search for recognition from peers within the community, and, finally, by discursive exchanges which are reasoned (rational constructs) and reasonable (respectful of the interlocutor, avoiding all coercive effects and all symbolic violence). We apply these social logics to our community management policy. The policy is based on the logic of giving: giving information to stimulate other ‘counter-giving’ of information by other users (Mauss, 1999; Caillé, 2000) and the logic of intra-community recognition (reward rather than shame, producing emancipatory recognition rather than mistrust - Honneth & Rush, 2013). And the ethics of discussion: moderating inappropriate remarks, encouraging debate (Habermas, 1987). We stress play aspects (organising games or photo competitions for example) and the importance of a friendly and, on occasions, light-hearted tone to the moderation.

In terms of results, we observed very little ‘counter-giving’ of information. The material posted by our community manager was rewarded with likes or positive commentaries. It was very rare that members initiated a conversation thread or a commentary via a post on the wall of our page. The commentaries, which followed posts by the community manager, never gave raise to discursive commentaries. We conclude that our page is not suitable for organisation of debate as part of a rationalist paradigm. We note, however, the high esteem in which the members held the community manager. We only once had to censor a remark. In terms of recognition, we observed the emergence of half a dozen regular ‘commentators’ or ‘sharers’, who adopted the stance of experts in the local area but without ever claiming the particular status of natural leader or prescriber. So we can say that the social logics of the normative model of the virtual community were present up until now. The logic of giving is limited to thanks, the logic of recognition is limited to the emergence of a few local ‘experts’ and logic of discussion is very limited to the point of being inexistent in terms of argumentation but nonetheless present in the form of respect for Netiquette.

**Questions about the effectiveness of ‘bottom up’ communication.**

On the basis of the above, we can say that the bottom up communication, on which the citizen engagement with eco-responsibility and eco-consumption rely, is hardly present. Rather the experiment shows up until now more of a top down approach constructed and propagated by the community manager with the help of an especially recruited online journalist; the participative and cooperative dimension of the initiative is limited to a diverse pilot committee, which is already involved in community management decisions. *A minima*, participation is translated as the passive reading of remarks and posts: this is often considered as ‘non-participation’, detrimental to the process of digital socialising. This is particularly the case in participatory democracy, where passive readers often have a lower status compared with people who add comments. But the passive reader or ‘lurker’ today deserves all our attention. Indeed nothing tells us that such people don’t talk or don’t spread information or don’t initiate discussions about eco-responsible consumption via other online communities or even through non-moderated face-to-face communication.

If the generalisation about ‘active’ participation translates as exchange, which is more shared or more collegial, then the passive reading of the conversational content of a CSAI (Community...
Service and Application on the Internet) seems to us to be a form of participation all to itself. On this topic, we share Michel Marcoccia’s view when he writes that “[…] someone who is happy just to read posts without ever contributing to a forum, a ‘lurker’, nonetheless belongs to the conversation group in the sense that the participatory framework of a forum allows for ‘unseen’ reading as a form of participation” (Marcoccia, 2003). So there are several levels of participation, which we should categorise more precisely because they suggest different levels of engagement. Be this as it may, the development of the online community bond is at the heart of the question of participation, in the sense that the latter is both the cause and the consequence of the former. Without participation, the bond is impossible because non-users cannot feel what social psychologists call the sense of belonging. And without the slightest feeling of belonging to a group, the user will not engage in interaction.

Finally, considering the informational perspective, has this Facebook page generated collective intelligence on eco-responsible production and consumption? The principle of Web 2.0 signifies that a communicative activity between users of the same platform generates pertinent information, which is updated in real time online. Thereafter, the value of the relation is judged increasing by its potential to generate information. Member users’ motivation to join an online community initiative is above all one rooted in an interest in obtaining information. Recent research on users of CSAI in the health sector in Quebec shows that a non-specialist medical knowledge “[…] circulates on Web 2.0 site where it is used to interpret the experience of illness and treatments.” (Thoër & al., 2012, p.75) One cannot, of course, draw generalisations from one single example but we should consider online community initiatives as fundamentally information-based, like a database which is updated collectively, benefiting from shared intelligence and offering personal responses to specific questions - these seem to be their most important functions. On our page, in line with what was mentioned above about the ‘bottom up’ approach, the knowledge available on eco-responsible consumption is not drawn from collective intelligence. But nothing shows that it does not have the potential to develop in this way.

It remains to be seen if this initiative manages, in the long run, to engender a positive attitude to eco-responsible consumption. It is too early to say. The initial feedback from the users of our page, as well as those of the stakeholders, indicates that our page is a unique virtual community in the area, over and above the eco-responsible dimension of the theme. Its identification by the inhabitants of Fontaine d’Ouche suggests that it will grow into a pertinent tool for communication and environmental education. Nonetheless, will these attitudes translate into long-lasting consumer habits?

**CONCLUSION**

The operational assessment of our action research is mixed on the level of citizen engagement in eco-responsible consumption/production. The initiative seems to meet its brief to communicate and educate about environmental action, and constitutes today a virtual community in the area, but its role in changing behaviour still needs to be evaluated. The question of engagement with eco-responsible action following a communication initiative is a problem for researchers in communication science. If current research offers some effective and persuasive solutions in the
area of ‘engaging communication’ (Bernard, 2010; Girandola, 2003), the effect of eco-responsible engagements can only be observed over the long term. This fact set a limit on the conclusions of a number of social psychological studies which aim to measure the impact of such initiatives, as one might measure the impact of an advertising campaign.

At the current time, it is also difficult to measure our hypothesis about the deep and adaptable resilience of areas home to socially marginalised communities. A comparison with other experiments, led in underprivileged or social stigmatised areas of other cities in the developed world, could help to add credence or otherwise to the idea. As part of a broader reflection on the economies of functionality (Rifkin, 2000) and other circular economies (Aurez, Levy, 2013), the idea of replicating internationally our methodology would allow us to measure the potential of 2.0 to engage citizens in eco-responsible consumption and in particular those in institutional contexts of diverse local democracy.

Finally, on the question of methodology, our action research is still on-going; the experiment continues. The extent of the sustainable consumption at the level of our field area can only be evaluated in the medium term (2-3 years). Our difficulty today is to identify someone from the target population to take on the community management of the page, and thereby maintain the initiative. The task of identifying the first contributors, to train and empower them to undertake community manager duties has already begun. This is all part of giving recognition to the inhabitants of the area and fighting against social exclusion through the ‘skilling’ of community managers with a value on the job market.

For the ideology implicit in the idea of a community of (good) practice, CSAI (Community Service and Application on the Internet) offers the social means to exchange skills and practical knowledge to accompany diverse initiatives led by inhabitants, local organisations or authorities and could lead to other social and ecologically comparable innovations. In our view, nothing shows that such tools will succeed where politicians and other stakeholders are failing today, i.e. in mobilising citizen participation. Here also the expectations of social demands are often marked by technical determinism. Laurence Monnoyer-Smith has clearly shown the reasons for the failure to set up social debates online. For her, the mobilisation of populations in a debating process requires “[…] the responsibility of deciders, the transparency of decisions, the follow-up of dialogue.” (Monnoyer-Smith, op. cit., p. 230). Without detailing these three proposals here, we would say that they at least resonate with the logic of recognition raised above. The citizen, without necessarily being quoted by name, must be able to recognise that his/her contribution has been taken into account and that it has a certain weight in the political decisions that follow. Moreover, the motivation to make a contribution, identified by Laurence Monnoyer-Smith, echoes a form of reflective/argumentative ideology in the awareness of the citizens’ word, which is not so far removed from the normative communicational dimension of the model of the virtual community.

The operational object of CSAI that we have put in place is to accompany social innovation through access to local information, sharing knowledge and good practice. Here it is not a question of deliberation. The application of a marketing and managerial tool such as Community Management, with a view to developing an emancipatory citizen initiative raises again the question of social reasoning. Are we moving towards “[…] a double radical simplification: that of
the citizen and of the consumer, and that of our rapport with democracy and with management”
(Monnoyer-Smith, op. cit. p.202)\textsuperscript{13}?
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