



DIGITAL MEDIA AND A NEW SOCIETY

A LOOK AT HUMAN INTERACTIONS AND
ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

Suzana Gilioli da Costa Nunes,
Nelson Russo de Moraes,
Fernando da Cruz Souza

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação – CIP

N972m

Nunes, Suzana Gilioli da Costa.

Digital media and a new society: a look at human interactions and organizational relations. / Suzana Gilioli da Costa Nunes; Nelson Russo de Moraes; Fernando da Cruz Souza. – Palmas, TO: EDUFT, 2020.

65 p. ; 21 x 29,7 cm.

ISBN 978-65-89119-50-0

Title in portuguese: As mídias digitais e a nova sociedade: um olhar sobre as interações humanas e as relações organizacionais

1. Digital media. 2. Society, interaction. 3. Organizational relations. I. Suzana Gilioli da Costa Nunes. II. Nelson Russo de Moraes. III. Fernando da Cruz Souza. IV. Title. IV. Subtitle.

CDD – 370

**Suzana Gilioli da Costa Nunes,
Nelson Russo de Moraes,
Fernando da Cruz Souza**

DIGITAL MEDIA AND A NEW SOCIETY

A LOOK AT HUMAN INTERACTIONS AND
ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS



**Publisher of the Federal University of Tocantins - EdUFT
Palmas (TO), 2020**

Universidade Federal do Tocantins

Reitor

Luis Eduardo Bovolato

Vice-reitora

Ana Lúcia de Medeiros

Pró-Reitor de Administração e Finanças (PROAD)

Jaasiel Nascimento Lima

Pró-Reitor de Assuntos Estudantis (PROEST)

Kherley Caxias Batista Barbosa

Pró-Reitora de Extensão, Cultura e Assuntos Comunitários (PROEX)

Maria Santana Ferreira Milhomem

Pró-Reitora de Gestão e Desenvolvimento de Pessoas (PROGEDEP)

Vânia Maria de Araújo Passos

Pró-Reitor de Graduação (PROGRAD)

Eduardo José Cezari

Pró-Reitor de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação (PROPESQ)

Raphael Sanzio Pimenta

Conselho Editorial EDUFT

Presidente

Francisco Gilson Rebouças Porto Junior

Membros por área:

Liliam Deisy Ghizoni

Eder Ahmad Charaf Eddine
(Ciências Biológicas e da Saúde)

João Nunes da Silva

Ana Roseli Paes dos Santos

Lidianne Salvatierra

Wilson Rogério dos Santos
(Interdisciplinar)

Alexandre Tadeu Rossini da Silva

Maxwell Diógenes Bandeira de Melo
(Engenharias, Ciências Exatas e da Terra)

Francisco Gilson Rebouças Porto Junior

Thays Assunção Reis

Vinicius Pinheiro Marques
(Ciências Sociais Aplicadas)

Marcos Alexandre de Melo Santiago

Tiago Groh de Mello Cesar

William Douglas Guilherme

Gustavo Cunha Araújo
(Ciências Humanas, Letras e Artes)

Diagramação e capa: Gráfica Movimento

Arte de capa: Gráfica Movimento

O padrão ortográfico e o sistema de citações e referências bibliográficas são prerrogativas de cada autor. Da mesma forma, o conteúdo de cada capítulo é de inteira e exclusiva responsabilidade de seu respectivo autor.



<http://www.abecbrasil.org.br>

SUMÁRIO

PREFACE	6
INTRODUCTION	9
CHAPTER 1 – Philosophical, anthropological and sociological fundamentals	12
CHAPTER 2 – Social networks, internet and digital telephony	30
CHAPTER 3 – Communication and organizations: new paradigms with digital media	38
CHAPTER 4 – People and online social networks	52
CHAPTER 5 – Indicatives for next studies	55
REFERENCES	58

PREFACE

*Por Cristiane Hengler Corrêa Bernardo, PhD
Communication Lecturer*

It is at least essential for discussions in the field of communication, organizations and social relations in general this work I had the honor to preface. However, despite being indispensable, it goes beyond this single adjective. I will indicate just a few to give the reader a taste of what they will find along the pages, which I have delighted in less than a day. That's right, less than a day. Not for the lack of time, but for the pleasure that time has given me. Instigating. Bold. Interesting. Amazing. I will stop here the adjectives and leave the others for the reader to choose their own, after all, the Portuguese language is rich and this work deserves many others adjectives that I am leaving between the lines.

The first chapter took me through the philosophical, anthropological and sociological threads, to the reflection about the interaction on social networks, based on the concepts of identity, communication and sociability. Such reflections emerge from Descartes, with his phrase “cogito, ergo sum” (I think, therefore I am) and the delicious boldness, despite keeping a certain shyness, that questions the possibility of such reflection leaving out interaction, dialogue, meeting the others. Despite not daring a new axiom, it points us to such a possibility, which already instigates, marvels, enchants us. There I go offering new adjectives.

From there it takes off for a trip that present us to Max Weber; João de São Tomás; Van Orman; Jakobson, among others, and takes us, like a time machine, to Plato's Cave. From there we are again transported and brought to Saussure's signs. Sequentially, Wittgenstein leads us to meet Kant again when discussing the limits of human language.

This journey also goes through the tracks of inevitable communication and culture in Levinas. Following the line of Semiotics, it arrives at Barthes, who leaves his feelings “in full blossom” and anthropology, with Franz Boas, who gives us a shock of reality by refuting ethnocentrism and biological determinism.

The next steps in Chapter 1 will remain in suspense, not because they are less important than the trip reported so far, but to leave the reader to formulate their own conclusions when faced with so many characters that mark the state of scientific knowledge in the philosophical, anthropological and sociological fields.

Chapter 2, entitled Social Networks, Internet and Digital Telephony, presents the reader with an essential perspective in whose the discussion of social networks is much earlier than the advent of the internet. Social networks are sociological and anthropological discussions, even before what is now known as digital social networks. Reflections today have gained interactivity mediated by computers and cell phones and draw the attention of researchers for the breadth resulting from globalization and the opening of geographical borders for the establishment of networks. In this context, the authors discuss the new meanings and potential of social networks stemming from the internet and globalization. This approach comes from the dialogue with

the sociological and anthropological thoughts of Durkheim, Ferdinand Tönnies, Claude Lévi-Strauss, among others.

The authors very appropriately bring the differences between social networks and the possibilities offered to digital media to serve various purposes. Examples of networks of fishermen, family, friends, professional, in short, the diversity of networks is presented through empirical studies carried out by authors from various parts of the world and bring the specificities of each type of social group constituted in a network. These specificities are discussed from the perspective of socio-human interactions and offer very insightful clues about the motivations that lead individuals to establish “nodes”, as well as how often these relationships are maintained.

The reader will also find, during the reading of the chapter, a brief history about the internet and how it propitiated the explosion of social networks in the digital environment, drawing a parallel with the effects of globalization. You can also follow the evolution of telephony and the convergence of media into digital telephony, providing an almost symbiotic approach between the production and reception of messages. Thus, in an almost historiographical narrative, you will see the birth of digital media, information and communication technologies, as well as the new dialogical space - cyberspace. In this cyberspace context, we are taken to flights over the colossal transformations in human interactions and their immeasurable capacities for adaptation.

It is clear that the thread that runs through this work finds in each station a skilled driver who is aware of the responsibilities of taking the reader to new landscapes. Thus, Chapter 3 - “Communication and organizations: new paradigms with digital media” offers the possibility of immersion in the universe of organizations and leads us to the concept of Organization as a living organism, which not only promotes human interactions, but also it is made up of such interactions.

Accordingly, it is necessary to look at organizations under the new paradigms created from digital media and that is what this new landscape provides the reader. The public of an organization has ceased to be just the client and has now been made up of stakeholders, the so-called concerned parties, due to the new demands and social values. The authors bring this discussion in order to reflect on the performance of organizations and the interactions resulting from the relationships established with the most diverse stakeholders.

Today’s organizations are not just based at their physical addresses. There are digital addresses, their so called homes, and it is exactly in this space that they gain even more visibility. This visibility is subject to burdens and bonuses, since, as can be seen in the discussion undertaken by the authors, the internet gave voice to the public, which went from being a mere passive recipient to becoming an active subject. Such a discussion is permeated by the evolution of the internet and as a consequence by the changes that break paradigms bringing new concepts to be discussed in the perspective of communication.

So the authors go through QR Codes, augmented reality, Mobile Tagging, Web 1.0; 2.0; 3.0, moving from movement, through sharing and reaching intelligence. They also bring e-commerce electronic pages to e-gov and their different purposes and governance structures to the discussion. Finally, they offer the necessary reflection on the transparency and responsibility of public agents.

“People and online social networks” is the title of Chapter IV, which offers some analysis based on empirical experiences carried out by several authors, from Orkut, through Facebook

and Twitter, and even stops by Instagram. This tour offers the reader a brief presentation of the networks, discussing the creation objectives, as well as the instruments and possibilities offered.

Closing the work, the final considerations present the challenges that contemporary society poses to humanity in a world where everything is urgent, where information is passed almost simultaneously through digital media and social networks are constantly fed by billions of content producers who at the same time consume them with the same voracity which they are produced. *Super* has become obsolete, outdated for postmodern society. Today *hyper* is in force and, for this very reason, this work concludes by addressing the hyper speed of relationships that was woven into a conducting thread at the very least ... and at most, it fits all the adjectives that you reader want to assign.

I hope that this work can lead you to profound reflections that PhD. Nelson Russo Moraes, PhD. Suzana Gilioli da Costa Nunes and the master's student Fernando da Cruz Souza, professionals whose thematic of human relations move their interests, because it is in it that their identities, communication and sociability, are presented with all the analytical potential.

Have a great read.

Cristiane Hengler Corrêa Bernardo, PhD

Communication's Associate Professor

São Paulo State University (UNESP)

INTRODUCTION

Eric Hobsbawn (HOBSBAWN, 1995), in his work “The Age of Extremes: the short twentieth century, 1914-1991” (HOBSBAWN, 1995) highlights the search for solutions to problems posed by new contexts in the twentieth century would be of the scope of all its previous history. This highlight, of immense weight, refers to time only until 1991 (historiographical part of his work), so without considering all the transformations that would still come in the last years of the 20th century, which were gigantic given the leverage of the phenomena of globalization, the internet and digital media on the various forms of human interaction.

In such a historical context, from a whole century (an outline from 1890 to 1990) humanity has been re-signifying itself and undergoing changes in its relational modes, especially between organizations and national states, between society and nature and also in production processes to meet the growing and changing demands of human beings.

However, considering the great changes made by the human being to the human being, perhaps the greatest are those that unfold from the convergence between the fields of data processing and communication (which brought the internet and the portability of access) and those on the field of human interaction.

Humanity in general, people and their organizations in particular, have undergone great transformations in their social bases, in their understanding of culture and in the understanding of the possibilities and limits (or “non-limits”) of informational-communicative social interactions. The transformations notably come from several fields, from the reconfigurations of political geography, going through the changes in transnational capitals and contributing to the constant innovations in the field of technologies applied to the maximization of time and due to the increase in human social productivity.

Although the term “increase in human social productivity” may sound and seem strange, we have used it to designate a reflection on the accelerating and maximizing effects that unfold in new social configurations, considered regular for basic social phenomena such as showing a photos album, the act of buying something, government oversight and even making and cultivating a friendship.

Within these new contexts of high technological speed, business organizations have undergone, since the end of the 1980s, an intense evolutionary acceleration of their processes, which, in addition to being reengineered and computerized, have been dynamized by the absorption of concepts previously typical of social human relations. Thus, purchases via e-commerce systems were started for orders placed by consumer through purchase applications, besides the control of government directly by the citizen through the portability of internet access.

It is important to highlight that organizations are rational systems planned, managed and maintained by human beings, so they need to be understood as structures created by the arbitrary will of society, under the reflexes of the interests, conditions and interactions of human beings, as highlighted by the sociologists Émile Durkheim and Ferdinand Tönnies (ARON, 2008).

This book seeks a theoretical guideline that can contribute to a better understanding of human social relations and how they are deeply transformed in contemporary times, especially by the new information and communication technologies (ICT) and from them by the digital media. It is sought, therefore, to bring several studies from the fields of Philosophy, Sociology and Anthropology that can contribute to the foundation of the understanding of the theories of organizations and social networks.

The text goes through a dialogue about the understanding that social networks are based socially and anthropologically, thus they already existed, through direct human social relations, even before the popularization of the world wide web (internet) and the portability of access made possible by the convergence of media between microcomputers and the smartphone (cell phone with advanced technological resources that allows access to the internet).

Then, it dialogues, in a theoretically sustained way, about the transformations of private, public and third sector organizations, as well as of social relations and human interactions after the appropriation of the functionalities of digital media in general and of online social networks (or social networks) specifically.

The main objective of this book is to assist in the approximation between the common appropriation of the terms digital media and social networks, used (sometimes) incorrectly in contemporary times, with theories that contribute to their creation, especially the theories of human wills, cultural anthropology, communication, organizations and social networks.

Thus, the work is organized in five chapters, and it is up to chapter 1 to deal with a theoretical alignment structured from the philosophical plane of existence to the critical foundations coined by the Frankfurt School as its main social theory. To that end, the aforementioned chapter runs through Cultural Anthropology, which in Franz Boas brings the sustained struggle of ethnocentrism and also the perspective of historical particularism for the differentiated production of culture. The chapter also goes through theoretical convergence with sociological schools, with emphasis on the structuring of social thought in Durkheim, the structured criticism of Karl Marx's capitalist model.

Also in chapter 1, there is the organization of a coherent theoretical matrix for the analysis of the origin of communities and society, which in Ferdinand Tönnies would arise through human will. Finally, the chapter becomes even more contemporary for us when it cuts and brings up the sectors of society (State, market and third sector), their characteristics and possibilities for interaction.

In chapter 2, the work brings the convergence between perspectives specific to communication theory, computer theory and democracy theory, indicating the contexts where the works to unfold on the internet and digital telephony would have appeared. Thus, the chapter brings the definition of digital media, differentiating them from social networks, whose socio-anthropological basis indicates for human, interactive social relations, even before the internet.

In chapter 3, the book revisits the concept of organizations, highlighting a theoretical dialogue between their goals, models and management challenges, which necessarily involve communication. Thus, organizational communication is presented as a central instrument for the management of public, private and third sector organizations, with specific configurations and challenges highlighted.

In Chapter 4, some online social media platforms are presented, including Orkut, Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, with their creation story, some of their features and how they changed (and change) the interaction human social, proposing to bring people and distant worlds together, but sometimes bringing greater and more severe levels of distance and even isolation.

Finally, chapter 5, highlights very important indications about the challenges of society in the management of its organizational relations and mainly of human social interaction within the contexts and complexities typical of the “society in networks” or “new society”, strongly characterized by the immediacy, superficiality and even aligned to consumerism. In this sense, alerts are established to the field of studies on the applicability of digital media to society in general and to the interaction between people in particular.

CHAPTER 1

PHILOSOPHICAL, ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL FUNDAMENTALS

All contemporary knowledge about digital media necessarily passes through the concepts of interaction and social networks and these are based on some elements that, being essential to our recognition, characterize the human being, their identity, communication and sociability. Then, the fields of Philosophy, Anthropology and Sociology are like pilasters for a good understanding about digital media, onde they are founded as fields that support communication and structure the theoretical guiding thread necessary for studies and research on this theme.

To approach the theme, we start with a philosophical quote that seems to position itself strategically and rationally towards instrumentalizing new ways for social interaction and the viability of natural or artificial wills. The phrase “cogito, ergo sum”, or “I think, therefore I am” by the famous Enlightenment philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650) refers to the perception of identity and natural personality and, from this, of the rationality capable of altering the path of existence itself for the being. Descartes builds his philosophical alignment from more physical and biological perspectives composing the axiom “I am, I exist” in others much more metaphysical axioms until he reaches the widely used derivation “I think, therefore I exist”.

Certainly, such a relevant phrase would, in addition to echo, assist in the structuring and sedimentation of innumerable theories; among others, the theory of Weberian social action, which, in turn, throws existential responsibilities upon human beings, who, according to Max Weber (1864-1920), are capable of being agents of transformation of social reality.

It is noticeable the depth of the Cartesian statement about the existence in a philosophical field of origin and of space utilization in the being’s individuality. However, when make eye contact, which is a simple action, with an equal, something different from thinking and existing would happen and happens: maybe the basic communication of the interaction, maybe the subtle sensation of coexistence (and this sensorial experience could happen through orality/hearing, touch and even smell). I would not dare to scribble a longer axiom than the original elaborated by Descartes to describe such a basic interactive sequence of human communication, it would not be good, nor as good, but possible.

Starting from the Enlightenment philosophy, the Portuguese philosopher John Poinset, whose name was changed to John of St. Thomas (1589-1644), dedicated himself to the study

of signs in communication, authoring the famous book *Tractatus de Signis* (1632). Despite being historically centered in the seventeenth century, his works were beyond the thoughts of his time, establishing strongly Enlightenment views, so that his texts and works are classified as belonging to the modern era. His book *Tractatus de Signis* brings in its first part a triangulation between reason and the human social relation dealing with sociability; the second section presents the creation of signs according to the nature of the relationship; the third part covers the theme of understanding and divisions of signs, still according to the nature of communication based on sociability, but always linking the relationships between sound and things; the last part brings conclusions with final concepts on the theme. Subsequently, part of his theory would be reinforced by the studies and works of the American Willard Van Orman Quine (1908-2000), who would argue that, since words are linked to things and facts by us, language would be a social art.

Ahead, properly within the period established as “modern time”, in Switzerland in the 19th century, Ferdinand Saussure (1857-1913) also dedicated himself to the so-called Philosophy of Language, a very specific branch, but of extreme importance for the whole field of communication and for a better understanding of digital media as a circumscription of its strong influence. Within the semiotic approach then inaugurated, language is understood as a compound and complex set of “signs”, which would, from this theory, be the basic elements of the systems and of the whole structure of communication. Summarizing Saussure’s studies and theoretical alignment, the Russian Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) advanced his work by deepening the treatise on the convergence between language and signs within the field of semiotics.

It is possible to go back in time on this trail, and revisit the narrative of the “myth of the cave”, in the work “The Republic” (379 BC) of the philosopher Plato (427-347 BC). In this famous, extensive and considered complex work, Plato articulates social and political parameters for the following character-elements: the prisoners of the cave, the cave itself, the echoes and the inner shadows of the cave, the exit from the cave and sunlight.

Ferdinand Saussure, among many significant contributions, highlights that every sign is composed of two elements: the first, an “acoustic image” (it is not the specific sound, but the image we produce for that specific sound); the second element of the theory brings the “meaning”, that is, a relationship between the words communicated in the sound and the things or facts of the real world. In this sense, Saussure’s definition is that it is on the mental plane that human beings relate the word (the sound), for example “pencil”, it relates to the physical object “pencil” and that this relationship does not unfold with requirements or a broad preliminary analysis, so we could have linked to the sound of the word “pencil” to a different object like a “spoon” and, thus, we would ordinarily call the “spoon” “pencil”.

Structuring the philosophical field of transcendental idealism, the Prussian Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) consolidated himself as one of the most important philosophers of his era, delimiting many theories and thoughts that would come in the following centuries. Among his many contributions, he defended the existence of an external and material world that occurs independently of us and our conscience. To this end, to affirm that a being exists, he refers to the need to be in a certain time and in an external material context.

In this line of thought, still in the philosophical field, the work Logical-Philosophical Treaty (*Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*), by the British naturalized Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951), densify studies and brings the strength of 18th century Kantian thought to

structure pondering the limits of language, or what can be effectively said in human communication.

In the path of approximation of Kantian thought to social networks, it is important to highlight that Kant defended that the human being, through his sensitivity, perceives the things and facts of the world, while, through his rationality, he could meditate or think about them. Thus, there would be two worlds: a world experienced through human senses and instincts and another world of things as they are actually configured in the exterior space and surrounding it.

In the same way that Kant sought to describe the limits of reason, in his work Wittgenstein sought clarification about what could be said and even about the limits of language and thought as a whole. Wittgenstein's theoretical path starts from two matrices: he states that the outside world is composed of things and facts, while language is composed of propositions about such things and facts, which may be true or false. Thus, as a sketch is the image of a construction, language would be formed by images of facts and things, so, philosophically, the limits of the world would be given by the limits of language.

A little later, within a certain philosophical guiding thread that helps to base the understanding for social networks, Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995) highlights the aspects of inevitable communication, when even if written or spoken languages are not used, the message is transmitted. In his work *Totality e Infinity* (1961), Levinas theorizes that language would be a means by which there is communication, even before speaking or writing. Thus, for example, even if the person does not read the text in a particular advertising campaign, the images of a company's logo associated with the actions of a given social or environmental project would lead to the communication of a company that acts with social and environmental responsibility.

Still in the field of semiotics, the French author, Roland Barthes (1915-1980), contributes saying that every language can have a "skin" of feelings that emanate from its emission, giving the message the subtle contours left by the emphasis, by the organization of words and even terms used. Thus, according to Barthes, from his work, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (1977), feelings such as love, hate, sadness, longing, among others, could be understood by messages within communication processes, making it more rich and complex processes.

It is important to consider, in order to densify philosophical perspectives, some elements of the field of Anthropology that may strengthen the guiding thread brought about in this book. After all, all the philosophical processes described here, from the Cartesian conception "I think, therefore I am", must be limited by the context of human interaction, proper to communication between human beings, which, in turn, exerts influences on points of view, value codes and cultures.

Man, in the search for its broad definition that considered and understood its biological, psychological, social, historical and even transcendental (spiritual) structures and perspectives, circumscribed Anthropology as an area of knowledge, which - like Sociology - unfolds from all previous philosophical knowledge, being mainly divided into Cultural Anthropology, Physical Anthropology and Philosophical Anthropology.

In this area of knowledge, it is the Cultural Anthropology that bounds and can best contribute to the strengthening of the theoretical foundation studies on social networks and from these, through the internet phenomenon to contemporary social media, being, therefore, the branch of anthropology to which we will mainly direct our attention. From anthropological pers-

pectives, it is assumed that it is the human being who creates his cultural environment, through the combination of their knowledge (individual or collective) acquired with lived experiences. Thus, for the cultural anthropologist, culture is the part of the environment produced by humans. Then, in an expanded formulation, Azevedo's (1996) definition of culture is as follows:

Culture is the set of senses and meanings, values and standards, incorporated and underlying the perceptible life's phenomena of a concrete social group, which is consciously or unconsciously experienced and assumed by the group as an expression of its human reality and goes from generation to generation, preserved as it was received or transformed effectively or allegedly by the group itself. (AZEVEDO, 1996, p. 336).

The definition of culture is, in this area of studies, essential for one to understand, from the main anthropological concepts related to social interaction, how social networks are structured and how people influence and are influenced by their direct communication or even by the messages inherent in the inevitable communication (previously dealt with by the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas).

Having culture as a central definition, it is important to note that, although there were in the cradles of civilizing processes (including the long and violent periods of maritime expansion and colonization from Europe) perspectives of ethnocentrism resulting from defenses that determinism was predominant over the evolution of cultures, it is assumed from Franz Boas (1858-1942) that there are no advanced cultures and backward cultures.

To end of combating ethnocentrism, properly founded on Franz Boas' Diffusionist Theory, Anthropology expands on the instrumentalization of theoretical steps to understand human communication, social interaction and, finally, digital social networks. Aware that social interaction, especially within the Theory of Symbolic Interactionism, is properly approached by Sociology of Communication specially by the American author Herbert Blumer (1900-1987).

Thus, the anthropological line of defense established by Franz Boas and other scholars, by refuting biological determinism and ethnocentrism, brings to the theoretical debate the historical particularism (culturalism) which in turn establishes that each, each community or each people has its history and therefore its moment in the temporal space of the socio-historical perspective. Historical particularism, therefore, refutes the evolutionary conception of backward and advanced cultures, establishing itself as a backdrop for studies on culture, even in contemporary times where interactions occur mediated by the so-called new information and communication technologies.

The Diffusionist Theory indicates that the development and transformations of a culture (individual or of a human collective) occur through the diffusion of cultural elements from one individual (or collective) to another through contacts and exchanges of information (cultural interaction). For diffusionist anthropologists, the phenomenon of cultural lending would be the central element of cultural transformations influenced by interactionism.

Then, from the works of Franz Boas, from the United States, within the Diffusionist Theory, Cultural Relativism is an anthropological notion that considers historical particularism to conceive that autochthonous cultural transformations (influenced by empiricism and geographical determinism) and those driven by social interactions events happen everywhere and at all

times in the evolution of humanity. Thus, it is assumed that culture is always in transformation and never constitutes a finished work.

From the anthropological works of the English author Radcliffe Brown (1881-1955) and the Polish author Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942), among others, arise the basis of the Functional Theory, whose matrix is strongly linked to the French Sociological School, especially to Émile Durkheim (1858-1917) for the specificity of research and explanations about the social division of labor and about the social function of organizations.

With a view to social interactions driven by communication processes (strategically planned or not), it is emphasized in this work, that the foundations of the Functional Theory support several social relations, including those with influence on social networks through digital media.

In Anthropology, the Functionalist Theory considers that each element, and even institution (family, company, State, school, Church, etc.), is part of an organic entirety within a culture, failing to make full sense when isolated. Thus, the interdependent functions between the parts of a cultural group start to assume responsibilities and obligations to sustain social relations, sociability.

Later, still in the anthropological field, the Belgian author Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009) would bring the perspective of structural thinking to culture. In this perspective, the anthropologist argues that there are previously conceived rules about culture in people's minds which by being organized in pairs of opposite senses would align a certain list of essential analysis requirements. It is true that Lévi-Strauss led the thinking of a current of scholars who were looking for ways to discover more information about human behavior on a universal scale.

Structuralist anthropologists argue that cultures are organized as complex systems of signs that are constituted, shared and accepted in order to harmonize human thought and actions. Thus, from the Structuralist Theory, knowledge, ways of life, sociability and cultures in general can be constantly changed.

As for the list of essential requirements for the analysis and study of cultures, according to the Structuralist Theory, Barros Júnior *et al.* (2011, p. 67) highlights: (1) knowledge, (2) beliefs, (3) values, (4) norms, (5) symbols. And he explains:

Each of these components constitutes its own block of experiences, both for the individual and for his collectivity. It is these elements that mark what represents the culture of a group and, in a way, determine how that group should operate within its cultural universe, generating what we call cultural patterns, cultural traits or expressions. (BARROS JÚNIOR, *et al.*, 2011, p. 67).

Therefore, in Structural Anthropology, it is conceived that expressions in a restricted sense and communication in a broad sense are elements that characterize a culture (individual or a human collective), and are directly and intimately linked to socio-historical perspectives and *modus vivendi* in face of geographic determinism (and in its relationship with nature) and interaction with other human beings or human groups.

Upon completion of a philosophical theoretical guideline and after revisiting some of the founding theories of Anthropology, which are structured as important (obviously not uniquely) guidelines for the foundations for understanding of human interaction, social networks and even

from the world wide web (internet), it is necessary to compose the third pillar: this one dedicated to the basic alignments of Sociology.

Distinguished from Philosophy, at first as Social Philosophy, by the French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857), Sociology is the science that studies human social relations, having its emergence linked to a very effervescent socio-historical context at a time of transformations in the fields of knowledge production.

The philosopher Auguste Comte was born in Montpellier - France (1798) and died in Paris (1857). Living in a period of great social and political problems in his country and in Europe as a whole, the philosopher dedicated himself to studying, creating and structuring a system or method of social analysis that would bring human interpretations - not theological or philosophical, but human and social - to the problems of humanity. Such a system had been called a Positive Policy System or Positive Philosophy, and in this area, Auguste Comte intended to explain social phenomena and society itself from historical and logical criteria, just as it had happened with chemistry, biology, physics, mathematics and astronomy (ARON, 2008).

The Enlightenment period in the field of Philosophy and the search for answers to the problems posed by humanity in its troubled social organization in the 18th century, still marked the matrix of the Cartesian concreteness of the answers, or at least the proposition of trails for its search. Thus, Comte, heir to the Enlightenment matrix, dedicated about thirty years of his studies to sculpting a space for social analysis, in this case strongly based on positivism, characteristic of the age of lights.

As for the European society of the time, the refractions Industrial Revolution processes were experienced, which in turn were packaged by the Enlightenment creations that brought new manufacturing processes, replacing artisanal and practically domestic factories, and along with it the discouragement for a life focused on agriculture and an endless search for a job in city factories.

Thus, in Europe in general and in France in particular, many social changes boiled in communities and on the streets, guiding debates and movements in order to stimulate studies of the social base and the social order, in addition to the search for a new pact among people. It should be noted that the social contract theory had previously been studied by contractualists, especially by Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704) and mainly by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Accordingly, it stand out as social phenomena of this temporality:

- (1) The crisis of the French republic, once since the French Revolution of 1789, France has experienced different regimes and forms of government (constitutional monarchies, republics and empires);
- (2) The strengthening of the labor movement, bringing something unprecedented to society what needed to be understood and studied in order to constitute explanations and even guidelines on the reorganization of forces in social classes;
- (3) The spread of socialism in the eighteenth century as a possible form of regime for states and nations, having as substrate class movements especially strengthened by the industrialization process of the Industrial Revolution era.

This context of growth of the cities and abandonment, by the peasants, of their productive expertise and of their life in the countryside, brought numerous and profound problems of social

order that needed to be studied for a better organization of social relations. In France, following the studies of Auguste Comte, Émile Durkheim would sculpt the School of French Sociology, having as a main work (related to this study) “The Division of Labor in Society” (originally published in 1893).

As already discussed, Sociology focuses on the study of human social relations, leading to the definition that “Sociology is a science that studies human society and whose development occurs from the need to understand man and his group life” (COSTA, 2010, p. 38). Within this field of knowledge production, some schools of study stand out, among them: School of French Sociology (Auguste Comte, Émile Durkheim among others), School of German Sociology (Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Max Weber, among others), Frankfurt School (also German-based, but distinct from the former, with thinkers such as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Jürgen Habermas) and the Chicago School of Sociology (Albion Small, Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, among others, being highly regarded by the influence of the German author Ferdinand Tönnies on subjects relating to human ecology).

We now look back to Émile Durkheim, who was born in Épinal, France, in 1858, and died in 1917, in Paris, a descendant of Jews who began his philosophical studies at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, then went to Germany, becoming later entitled the “father of sociology”. He taught Sociology in the first chair of this science created in France. He moved in 1902 to the University of Sorbonne, in Paris, where he brought together scientists in a group of studies and research that became known as the French Sociological School. His main works are: “The Division of Labour in Society”; “The rules of sociological method”; “Suicide”, “Elementary forms of religious life”; “Education and sociology”; “Sociology and philosophy” and “Lessons in sociology” (ARON, 2008).

Durkheim’s work culminated in a theory that carried the positivist principles proper to his predecessors and the functionalist perspective rooted in the sociological studies he developed. The theoretical designation of social facts brought an understanding that society had hegemony to propel individuals along the paths of life, being taken as fragmented and isolated (in their individual units) in the face of the hegemonic power of the social whole.

Durkheimian studies are established on the field of analysis in which there is a plan for people, their interests and their social relations, but that on these, strongly interfering in their sociability, it is necessary to consider a plan of institutions (family, Church, State, police, school, companies, etc.), which would have their own roles in society, determining social standards and possibilities within a descriptive perspective of life in society.

It is important to highlight that the Emile Durkheim’s vision of social facts enters the field of functionalism, which is characterized as a branch of social sciences that searches the definition of functions of the various societal institutions, explaining society from them. Thus, his work maintains the strong trace of positivism (inherited from Comte, which seeks to more concretely analyzes society) and also of functionalism, through which society is analyzed via functions of its institutions. It highlights that the social facts are characterized by: (1) coercivity, (2) exteriority and, (3) generality (ARON, 2008).

Durkheim has extensively studied social relations and their orders, economic relations, the emergence and rise of individuals in society, religion and the social division of labor. According

to these perspectives, social facts are distinguished from organic or psychological facts in that they impose themselves on the individual as a powerful coercive force called social coercion.

Individuals are forced to submit to this coercive force, being good examples of manifestations of human behavior based on such coercion: the adoption of a language, family organization and the feeling of belonging to a nation. It is important to highlight that, for non-observance and compliance with the precepts established by society and determined by the coercive force (social coercion), there are legal sanctions and spontaneous sanctions (COSTA, 2010).

Legal sanctions are those punishments prescribed by society in the form of laws for those who transgress it, such as: traffic fines, court decisions for the application of imprisonment or community work. On the other hand, spontaneous sanctions are those that arise freely in people as a response to conduct considered inappropriate by society, but that are not included in legal details, such as: the weakening of relationships with a person who has caused gossip and rumors within a certain group; the scolding given to the teenager who breaks glass bottles on the street; the look of disapproval to the student that disturbs the focus/attention of others in a class or lecture.

Deviant behavior in a social group may not have a penalty provided for by law, but the offender may be spontaneously punished by the group insofar as its action violates certain values and principles. Society's negative reaction to certain attitudes or behavior is often more intimidating than the law. (COSTA, 2010, p. 39).

According to Durkheim, social facts exist and we are subject to them regardless of our will or adherence, thus being "outside the will of individuals". When the individual is born, they already find social rules, customs and laws to which they will be compelled by social coercion. Classic examples are: the Federal Constitution, naturalness and education. There is a certain level of conflict between what we desire and what we are pressured to obey due to the "exteriority" characteristic of the social fact, as, for example, when we would like to be immediately served at the bank's cashier, but we are obliged to wait for our turn to come in the queue or in the order assigned by a password (ARON, 2008).

In addition to "coercion" and "exteriority", the social fact is also characterized by not occurring in isolation, it is repeated with different people and groups over a geographic space and time. It is through generality that the social fact has its collective nature, such as, for example, the type of housing, values and beliefs (ARON, 2008).

Émile Durkheim, in his studies, analyzes the work in current capitalist relations and describes in his work "The Division of Labor in Society" (late 19th century), the specialization driven by industrial production, developing a superior form of solidarity and not the conflict.

Aron (2008), points out that according to Durkheim there are two forms of solidarity (this term used by Durkheim, in fact, refers to sociability, human social relations): mechanical and organic. Mechanical Solidarity is more common in less complex societies, where people are (practically) self-sufficient in producing all the goods they need to live. According to this theory, what unites people is not dependence (after all, in this model, people are self-sufficient) of each other's work, but rather the acceptance of their customs, traditions and beliefs taken as common.

On the other hand, Organic Solidarity would be originated by the diversity among individuals (and not because they have in common the customs, beliefs and traditions). Therefore, in this case, what unites people is the interdependence of social functions, that is, the need that one person has for the other due to the strong division of social work existing in society. In contemporary society, social cohesion would be given by the growing division of labor, being easily observed in the following example: “teacher, student, secretary, librarian, cleaning services assistant”.

Starting from the School of French Sociology and contributing to the School of German Sociology, Karl Heinrich Marx (1818-1883) was born in the city of Trier (Germany) in a family of liberal bourgeois. He studied Philosophy, Law and History, reaching the title of Doctor of Philosophy. According to Marx, capitalism disorients the human being, exploiting them and removing them from their social nature. He defended the idea that the working class should unite for the purpose of overthrowing the capitalists and annihilating the system’s perverse characteristics for good. It is important to highlight that Karl Marx (during his PhD studies in Philosophy) was strongly influenced by the philosophical thoughts of Georg Hegel (1770-1831), especially those regarding historical philosophy (where history would be the path of the individual passing through the taking of their own conscience about life until its final) and dialectic (Socratic dialectical method where the opposition of ideas leads to the formation of new ideas) (ARON, 2008).

Highlighting his strong partnership of theoretical works with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), the main works of Karl Marx are: “The German Ideology”; “The Poverty of Philosophy”; “The Communist Manifesto”; “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy”; “The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850” and “The Capital”. Between 1818 and 1883, Marx and Engels worked on the structuring of the method called Historical and Dialectical Materialism, an important social theory in which explanations of history are established through material facts and where the study of history occurs in a methodological and clear way, designating the roles and forces opposed by the different social actors, especially between capital and labor, in the figures of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (COSTA, 2010).

Thus, all the work of Karl Marx is guided by a deep rupture with the accommodation between social strata, calling together workers to seek access to the means of production via demands, movements or conflict, being their focus based on critical understanding of the human being within a socio-historical process. Aron (2008) and Costa (2010), highlight that the Marxist Theory is based on the following three elements: (1) analysis of the social context; (2) disproportion of forces between Capital and Labor; (3) instrumentalization of the conflict as a means of combating social inequalities.

In this perspective, structured concepts present in Marxist theories as categories are fundamental to the understanding of the contemporary use (and its effects) of many of the digital media. Marxist categories argue that individuals should be analyzed according to the context of their social conditions, since they have produced their existence in social groups from primitive times to the era of modernity in their most intricate relations. Aron (2008) also points out that, according to the theory, the isolated individual appears in the legitimacy and in the interest of the capitalist world to thus basically serve the interests of Capital, after all, the human being would be more easily guided by the paths determined by the dominant category.

In this line, for example, in the contemporary company, when a person is admitted to a job, he/she signs a labor contract, where he submits himself to the owner of the capital (in this case, the company) to follow the owner business' interests. The contract cited in this example, before the worker can enter the workers' agenda, establishes strict limits oriented by capital (working hours, shift arrangements, use of personal protective equipment - PPE etc.).

Thus, what seems to be a relationship between equals: on the one hand, the worker who sells workforce and on the other the owner (or manager) of the capital that intends to hire and pay them, is not actually between equals. In this relationship, everything will be determined by the coercive power of capital, establishing the conflicting relationship between both. Once inserted in the intra-organizational context, the individual (fragmented and legally isolated) becomes part of the group of workers, within the proletarian or Labor class. On the other hand, there are several corporate collectives that are structured like the class of the bourgeoisie. In this scenario, each party defends its point of view. Often, on the same object, the focus is different between workers and representatives of Capital.

In the early days of history, almost everywhere, we find a complex disposition of society, in various classes, a varied gradation of social levels. In ancient Rome, we have patricians, knights, commoners, slaves. In the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, heads of corporations, wage earners, apprentices, servants. In almost all of these classes, again, secondary degrees. The modern bourgeois society, which grew out of the ruins of feudal society, did not abolish class antagonisms. It established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. (MARX, 2000, p. 9).

Within the Marxist analyzes, method and categories, the State plays an important role in mediating conflicts. Given the coercive force of capital, the State has an important role in intervening in the reduction of conflicts through laws, courts of law and the police. According to Karl Marx, man makes his history from his social struggles that are established in the search for the fulfillment of his demands.

Furthermore, alienation and added value are other Marxist categories directly applicable to the understanding of contexts and reflexes of the relationship between capital and labor, even in contemporary times, mediated and even multiplied by the possibilities brought by digital media. Regarding alienation, it is conceived that the human being, established in the intra-organizational environment as a worker/factory worker/proletarian, moves away from their participation in the debate of collective workers' agendas as his attributions are increased. With the alienation of the worker, it is easier to conduct them as the "maneuver mass" of Capital, once they are more easily resigned to rules and coercive power.

Marx, specifically in his studies on economics and the process in which production is increased but the worker does not perceive compensatory remuneration on this productive expansion, coined the term "added value". In a practical illustration, imagine a worker who was hired to produce 100 pairs of men's shoes per week and that in the months of May and June (as a productive preparation for the month of Fathers' Day in August) rose the production to 150 pairs per week. Karl Marx calls this situation "added value", in the specific case of the worker not receiving the compensatory remuneration on the fifty pairs of shoes in addition to his contractual basis.

Notably, the Marxist categories “relationship between capital and labor”, “alienation”, “added value” and even the method of historical and dialectical materialism become indispensable for a good understanding of the impacts of business actions with purposes streamlined by digital media.

In addition to the warming up of the planetary theoretical approaches to capital, its origin and its impacts on human relations, German sociological thought also turned to the recognition of the diversity of social life, while the thoughts of French and English authors focused on universality. With this in mind, German thought is primarily concerned with the study of cultural difference, mainly due to the influence of context, with Max Weber (1864-1920) and his comprehensive perspective as a reference.

Max Weber was born in 1864, in the city of Erfurt (Germany), in a family of liberal bourgeois. Having studied Law, Philosophy, Economics and History his studies were always interrupted by health problems. Considered one of the three main structurers of Sociology (alongside Émile Durkheim and Karl Marx), he began his teaching career in Berlin and, in 1895, assumed a chair at the University of Heidelberg. He studied religions deeply and defended liberalism and parliamentarism. His works are obligatory for studies in the areas of bureaucracy and structure of organizations; the relationship between the state and religion; categories of human domination; and on the social action of the human being. His main works were: “Economy and society”; “The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism”, published in 1913, “Essays in Sociology”, the basis of his theory of social analysis (ARON, 2008).

As a context for Max Weber’s life and intellectual production, it is important to note that England and France were European references for the production of knowledge aligned with the concern with the scientific bases of industrial development and urban life, which made these countries central economic the headquarters of bourgeois thought of the 17th and 18th centuries. On the other hand, maritime expansion and the colonization of new continents put England and France (alongside other countries) in contact with other cultures and other societies, leading their thinkers to an effort to interpret global social diversity and new social and market relations arising from these processes. However, Germany would later unify and organize itself as a national state vis-à-vis other European nations, and this caused the country to lag behind in the industrial and organizational race of its empire (second half of the 19th century). This mismatch with the European rhythm gave rise to an interest in history as a science of integration, memory and nationalism, leading German sociological thinking to recognize the diversity of social life (COSTA, 2010).

The Weberian perspective brought, in this context, a new approach to the analysis of society: the so-called comprehensive method or comprehensive approach. According to Costa (2010) “understanding should be the typical way of human sciences that should not explain the facts themselves, determining their immediate causes, but rather understanding the processes of human action and extracting its meaning” (COSTA, 2010, p.51).

According to Aron (2008), Weber’s approach would not be based on studying human collectives (collective entities, classes or institutions), but on the social action, which he defined as human conduct endowed with meaning, or subjectively elaborated justification. Thus, by taking the focus away from the collective and the institutions, Weber values the connection between motive and action, bringing meaning and relevance to man as an agent of social transformation. In his treaties, Weber identifies and highlights three main types of social action:

- (1) Traditional action: guided by custom, tradition or family or community habits to which it belongs;
- (2) Affective action: results from the most instinctive, natural social relationships and even passions;
- (3) Rational action: it would be guided by order of society, the law or the ethics of the collective.

It is important to point out, for a better understanding, that if, on the one hand, in Émile Durkheim, the “social order” is impelled to the individual by a superior and external force to him, on the other, in the Weberian perspective, there is no absolute opposition between the individual and society, being considered that social norms are consolidated when defined as a determinant of decision (or motivation) by the individual. Costa (2010) defines social action as:

Basic concept of sociology that designates, in a general way, all human action that is influenced by the awareness of the situation in which it takes place and by the existence of the actions and reactions of the other social agents that are involved. While recognizing the social conditioning of human action, the concept of social action in sociology refers to the principle of freedom and historical participation. (COSTA, 2010, p.51)

According to Costa (2010), to improve the understanding of the meaning of Max Weber’s theory of human social action, social norms refer to:

Social life results in large part from the integration of two of its main operating mechanisms: social norms and values. Although it is difficult to distinguish precisely from one another, we can say that values are the objective or the meaning of social action, while norms are restrictions and constraints on individual and collective conduct. They are mechanisms that ensure the regularity of social life and the existence of its institutions, in addition to a certain reciprocity in individual actions (COSTA, 2010, p.51)

Max Weber’s theoretical contributions go far beyond the theory that explains human social action. Another extremely important Weberian theoretical contribution was the Ideal Type Theory, which would have the influence of the thoughts of the philosopher Immanuel Kant (previously mentioned in this chapter), mainly of his A Priori Theory. In Weber, the Ideal Type Theory or pure type consists of the formulation of a hypothetical and trendless social analysis pattern, so that from this pattern (pure type) one has instrumentality for comparison and approximations. Araújo (2013) highlights this:

[...], the social reality is complex, chaotic and beyond human control, that’s why the person who investigates it is its organizer. The finite human mind orders it, creating particular concepts of historical and cultural situations. These conceptual constructions are ideas and propositions that typify and characterize social reality and Weber calls them ideal types. Among the ideal types he developed are the bureaucracy, typical of modern states; domination, as a complex social phenomenon and cradle of power; Western capitalism, which is distinguished by its rationality present in the simplest social actions. (ARAÚJO *et al.*, 2013, p. 24-25)

Based on Max Weber, the construction of ideal typologies is structured as a method route for social analysis and refers to the values and meanings of a particular phenomenon or social aspect, according to the culture and context in which it is inserted and within of the scientific breadth of the social scientist.

Thus, the importance of the thinkers of the fundamentals of Sociology for a better understanding of social relations (who lived in their times) and the structuring of methods, systems and categories of analysis of society in general and of human social relations in particular is highlighted. In this sense, Émile Durkheim, Karl Marx and Max Weber are considered, classically, the three structuring thinkers for the understanding of human sociability. However, for a better approximation of social networks (and later digital media), we will move on to the theoretical rescue of the German author Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) and the theory of human wills and finally to the contemporary studies of the Brazilian author Rubem César Fernandes (born in 1943) to better elucidate the sectors of human society.

Ferdinand Tönnies was born on July 26, 1855, in the German city of Oldenswort, and died on April 9, 1936, in Kiel, also in Germany. He studied Philosophy, Classical and Political Philosophy, having a PhD in Classical Philosophy in 1877. In 1887 he published the first version of the work *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (Community and Society), which would be his most important work for the knowledge society in general and for Sociology in particular.

Various Sociology authors and scholars place it as a safe reference for sustaining the alignments of Human Ecology, within the Chicago School of Sociology, especially regarding Tönnies approach to affectivity and rationality as essentially structuring for the composition of communities and society and, as a result, for organizations and even for cities.

The work *Community and Society* (1887), by Ferdinand Tönnies, certainly begins with a very complex and subjective perspective of the human being that cuts across all its chapters: the human will, subdivided into natural will and rational will.

As a result of the most organic instincts, the natural human wills assume our decisions and our steps. However, in addition to food, hydration and other more biological phenomena linked to the maintenance of life and, rescuing here the first pages of this chapter, Tönnies highlights our willingness to approach (or not) and to communicate (or not) with a certain person (TÖNNIES, 1957).

On the other hand, from human rationality - from its planning and even from the need (or interest) of contractual mediation - human rational wills arise. The different interpretations of Tönnies' work bring as faithful synonyms to the term rational will: arbitrary will and also artificial will (BRANCALEONE, 2008).

Ferdinand Tönnies (TÖNNIES, 1957) brings human social relations (or sociability) to explain how the links and even the social foundations of communication and social interaction would be. Therefore, he presents that from the natural human wills community sociability (or community social relations) is structured, where a strong level of affective connection would bring the characterization of this sociability. Finally, he argues that, based on community social relations, concrete ties would be the basis for communities. Tönnies also stresses that human (or artificial or arbitrary) rational wills unfold into societal social relationships, on a contractual or formal basis and that out of these relationships comes society.

As for social relations or community sociability and the communities themselves, Tönnies elaborates and defends the main rules:

This close interrelation as a direct and mutual affirmation is represented in its most intense form by three types of relationships, namely: (1) the relation between a mother and her child; (2) the relation between husband and wife in its natural or generical meaning; (3) the relation among brothers and sisters, that is, at least among those who know each other as being the offspring of the same mother. If in the relations of kindred individuals, one may assume the embryo of *Gemeinschaft* or the tendency and force thereto, rooted in the individual wills, specific significance must be attributed to the three above-mentioned relationships, which are the strongest and most capable of development. (TÖNNIES, 1957, p. 37).

The author states that the affection that emanates from inbreeding relationships and parental ties would be the strongest and most robust for the production of community sociability, and from these relationships communities of very strong roots are expected, whether in vertical relationships - between parents and children - that is, in horizontal relationships - between siblings. Later Tönnies points out, in the same chapter, that this would be the first of three patterns of community sociability based on coexistence, namely: (1) blood ties, (2) territorial cohabitation and (3) spiritual affinity, which respectively they base communities of blood (kinship), territorial communities (neighborhood) and communities in spirit (of communion in faith).

From the perspective of human rationalities, almost always mediated by contracts (let us also take all kinds of money as a contract), Ferdinand Tönnies, already in 1887, describes that social relations became colder and individuals more isolated from life in the city and the implementation of the deep social division of labor would isolate people. About this he points out in his work that:

The theory of the *Gesellschaft* deals with the artificial construction of an aggregate of human beings which superficially resembles the *Gemeinschaft* in so far as the individuals live and dwell together peacefully. However, in the *Gemeinschaft* they remain essentially united in spite of all separating factors, whereas in the *Gesellschaft* they are essentially separated in spite of all uniting factors. (TÖNNIES, 1957, p. 64-65).

In this introductory excerpt to the second section of his work, which deals with the Theory of Society (*Gesellschaft*), Tönnies is very clear in addressing the superficiality of human relationships established in society, always structured from rational planning and the necessary contractual mediation.

It is easy to observe that human sociability, theorized in Ferdinand Tönnies as being structured from human natural wills (leading to community sociability and communities) and human arbitrary wills (leading to societal sociability and society), is also explained by Émile Durkheim, when he sculpted the terms mechanical solidarity (typical of smaller human groups and of simpler standards, where people would be self-sufficient) and organic solidarity (typical of larger cities, where the social division of labor would be much more intense and the people would live in interdependence).

A last theory, much more contemporary, should also be part of this chapter, which we take the liberty to call the Theory of Sectoriality. This brings an analysis and defends a classification for organizations structured by human rationality and which, obviously, are the result of rational human will, among them companies, associations, churches and public authorities.

Rubem César Fernandes is from Rio de Janeiro, Niterói, born on May 25, 1943. Graduated in Philosophy, Master in Social History (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro-UFRJ) and Doctor in Social Thought (Columbia University, USA), he has the main part of his academic and scientific performance focused on the understanding and production of knowledge about civil society and its (and its organizations) relations to the State.

In 1994, Fernandes published the famous “Private but Public: the third sector in Latin America”, where he presented a detailed revisit of the formation and maturation of civil society organizations in Latin America, including highlighting its roots in movements of the peasantry, the workers, of the student class and groups linked to the Basic Ecclesial Communities - CEBs. The work provides definitions for associations, foundations, companies and public authorities, presenting a method of analysis and classification categorized by sectors of society.

A priori, the work presents the market as the first sector and that the State would be the second sector, but it makes it clear that, according to the sociological and even anthropological matrix taken, these first two sectorial groups would have the alternating order, since that the understanding was correctly guided on two angular questions for the classification: (1) origin of the organization’s creation resources and (2) purpose of the organization under analysis.

Hall and Ykenberry (1990), in the work *The State*, make evident the socio-anthropological defense that tribal groups would have evolved in all parts of the world, so that between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, in the Mesopotamia region where one of the first experiences of public models of management of a human collective would have been observed.

In order to admit to the theoretical focus of this work the support of the sectoriality, the convergence between the theories of the works *The State* (HALL; YKENBERRY, 1990) and *Public, but Private: The Third Sector in Latin America* (FERNANDES, 1994), is sought to circumscribe and consider the State as the first sector of society and the market as the second sector, followed by the sector of associations: the third sector. Thus, the following table is adapted from Fernandes (1994):

Sectors of society

ORIGIN OF RESOURCES	PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION	SOCIETY SECTOR	ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS
Public	Collective well-being	1st sector = State	City halls, autarchies, ministries, public foundations, etc.
Private	Profit	2nd sector = Market	Industrial companies, commercial service companies, linked to mining or agriculture, etc.
Private	Collective well-being	3rd sector	Associations, churches, private foundations, unions, etc.

Source: Adapted from Fernandes (1994), but considering the work of Hall & Ykembergy (1990).

In a quick and brief definition, Ferreira (1986, p. 714) shows that the State is the “[...] administrative political body that, as a sovereign nation or territorial division, occupies a determined territory, is governed by its own government and is an internationally recognized legal entity”. To better circumscribe the understanding expressed for something as complex and broad as the State we draw upon Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira, who produced several works on the State and its reforms, including all its transformations until the transition of the patrimonialist profile to the State Management, in the 1980s and 1990s. Bresser-Pereira (2004), when studying the transformations of the Brazilian State, highlights that the “Republican State is a government system that has engaged citizens, participating in the government together with politicians and public servants” (BRESSER-PEREIRA, 2004, p. 132).

The characterization of the contemporary State revolves around the understanding of a society in transformation, which demands a better level of quality in management and also an increasing participation and interaction with citizens, where the various possibilities unfolded by digital media enter. Bresser-Pereira presents an interesting characterization for the State:

State strong enough to protect itself from private capture, defending public assets against rent-seeking; it is a participatory state, where citizens, organized in civil society, participate in the definition of new policies and institutions and in the exercise of social responsibility; it is a state that depends on government officials who, although motivated by self-interest, are also committed to the public interest; it is a state with an effective capacity to reform institutions and enforce the law; it is a state endowed with the necessary legitimacy to tax citizens in order to finance democratically decided collective actions; it is a state that is effective and efficient in fulfilling its required roles. In short, the republican state is a system of government that counts on engaged citizens, participating in the government together with politicians and civil servants. (BRESSER-PEREIRA, 2004, p. 131-132)

It is noted that the State, managed by the government, responsible for the *res publica* must promote participation, which will bring social control over it and, finally, processes of accountability over the public agents that are members of the various spheres and levels of government, and that this process passes through the production and access to information, which can finally be used by digital media.

In the scope of the market, the second sector of society, there is the private initiative, structured from private capital with a view to obtaining profit on the invested capital, a good definition being that mentioned by Angel Infestas Gil, in the work *Sociologia de la Empresa*, where he highlights that the company is a social system open to the outside, but that remains directed and aiming the profit on the investment made (GIL, 1991).

Towards this end, business organizations, coming from different productive areas (mining, agriculture, industry, commerce and services), are designed in accordance with the norms previously legislated by society (through the State in its legislative power) and will develop their economic activities in close relationship with the interests of consumption and sustainability established by this same society to which it is inserted. Thus, it is important to note that this sector of society has been increasingly structuring organizational areas aimed at communicating with society, whether through the area of advertising and marketing or even as dialogues involved in the perspectives of Corporate Social Responsibility.

It can be seen here how much the interaction between business organizations and people (their groups in particular and society in general), mediated by digital media, is strategic and potentially complex, as it is surrounded by the perceptions of individual values, cultures and interests on the one hand driven by natural wills and on the other by macro corporate structures arising from rational human wills.

Finally, the third sector of society also re-signifies itself through digital media, which in turn re-signify social networks previously structured directly between people and their groups, especially due to the phenomena of globalization and access to the world wide web - internet.

In this sense, the “set of private non-profit organizations that are oriented towards the purpose of promoting collective well-being” is defined as the Third Sector (MORAES, *et al.*, 2015, p. 22), being included in this category all private organizations that do not aim to make a profit, that is, organizations created with private resources, but with a view to collective well-being.

Third sector organizations in Brazil are characterized by two matrices of strong influence (which reflect the generality and not the totality of the influence of each matrix): (1) the European matrix of charitable tradition, created and strengthened around the work of the private churches, thus bringing a greater focus to the results for the promotion of human development and, on the other hand, (2) the North American and English matrix, which brings a more focused look at the efficiency of the processes, since their first organizations of the third sector would have been structured together with the business movement, as associations and foundations with a focus on corporate social responsibility.

In the Brazilian case, it was agreed to call third sector organizations NGOs (non-governmental organizations), however, academically and technically, caution is suggested and (whenever possible) use the term TSO- Third Sector Organization. This is because, literally, companies are also characterized as “non-governmental organizations”, causing conceptual conflicts.

In Brazil, third sector organizations are classified into the following possibilities (or most common categories):

1. Association (may be a class association such as a residents ‘association or a teachers’ association or an altruistic focus association such as an environmental association);

2. Union (the source of its resources is private and its purpose or charisma is collective or social well-being);
3. Church (likewise, its resources are private and its purpose is collective or social well-being);
4. Political Party (originates with private resources and strives to strengthen democracy and participation);
5. Private Law Foundation (originates from the existence of private resources and its orientation to collective or social well-being).

In common with the different organizational models, according to Fernandes (1994), the main characteristics of third sector organizations are:

1. Being structured (with statute, hierarchy, organization chart, flow chart and other documents);
2. Being private (the origin of their initial resources/for their creation is/was of private origin);
3. They do not distribute profits (the accounting financial product earned in calculating the result of the year cannot be distributed among directors and/or associates);
4. Self-governing (they are autonomous in relation to other organizations and even in relation to the State).

It is perceived, in a conceptual way, that third sector organizations (TSO's) emerge as expressions, organized and official, of the human social movement that acts in the search for representation of its collective or of its struggles, whether for the protection of its members rights or to seek insertion in the debate arenas on national public policies. Thus, the third sector needs to communicate in order to obtain visibility and even to legitimize its functions within its own human bases, a path that necessarily passes through interactions, largely mediated by digital media in contemporary times.

CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL NETWORKS, INTERNET AND DIGITAL TELEPHONY

After the understanding of a possible theoretical guiding thread that delimited contributions coming from Plato, in the Ancient (or Classical) Philosophy, to Descartes, immersed in the Enlightenment philosophy; and a theoretical approach on Semiotics, as a philosophical area (converged to communication), in a section that exposes the importance of the digital media relating to the area of language, from various philosophers and scholars in this field. Also, having gone through the support and warnings brought by Cultural Anthropology, especially in Franz Boas and Claude Lévi-Strauss, about the origin and the meaning that can be given to the processes of interaction and about cultures. Then, after revisiting classical sociological concepts, built on to the full of a society in turmoil that lived the contradictions between the capital benefits and the expropriation of the living conditions in the face of the urban expansion. And, finally, after understanding that social networks are different and so will be the possibilities of digital media for the different purposes and challenges of the three sectors of society, here begins the framing that goes from social networks to digital media and its variations.

Since the beginnings of human social relations, the terminology social networks can be applied to characterize the connections (bridges) and connections (nodes) between points (people). So, within a sociological perspective, it is not at all correct to say that social networks are a recent phenomena or that they would have originated after the phenomenon of globalization or the internet. However, it is quite true that globalization and the internet have substantially altered social networks, establishing new meanings and applications, and, in some cases, there is potentialization and in others the decline of their original purposes.

Thus, social networks, linked to the concept of human social relations, including the treatises on Mechanical and Organic Solidarity, in Émile Durkheim, and Communities and Society, in Ferdinand Tönnies, would have been first studied by the fields of Sociology and Anthropology, with more specific constructs produced in the works of the first half of the 20th century. In this context, it is important to highlight the existence of two structuring trails for the most contemporary concepts of social networks: one with an anthropological basis and the other with a pragmatic-structural basis.

Since studies on social networks with a pragmatic-structural basis developed within the scope of the views and strategies of war, wrapped in the contexts of the second World War, with a focus on social interaction within those groups and scenarios, a greater focus is devoted here to anthropological side of the discussion.

Wellman (1991); Wasserman and Faust (1999) and Mercklé (2004) highlight that the structural-functionalist anthropological perspective was insufficient in its theoretical-empirical basis

for the correct explanation of human social relations, as this was mainly aimed at understanding and describing cultural systems, privileging studies within restricted groups, although the interaction was always the subject of anthropological analysis. They emphasize that studies and works had, in this sense, difficulties in moving to areas of study of social systems where more complex relationships permeate or interact with social structures. Thus, after the 1950s some anthropologists dedicated themselves to coining a concept of social network to the sociological and anthropological support.

Barnes (1977) developed his specific study on social networks in a Norwegian fishing community, the Bremmes community. In his studies, Barnes described the different social relationships of people in respect to territory and jobs (business relationships). Subsequently, it also included parental and friendship ties (social relations) and then conceived the understanding that people may (or may not) know each other directly and establish flexible social relationships networks (depending on the durability of social relationships) and in different intensities (according to the level of interaction performed).

According to Portugal (2007), Barnes' studies are fundamental to describe the importance of interactions between people for the definition of social structures, with emphasis on individual relationships involved in basic social relationships such as employment and political positions.

Seeking to understand the differences and interactions between intra-familiar social relationships and social networks external to it (among friends and neighbors, for example), Bott (1976) says that friendship and neighborhood networks have a strong influence on social relationships of family members and their social networks. To that end, he emphasizes that "the extent to which people known to a family know each other and meet each other, regardless of the family" (BOTT, 1976, p. 76) would be their connection. Thus, in this line of studies, it defines the existence of "narrow-meshed networks" for when the social relations and interactions between its members are quite intense, and the concept of "loose-meshed network" for when social relations and interactions go from a situation of lesser intensity to sporadic.

In the context of contemporary studies on networks, it is worth knowing the American psychologist Stanley Milgram (1933-1984) work, whose main experiment became known as "small world studies". In this study, 217 people (out of 296 guests) took part by sending a document by different means (Fedex, personal contact or by third parties) to the same recipient, 64 of whom arrived at the destination, which were considered for the evaluation of the results. The study pointed out an important diversity of chain sizes (or paths) between the sender (or emitter), taken as the initial node and the recipient, taken as the final node, resulting in an average of 5.5 (five point five) intermediaries (WATTS, 2003).

Stanley Milgram's studies are a reference for much of the theoretical and empirical work that later unfolded in this area, having brought, in addition to the methodological confirmation that all people in the world are separated by only 6 (six) people, the contribution for the clear definition of people and/or organizations like nodes and that their ties would be the links or bridges of connection (PORTUGAL, 2003).

Subsequently, theoretical studies and empirical work on the application of network concepts would go beyond the fields of social sciences, being very common in mathematics, biology, engineering, medicine and physics, with authors such as Duncan Watts (Australian born in 1971), Albert-László Barabási (Romanian born in 1967) and Mark Buchanan (American born

in 1961) as main references (PORTUGAL, 2007). The immeasurable applicability of the term “network” to understand such diverse phenomena in different areas of knowledge indicates its foundation for the epistemic field of interdisciplinarity.

In this interdisciplinary sense of understanding the theoretical basis and pragmatic applicability of social networks, the so-called “deep structures that unite and separate social systems” (WELLMAN, 1991, p. 23) are complex links that support sociometric analyzes in psychology, graphs of mathematics and even the understanding current social media, specifically in their applications for the online social networks or social networks on the internet (as was the case with Orkut and currently Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, Twitter, among other platforms for human interaction with organizational interfaces). It is important to note that:

Social structures can be represented as networks - as sets of nodes (or members of the social system) and sets of ties that represent their interconnections. This is a wonderfully liberating idea. It directs the eyes of analysts to social relations and frees them from thinking of social systems as collections of individuals, dyads, restricted groups or simple categories. Structuralists usually have << nodes >> associated with individuals, but they can also represent groups, corporations, households, or other collectives. << Ties >> are used to represent flows of resources, symmetrical relationships of friendship, transfers or structural relationships between << nodes >>. (WELLMAN; BERKOWITZ, 1991, p. 4).

In Wasserman’s work; Faust (1999) highlights that the theories of social networks are based on four fundamental elements to their characterization. At first it shows that the actors, as well as their actions and relationships are intricate in a collective sense and subjective interests, indicating that they would not be autonomous, but interconnected and interdependent, in a close approximation to the sociability of Mechanical Solidarity present in the works of the French sociologist Émile Durkheim . A second basic characteristic would be that the “ties” between the “nodes” that would be conducting threads (such as conduction channels) that could provide and sustain material and mainly immaterial traffic. Following in Wasserman and Faust (1999), we have as a third characteristic of social networks that is the structures of social relationships based on “ties”, which serve to make interactions possible, but also, depending on their structuring elements, they would serve to restrain certain unwanted flows or interactions by individuals. Finally, the work brings as a fourth characteristic that, according to the models of the networks, these would bring concepts and norms for the flows and interactions between the actors (nodes), such as, for example, the dialog specificities for “ties” of political, economic, sporting, scopes etc.

Considering the characterization given by Wasserman and Faust (1999) for social networks, it is interesting the convergence of this with previous studies by Degenne and Forsé (1994) which sustain that people would be included in classes (or categories) and from these in structures of social relations, which according to the statement of Portugal (2007, p. 7) that given the degree of interdependence between << nodes >> “the starting point of the investigation should not be, therefore, a set of independent units, but, on the contrary, the set of relationships that interconnects them”.

In seeking a better definition of social networks and their applications in society, we come up against the very limitations of anthropology and sociology in finalizing the definitions of

their objects of study, respectively, the human being in its fullness and human social relations. The dynamics of these two areas point out to a never concluding their knowledge production, nor their “cornerstones”, given the very dynamics of the human being in general and especially after the middle of the XIX century.

About the complexity of the social network theme, which arises between the socio-anthropological theories and the pragmatic ways of human social interactions, Bruno Latour (LATOURE, 2012), in a work that deals with the actor-network, in an excerpt in which he discusses the debates between Gabriel Tarde and Émile Durkheim, asserts that:

Tarde always complained that Durkheim abandoned the task of explaining society by confusing cause and effect, replacing the understanding of the social bond with a political project aimed at social engineering. [...], he vehemently maintained that the social was not a special domain of reality, but a principle of connections; that there was no reason to separate the “social” from other associations such as biological organisms or even atoms. [...], he considered the social as a circulating fluid that should be followed by the new methods, and not a specific type of organism. (LATOURE, 2012, p. 33-34).

Latour (2012) goes on to discuss about the challenges to learn or approach the understanding of the social networks’ dynamics. Thus, he begins by highlighting as the first challenge the delimitation and definition of the profile and identity of its spokesperson or representative. The groups that interact and dialogue through social networks have many speeches, many points of view, sometimes different and that generate a certain level of noise that can impair the identification of their leaders, their sense and their ideologies, when this is the case.

A second challenge concerns the dynamics of the limits and the characterization of the group, which will reflect on the structures of the “ties”, or connections between the “nodes”. Studies on the topic highlight their mobility and fluidity, which makes social networks not static, changing their purposes, members, languages and instrumentalities (including techniques) of ties (connections) according to more varied contexts and situations.

Latour (2012) stresses that the third challenge for these studies comprises the developments of the previous one, dealing with the importance of having a safe definition of a more cemented, fixed, sedimented core that can guide the works, including for the possible approximations and convergences between its essence and its possibilities, which can be achieved through laws or internal rules, for example.

In conclusion, when studying social networks, Latour (2012) highlights as the fourth challenge the importance of inserting social scientists, statisticians and even journalism into the networks as broad and contributory areas to work, resuming the relevance of interdisciplinarity understanding on the topic and its consequences.

Based on a broad theoretical foundation and betting on a critical position on the social interpretations put forward, Latour (2012) reaffirms the importance of society in general revisiting the empirical understanding of social interactions and associative movements so that it can then be perceived the complexity, which requires interdisciplinarity on the studies of social networks, their actors and their networks, within a broad, complex and very dynamic social fabric.

Finally, a social network can be defined, according to Mercklé (2004), as “a set of social units and relationships, direct and indirect, between them, through chains of variable dimensions” (MERCCKLÉ, 2004, p.4).

The international computer network – internet – emerges as a social phenomenon preceded by another, globalization, bringing profound changes to human social relations and bringing with it a whole field of reinterpretations of social networks and the creation of an infinite number of possibilities to maximize the success of flows between people and organizations, bringing a burden of many new problems to society.

When first delimiting his approach to the internet theme within a pre-conceived context of globalization, Mattelart (2000) highlights that “the internationalization of communication is the daughter of two universalisms: the enlightenment and liberalism” (MATTELART, 2000, p. 15). Mattelart (2000) begins his work “La mondialisation de la communication” with a wide revisit to the different stages of humanity’s advances beyond its original geographical boundaries and how this has driven the theoretical-practical instrumentalities of the Enlightenment and human interests by expanding markets.

In order to understand the definition of globalization in Mattelart, which brings convergence of this with the phenomenon of the internet, the following contribution stands out:

Real-time communication systems determine the organization structure of the planet. What has been called mundialization/globalization - the first term is familiar to all neo-Latin languages, the second is of Anglo-Saxon origin - combines with the fluidity of cross-border exchanges and immaterial flows. (MATTELART, 2000, p. 11).

Considering from the first movements of maritime expansion to the architectures of transnational capitals, globalization has established itself in the history of humanity as a revolutionary phenomenon that had brought dialogued and/or violent changes to people’s *modus vivendi*, to their social groups and organizations, as well as to their structures of material and immaterial flows, as previously discussed in the theory of social networks.

The world wide web, e.g. the internet, emerged from the convergence between two different technology paths: data processing and communication (especially radio and telephony). The first computers, immense in their electro-electronic and data and information processing structures, date back to 1946, when electrical engineer John Presper Eckert Júnior and physicist John William Mauchly presented their first machines, which occupied entire rooms. In the following decades, after military use, computers would be quite inaccessible for business use, given its high cost (FUSCO, 2009). In the 1980s, computers would already have much more compact versions, making it possible to produce personal computers.

It is known that the internet emerged as a tool that connected, in a wired way, different computers for accessing their information and data bases, and the research was carried out under funding and military use in the United States, initially called ARPAnet (Advanced Research Projects Agency), having been released for commercial use in 1987 (CIRIBELI; PAIVA, 2011).

Contemporaneously taken as one of the most important inventions of humanity, the internet, according to Deitel *et al.* (2003), was driven in 1990 by the technological concept of the World Wide Web (www) that enabled interaction (mediated by technology and its platforms)

between people with their equipment being operated remotely, with a gradual technological advance in cabling for radio transmission and other possibilities of connections.

For Takahashi (2000, p. 5), the internet:

It is not a fad. It represents a profound change in the organization of society and the economy, with some considering it a new technical-economic paradigm. It is a global phenomenon, with a high potential for transforming social and economic activities, since the structure and dynamics of these activities will inevitably be affected to some extent by the information infrastructure available. Its political-economic dimension is also accentuated, due to the contribution of the information infrastructure so that the regions are more or less attractive in relation to business and enterprises. Its importance is similar to that of a good road for the economic success of the localities. It also has a marked social dimension, due to its high potential to promote integration, by reducing the distances between people and increasing their level of information. (TAKAHASHI, 2000, p. 5).

In the same way that the world wide web – internet - has evolved technically and in its functionalities, telephony has also moved strongly towards a process of technological leverage from the old wired phones, analog to digital technology.

Thus, known as the largest communicational cluster in the world, the internet is a network of devices interconnected through communication protocols, which allow access and transfer of the most diverse types of data and information.

Internationally, the internet has become a means of communication that can be accessed by the public in the 1990s, especially after the development of browsers, thus allowing users to access the World Wide Web (www). From the beginning, people consult the internet because they understand that it is the most agile and effective means of accessing information (CASTELLS, 1999).

Lemos (2007) states that telephony followed the strong rhythms of industrialization and urbanization, highlighting that cities grew and, as the social and technical division of labor increased, so did the interdependence between people, strengthening the networks:

Cities develop as ‘networked societies’ (physical, symbolic, cultural, political, imaginary, economic). The contemporary peculiarity is the hegemony of a set of networks, the telematic networks, which come to integrate, and even to ‘command’ (cybernetics), the various networks that constitute the urban space and the different forms of social bond that emerge from it. The process of complexification of the ‘network organism’ continues with contemporary cyber metropolises, the ‘cybercities’ (LEMOS, 2004; 2005; 2007). These can be defined as cities where communication and information infrastructures are already a reality and the practices that result from them form a new urbanity. (LEMOS, 2007, p. 122-123).

In this context, André Lemos coined the term “cyberurbe” (LEMOS, 2005) for a new urbanity, in which the relationships of communication, interaction and mediation of many of the

concrete relational bases take place through cyberspace, strengthened by digital telephony. And even bringing Castells, he presents a summary of the technological revolution:

Today, wireless technologies are transforming relationships between people and urban spaces, creating new forms of mobility. Cybercities become ‘unwired cities’ (Towsend, 2003). These enter the era of ubiquitous, intrusive computing (‘pervasive computing’) from devices and networks such as 3G cell phones, GPS, palms, RFID tags, and Wi-Fi, Wi-Max, Bluetooth networks. These metropolises are becoming ‘unplugged’ cities, a generalized connection environment, involving the user in full mobility, interconnecting machines, people and urban objects. In contemporary cities, the traditional spaces of place (Castells, 1996) are, little by little, becoming a generalized environment of access and control of information by wireless telematic networks, creating zones of permanent connection, ubiquitous, informational territories. (LE MOS, 2007, p. 123).

Thus, Lemos (2007) shows us that digital telephony and the mobility enable and strengthen the post-mass production process, where the emitting pole is released from the production of information and content without the necessary and criticized (by theorists) who coined the term “cultural industry”) business mediation. Lemos stresses that:

Post-massive media, on the other hand, work from telematic networks in which anyone can produce information, ‘liberating’ the emission pole, without necessarily having companies and economic conglomerates behind it. Post-massive functions do not compete with each other for advertising dollars and are not focused on a specific territory, but on the planet virtually. The product is customizable and, in most cases, insists on bi-directional communication flows (all-all), different from the unidirectional flow (one-all) of the mass media. (LE MOS, 2007, p. 125).

The theory that promotes the dialogue between cities and cyberspace, in Lemos (2005; 2007), is strongly enriched when it encompasses the new media possibilities provided by the new technological apparatus, especially by the convergence between digital telephony and the internet that made it possible, in addition to the portability of access, the two-way communication between the parties and the autonomy for the production of information and content, this was a major revolution in the communication processes of the last decades of the 20th century.

To coin the definition of digital media, Martino (2014) refers to a time when mass media and analog media enabled unidirectional communication between the producer/emitter of a content as a rule with the mediation of a given company or “cultural industry” and the recipient in an era where physical support is no longer needed:

In digital media, this physical support practically disappears, and the data are converted into numerical or digit sequences - digital - interpreted by a processor capable of performing extremely complex calculations in fractions of a second, the computer. Thus, in digital media, all data, whether sounds, images, letters or any other element, are actually a sequence of numbers. This feature allows data sharing, storage and conversion. (MARTINO, 2014, p. 11).

The new information and communication technologies (ICTs) made possible, at the end of the 20th century, a gigantic transformations in human social relations and in the articulated

forms whose organizations from the three sectors of society exchange societally, as well as seeking to get closer and maintaining connection and information flow with people and their social groups.

The concept of digital media brings along with it a very wide range of elements that need to be considered and that are analyzed by several theorists and scholars in the area of communication (GOMES, 2008; LEMOS, 2005, 2007; CASTELLS, 2003; MARTINO, 2014). Among these elements of first importance in the characterization of this context, we emphasize:

1. the convergence between the internet and digital telephony, bringing portability to the network and breaking the geographical barrier of the place (ubiquity);
2. the understanding of cyberspace as an immaterial space that makes the “life of life”, the concrete life in the world, move;
3. the culture of participation and content production;
4. the search for interactivity and, through it, the strengthening of phenomena such as e-commerce, distance education and social control over public spending;
5. the existence of the digital barrier, where many people and entire groups cannot access the network, due to social, economic and even technological issues.

The dialogue on the characteristics of this moment and in view of the new media contexts in which society finds itself inserted, in the classic “The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society” by Castells (2003) discusses the challenges posed by the convergence between the new information and communication technologies with social networks previously based on direct human (and even organizational) contacts.

In a foreground, Castells (2003) highlights the challenge of defending freedom, once at the same time that the new information and communication technologies (ICTs) open up an immense possibility of contacts and interactions between people and groups access to network in general and technologies in particular are not yet universal and, in this sense, they are opposed. In addition to the digital divide, which makes access difficult for many, whether due to social, economic or technological aspects, he asserts that the media infrastructure has its “owners”, with access and use being controlled and even influenced by market ideologies and/or interests.

Still considering Castells (2003), we have that the second challenge posed to the network society is the question of social and economic order, taken as a background to the first challenge. Consequently, the lack of technological infrastructure, which requires public or private investments, is structured as a limiter to full access, and there is also the possibility of noticing the lack of interest in people and groups living in more remote regions (regions of lower density would make investments per capita much higher) and also by classes previously in conditions of less insertion in economic and consumption contexts.

Finally, called upon the unmapped terrain, the human challenge of reinventing itself in its processes of producing knowledge and reframing social relationships, Castells (2003) highlights that in addition to “learning” technologies, the human being needs to differentiate very well the concepts of information and knowledge and that, in this field, the practically infinite volume of stored and diffused information impels the challenging possibility of producing meanings and new paths for the production of knowledge (CASTELLS, 2003).

CHAPTER 3

COMMUNICATION AND ORGANIZATIONS: NEW PARADIGMS WITH DIGITAL MEDIA

In order to approach the convergence between communication and organizations in times of hypervelocity, it is necessary to present some concepts that may support our debate. Understanding the concept of Organization and, even more, the context that surrounds it does not require a superfluous analysis. The perspective of understanding and functioning of the organization requires a vision critical that is critic, in addition to common sense. There are several ways of conceptualizing the term Organization (as a social unit or entity or as an administrative function of organizing). One of them, used in the first steps to understand the Administration, is that it is “a social unit or entity, in which people interact with each other to achieve common goals”. This concept is present in some bibliographies used in undergraduate courses to enable a first understanding of what it would be like for future administrators to deal with Management. However, when the discussions deepen, it is clear that the analysis of the organizational environment requires different approaches, making use of several theories, seeking explanations about the innumerable phenomena existing in this context. An organization can be considered as a group of individuals who work together and who, in a coordinated way, try to achieve goals (RUE; BYARS, 1997).

An example of the organization’s understanding complexity is present in the book ‘Images of Organization’, by Gareth Morgan. Frequently used in studies and research at master’s and doctoral levels, where it is said that such organizations are “complex, ambiguous and replete of paradoxes”, Morgan demonstrates the difficulty (and perhaps even impossibility) of understanding organizations in such an obvious way. The work argues that “our theories and explanations of organizational life are based on metaphors that lead us to see and understand organizations in a specific, albeit incomplete way” (MORGAN, 1996, p. 10). For Morgan (1996), there is no single concept of organization, and this need to be focused on from a more mechanical and even machine-like perspective.

Another concept that is important to highlight is that of company (sometimes used similar to that of organization). In the same way the concept of organization was defined there is no consensus on the definitions of the term company, and it is still a topic widely discussed in the area of Corporate Law. For Coase (1990, p. 115), companies are “bundles of contracts that organize economic activities aiming to reduce transaction costs of operating in markets”.

With all this complexity to make decisions in organizations, it is necessary to take into account the participation of several agents. The understanding of all these actors participating in the context in which the organization operates will influence the most assertive decisions to be made by the manager. When trying to understand the environment of which these organizations are a part, it is possible to perceive a multitude of actors who participate in this scenario. Any organization seeks to generate value through the relationships it maintains with a wide range of interlocutors. Here it is appropriate to include the term ‘stakeholders’ to our discussion, referring to the groups of interlocutors (shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, creditors, society), which are part of the context of any organization and without which it cannot exist. In this sense, Post *et al.* (2002) deals with an organization’s value creation activities, resulting in the degree of risk involved. Any organizational planning needs to take into account the interests of all these interlocutors, as these would eventually represent different forces and interests of society.

Organizations operate in different sectors of society: primary, secondary and tertiary. In the primary sector, agriculture (farming), livestock, hunting, fishing, activities of direct exploitation of natural resources of plants, animal and mineral origin (which have not added value due to industrialization) are concentrated. The secondary sector includes goods transformation activities, being subdivided into the construction industry, the utility industry (electricity, water distribution, piped gas) and the manufacturing industry (including agribusiness, pulp and paper mills, slaughterhouses, etc.). In the tertiary sector, all economic activities that do not produce goods but produce services related to organizational communication are included.

For organizations to function smoothly, communication processes are necessary. Without communication, organizations would not exist. Kreps’s (1995) reflects this thought well when he says that organizations self-organize and do it as a result of the dynamics of local interaction, and that self-organization is a communicational phenomenon (KREPS, 1995). Organizations are made up of individuals who naturally interrelate through communication. Thus, communication takes place between individuals, departments, units and organizations, internally and externally. The characteristics cited make the communicative process extremely complex, as it is consolidated through different cognitive processes, cultures and worldviews. As a result, organizations are broadcasters of communication to their most diverse audiences. Remembering that the results of a communicative process are not necessarily only positive. According to Taylor (2005, p.215) “communication is no longer described as the transmission of messages or knowledge, but as a practical activity that results in the formation of relationships”. Considering all the variables of a communication process will influence the building of relationships, whether with employees, customers or society as a whole.

Such processes need to be aligned with strategic objectives and involve both internal and external actors in the business environment. It is these informational and communicational processes that will allow greater proximity with its employees, with its customers and with the entire market that the company intends to reach. The development of strategic potential will depend on how these processes were defined, implemented and shared.

The achievement of competitive advantage is the relentless pursuit of any organization. Nowadays, it is said that this competitive advantage is temporary. The level of competition and dynamism of the market makes this definitive positioning almost impossible. This is due to the fact that, in addition to a dynamic market, the current consumer is a moving target. Marketing

needs are constantly updated, resulting in situation that if a company does not pay attention to its consumer behavior it easily loses its preference.

Accordingly, business' strategies will have their implementation favored as communication practices are well developed. It is always important to remember that all of this construction and definition needs to be aligned with the market and business strategies. In fact, no aspect related to management can be defined or analyzed in isolation, each one takes part in a whole and are complementary. In addition, communication cannot be thought of only in its objective aspects.

Klaus (1969) conceptualizes communication as an exchange of information between dynamic systems, capable of receiving, storing or transforming information. Thus, it requires an understanding of the human and subjective side of those involved, whether it is directed at the employee, the customer or the market in which they operate. Communication aims to trigger certain behaviors, taking into account relationships within and outside the company. The dialogue with the recipient must be open, generating a relationship based on ethics and social principles. Without the establishment of this trust, the relationship built becomes fragile, which, obviously, is not afforded by the manager who seeks competitive advantage and lasting ties with his clients.

The communicative process, in its complexity and among several aspects to be considered, basically implies the transmission of a certain information or message, which deserves special attention and care, as passing the wrong message to the market can generate great losses for the organization. Another relevant point in this process is the choice of the best medium for communication, which must be suitable for the target audience that is intended to be reached and which can be quite variable. Choosing, then, the best content for the message and the most appropriate medium for its transmission, makes it possible to influence and stimulate behaviors, which helps the achievement of competitive advantage, thus being a valuable management tool. If the customer feels that a company has understood their wants and needs through the message it has captured, a business relationship can then arise.

Corporate Communication has evolved from its embryonic stage, when it was defined as a mere accessory, to assume, now, a relevant role in the companies' business policy. Therefore, it ceases to be an activity that is discarded or relegated to the background, in times of crisis and lack of resources, to establish itself as a strategic input, which a company or entity makes use of to idealize customers, raise awareness of opinion multipliers or to interact with the community. (BUENO, 2000, p. 50).

Thinking of communication only as a simple dissemination of products is inappropriate and reductionistic, without first understanding the strategic plan for global communication. Integrated communication has three aspects: institutional, internal and marketing. In order to put this integrated management system into practice, we go through organizational communication, which includes, among others: advertising, publicity, the press area, sales management, marketing and public relations. According to Kotler and Keller (2006):

Integrated Marketing Communication (CIM) is a marketing communication planning concept that recognizes the added value of a comprehensive plan, capable of evaluating the strategic roles of a range of communication discipli-

nes - general advertising, direct response, sales promotion and public relations, for example - and to combine them to provide clarity, coherence and maximum impact through integrated messages with cohesion. (KOTLER; KELLER, 2006, p. 556).

In a global way, according to Lesly (1997), institutional/corporate communication (sometimes also called public relations) is the area that manages the interests and needs of the various stakeholders, harmonizing them with the interests and needs of the organization itself and its audiences. According to Curvello (2012), it is equally important to consider that internal communication starts from a sensitivity point to promote interaction and brings the collective into alignment with the values that must be recognized and/or legitimized in the organization.

Seeking to establish the knowledge that will lead to the understanding about the changes in the way organizations communicate in the face of technological innovations arising from the emergence of social media, Galindo (1986) conceptualizes marketing communication as being the articulation or connection between the company marketing plan and the consumer socio-cultural background or target group of consumers.

As already mentioned, one of the factors that significantly changed the way of communicating was technology. The improvement of communication involves marketing issues and the best knowledge of its customers. Software can assist in this process by breaking the paradigms of mass communication, focusing the attention of organizations on the customer through monitoring their behavior, consumption habits and purchases. This communication does not happen only with the client, as an individual, but with the whole society, considering the community, government agents, its suppliers, competitors and everyone who may be part of this network. Globalization, the acceleration of competitiveness and technology (among others) have expanded the notions of organizational limits, determining the emergence of networks. Nowadays, everything is connected through networks and this virtualized context brings people and nations together.

The network society is sustained through digital communication networks (CASTELLS, 2011). If, on the one hand, organizations can get closer to their customers and sell in regions geographically distant from their headquarters, on the other hand, their competitors are no longer just “neighbors at the door” and start competing with organizations from all over the world. This reality presents new challenges, which makes the function of managing organizations much more complex. Through communication, the organization’s culture and identity are also consolidated, making its processes and actions essential components for the construction of organizational strategies. The inclusion of technology in the discussion about organizational communication brings us to our next subject: digital media.

Digital media serves to enhance and transform the means of communication to be adopted by organizations, but all the planning and alignment of this use, as well as the selection of the most appropriate means, precede the use itself. In a very simple way, digital media can be understood as being more contemporary means of communication, enhanced with the use of electronic equipment arranged in a network.

The network society, in simple terms, is a social structure based on networks operated by communication and information technologies based on microelectronics and on digital computer networks that generate, process and distribu-

te information from knowledge accumulated in the nodes of these networks. (CASTELLS, 2006, p. 19).

The way the target audience accesses the network will influence the frequency of its use and, as an organization, it is necessary to know the characteristics and peculiarities of this access to better plan the connection with the customer. The media as a support for strategies to expand reach to customers have been increasingly used. Despite this, it cannot be said that digital media are used by the majority of the population. As with other means of communication, part of the population will have access as soon as a new medium appears, but another significant portion of people still lack access, which generates different social experiences in relation to the different means of communication. The possibility of connecting to networks through the various wireless technologies (3G cell phones, Wi-Fi, Wi-Max, RFID, GPS, Bluetooth) has also boosted access.

Another important issue to consider in the client-organization relationship is the profile of the target audience. Some profiles are easily reached by more advanced technological means, while others still stick to the more traditional formats. Knowing your target audience is a marketing precept that must precede the definition of the communication model to be employed. In this analysis, it is worth remembering the heterogeneity of the population that will be reflected in the public and some of its determining characteristics, including their generation, income, class, age, educational level, place of residence, etc. Another relevant factor is highlighted by the statement that the information and communication technologies - ICTs have promoted the acceleration of the technological cycles of human communication, which clearly demonstrates the connection between communication and technology.

The factors mentioned and addressed will certainly influence the reception that the media will have with the audience, considering, still, that some have already experienced the world like this since childhood. However, it can be said that one of the factors that will most interfere in the use or not of digital media is the ease of access to them.

It is also essential to highlight that one of the most important characteristics of digital media as we know it today is interactivity, which greatly facilitates the relationship with the organization if it chooses to use interactivity in its communication campaigns. This aspect allows to extrapolate the simple commercialization of products, evolving to a relationship with the consumer in a much closer and personalized way. It depends on the organization to realize these innumerable possibilities and to go beyond the usual.

From digital media and its innumerable innovations, it was possible to take a step in order to stop having basically linear communication with a target audience (THOMPSON, 2008). Today's media allows for more selective and less mass marketing (as previously noted), where customers are recognized in a more subjective way, more focused on their personal relationships, as a more sociable being, living more in the community and being the protagonist of their own life. The perception on the part of the manager of this new consumer will be essential in strengthening and articulating his current and future commercial relations.

The use of interactive digital media by customers allows a much broader understanding of companies, the products of their choice, the technical characteristics that comprise them while customers still have the possibility to give their opinion on the development of new products and on the contents published by organizations. Taking into account the open possibilities and this format of interaction, the customer is invited to know and give an opinion on the design and

development of products and services, which generates a continuous learning process, both for the customer and for the company.

With this immense range of possibilities made possible by the advent of digital media, organizations are required to reposition themselves to serve this “new customer”, adopting new communication policies, in the constant search for an intimate, lasting and personalized relationship with their audience. Digital media, in addition to allowing a greater reach, expanding their audience, in number and to multiple geographic regions, are becoming a relationship media. The internet proved to be a trend for organizations to express themselves through it, in addition to being a tool to reinforce the brand in front of society.

In an earlier context, organizations implemented linear and circular communication (SANTAELLA, 2001). As already mentioned, the change in the scenario required that this model would not prevail in a model of communication with greater interactions and the emergence of connections between consumers and organizations (NICOLAU, 2008). The interactive model allows the participation of all those involved, receiving and sending information, making the consumer an active participant in the entire communication process. When citing the term interactivity, in general, it is understood that there is an active participation by the beneficiary of an information transaction. “The possibility of re-appropriating and recombining the message material by its recipient is a fundamental parameter to assess the degree of interactivity of the product” (LÉVY, 2000, p. 79).

One of the proposals when it comes to the necessary changes in the communication process is the culture of convergence. According to Jenkins (2008), the idea of convergence could be translated by the flow of content in multiple media. With each interaction, the production of content is molded and the consumer becomes an active producer of themes and subjects related to the products and organizations with which they interact.

By convergence, I refer to the flow of content through multiple media platforms, the cooperation of multiple media markets and the migratory behavior of media audiences who go almost anywhere in search of the entertainment experiences they desire. (JENKINS, 2008, p. 10).

In this understanding, the consumer is accessed by multiple media platforms, in a proposal that goes far beyond the simple use of technology, dealing with a cultural transformation, stimulating consumers in a constant search for information and interactive possibilities with the organization. Convergence occurs in the minds of individual consumers and through their interactions with others, making consumption a collective process. One of the requirements proposed by Jenkins is participatory culture, where consumers and producers are part of a process with a new set of rules, in which none is completely exhausted. One of the main impacts brought about by media convergence, according to Jenkins (2009), was the change in the behavior of the public, which received more autonomy and, with this, revealed itself as a driver of changes both in the way of consuming goods, products and services, as well as in the way they are produced. Reaffirming, thus, the birth of a new consumer profile (as already exposed) to which organizations need to remodel themselves in order to meet their expectations and remain in evidence.

In recent times, there has been a significant change in the focus of marketing, which has changed from a mass approach to one-on-one marketing, where individualized service is aided by computer and communication technology, which has brought considerable transformations in

the company relationship with customers, creating new niches and business opportunities. The focus of companies has also changed, offering customers solutions, not just products. And, most importantly, creating the foundation for a relationship (GALINDO, 2002).

If old consumers were seen as liabilities, new consumers are active. If old consumers were predictable and stayed where they told them to stay, new consumers are migratory, showing a declining loyalty to networks or the media. If the old consumers were isolated individuals, the new consumers are socially connected. If the work of media consumers was once silent and invisible, new consumers are now noisy and public (JENKINS, 2008, p. 45).

Another important concept in the discussion now underway is that of transmedia narrative, a term that refers to the use of various types of media with content that complement each other and are not repeated. This requires a creative, continuous narrative that promotes and encourages audience participation. In addition to the call to market, the proposal also involves entertainment, since it aims to arouse consumer interest to research its digital and interactive channels. Furthermore, it is important to note that different media attract different market niches and, in order to provoke the desired attraction, the same narrative has a different tone according to the media in which it is presented.

This whole context transformed by the emergence of digital media only reinforces the need for market changes in organizations. Networks, digital media and the possibilities of interactivity make communication assume a new format. Digital communication practices need to be based on the choices of integrated communication, which, therefore, must be properly aligned with the strategic objectives of the organization. In this scenario, digital marketing is a complementary tool to integrated marketing communication, a tool that, if used well, will be able to enhance and optimize the actions of organizations in the search for competitive advantage in the market. In addition, several tools from digital technologies integrate mobility and portability of web access, improve search systems, establishing new pillars of relationship with the consumer in their communication.

Currently, a much debated subject are WEB 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0. The differences between these terms are not related to internet updates, but to changes in user behavior. In a nutshell, Web 1.0 was the first version to emerge, with more static sites that allowed little interaction. Web 2.0 was called the social web, due to the participation of users, with an increase in blogs, chats and social networks. For Torres (2009), due to the initiative and need of the consumers themselves, media and social networks, blogs and collaborative sites emerged. Web 3.0 (still in progress) is an internet with more organized information, both for use by humans and machines, increasingly closer to artificial intelligence. Gil (2014) states that this Web 3.0, also known as the “semantic web”, will be a web where synchronous communication (“live”) and knowledge will constitute the way of being of its users, always continuing under an environment and context sharing.

Given what has already been exposed, it can be seen that interactivity and changing users’ behavior is the driving force for the evolution of communication through digital media. It is up to the communication managers to use this predisposition of consumers to get closer to the producing organizations, creating more attractive and functional platforms in order to stimulate this relationship and interactivity. “When the unidirectional channels of traditional media give way to new interactive media based on computers, individuals will have the ability to search

for information that interests them and to filter those that do not want to see or hear” (ADLER; FIRESTONE; 2002, p. 10).

The changes that have occurred in the current scenario have resulted in changes in technological paradigms that have reshaped communication, generating market demassification, greater segmentation and an increase in consumer individuality (MCKENNA, 2006). For Adler and Firestone (2002), the advent of interactivity allows the emergence of numerous possibilities to attract the attention of the client. When these consumers access the necessary technology, it is possible to find a new form of advertising, where the ability to create and distribute content will be democratized by reducing the distinction between consumers and content producers in the media - which creates unprecedented challenges for advertisers.

Integrated communication coupled with the maturity of Internet use has been seducing consumers in terms of convenience, ease, security, speed and comfort. Organizations that invest in online communication and mobile internet will take the lead, as their application will boost their relationship with the customer. Some technologies have emerged seeking to improve the customer experience regarding their interactivity, such as mobile tagging (process of providing read data from tags for display on mobile devices, commonly encoded in a two-dimensional bar code, whose reader device is the camera on the phone), QR codes and augmented reality, although they are not yet used by all organizations. Such technologies, as well as other technologies and tools already mentioned, improve the consumer experience and are effective strategies for creating a closer, more solid and lasting relationship between the consumer and the organization.

Another very interesting change that has taken place in the marketing environment, and which we should look at again, is what some authors have called the “era of search”. According to Gabriel (2009), this “new” consumer chooses and searches for the company, its products and its brand. The consumer no longer has a passive, waiting position, but is responsible for doing research, discussing options and making his choices. This reshaped the market and started to demand that organizations worry about being available to be found by search engines quickly and easily by their potential customer. An important highlight is that all digital media are becoming relationship media, increasingly personalizing their relationship with customers. So that, there are different levels of positioning of organizations in relation to their strategic practices of digital presence in the market (CORRÊA, 2009).

What information consumes is obvious: it consumes the attention of the recipient. For this reason, a great wealth of information creates poverty of attention and the need to effectively allocate attention in the midst of an overabundance of information sources that can consume it. (ADLER; FIRESTONE; 2002, p. 17).

The evolution and maturation of the relationship with the consumer also extends to the relationship with the citizen. So, here is some reflection on the role of government in these times of internet and networks. Castells (2003) says that in public administration the motivation to use the internet is not always so clear, since it depends on the participation of the beneficiaries to use the technology and on the public agents, who, for the most part, still insist on using the internet only as an electronic notice board, putting aside the search for a more effective interaction. In order to understand the theme clearly, it is essential to make the conceptual distinction between information and communication and we will focus on this in the following paragraphs.

As explained by Manfio and Bittencourt (2019), it is necessary to understand that the meaning of information can be different depending on the time when it is discussed, because what is meant by information would be a product of complex interactions between technology and culture. For the author of *A Mathematical Theory of Communication* (MTC), Claude Shannon, the idea of information is devoid of semantic content, it is data or random sequences of digits transmitted from one point to another. Therefore, according to this theory, what matters is the channel and not the message, that is, communication is an informational scheme that must be economically viable and with the minimum of undesirable noises. Thus, the Shannonian model, first presented in 1947, approaches information in a binary and linear way and presents the information source as a statistical process, generating messages with various probabilities (GLEICK, 2011).

Gomes (2018) notes that information, even though it is a term of little conceptual precision, occupies a prominent place in the history of democracies and argues that digital communication environments represent a significant contribution for well-informed citizens to actively participate in the definition and implementation of public policies.

The information appears in the form of government data. In the 1990s, there was a belief that documents and other data from governments and governmental agencies could be made available online, available to citizens, since access barriers could be considerably reduced in the face of the state of information and technology. Among the expected effects of public access to public data it is government transparency mediated by technology (GOMES, 2018, p. 570).

For Manfio and Bittencourt (2019, p. 30), when it comes to information for the purposes of public administration, democracy and social control, the most appropriate definition is that which considers it as “a constitutive force in society [...] that it is produced, put into circulation and appropriated by societies as a condition of its existence and of its members, isolated or collectively”.

Accordingly, information, in addition to being a part of the social structure, also creates, changes and shapes the very social structure in which it circulates. Thus, information must be understood in the space and time it is circulated (MANFIO; BITTENCOURT, 2019, p. 11), being classified by the authors as active or passive.

In addition to these two aspects of the State’s manifestation, there is also the compound term “public information”, whose meaning is of fundamental importance. Considering for this purpose its specific character, more restricted to its production, circulation and appropriation, public information can be conceptualized as the “public good, tangible or intangible, with a form of graphic, sound and/or iconographic expression, which consists of a cultural heritage in common use by society and owned by public entities/institutions” (BATISTA, 2010, p. 30-31).

Therefore, information would not communicate, even if it is something to be informed, if there is not this principle of intelligibility, which, as a redundancy, would make access more accessible. At this point, as can be seen in the authors’ reasonings, it is clear that it is not enough for the law to impose rules to implement transparency, which would not happen as needed if it were just a bulletin board.

Moving on to the concept of communication. To support the intended understanding, the one advocated by Squire (2015) that is adopted here, it is pointed out that communication is

linked to the ability to articulate public interests in the public sphere, which is where debates, arguments and the outcome of discussions should take place. In this perspective, Escudeiro (2015) emphasizes the importance of the social function of public communication as an instrumentalizing and transforming force to society.

The communication process has several characteristics, from the production and transmission of content from innumerable possibilities of locative arrangements of origin to the citizen and political effectiveness of articulating such instruments with demands of democratization from a better and greater active participation of citizens (OLIVEIRA, 2004).

It is a communication that has gained expressiveness in recent decades because it involves various sectors of the lower classes, such as residents of a certain location, who are not assisted in their rights to education, health, transport, housing and security (...) it becomes a predominant force, but it plays an important role in the democratization of information and citizenship, both in expanding the number of information channels and in the fact that it constitutes an educational process, not only because of the content broadcast, but because of the direct involvement of people in communicational and popular movements. (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 50).

Based on this confluence between theories of communication and democracy, Zemor (1995) highlights the following categories: 1) responding to the obligation that public institutions have to inform the public; 2) establishing a relationship of dialogue in order to allow the provision of public service; 3) presenting and promoting the public administration service; 4) publicizing actions of the civic community and of general interest; 5) communicating of the decision-making process that accompanies political practice (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 118).

Thus, public communication has a democratizing and non-restrictive and non-exclusive nature, according to Escudeiro (2015), who highlights the importance of freedom of communication flows based on public information and made available by the State through its governments.

Given these possibilities, public communication becomes accessible to everyone, without restrictions. Its objective is to discuss topics of common interest to be debated in the public sphere and its result is the formation of public opinion and the strengthening of citizenship. (ESCUDEIRO, 2015, p. 1590).

Communication, therefore, can function as a possibility of making effective the bridge between the information to be published, as determined by law, and the public. Both this bridge can be made by models that improve access to information on public deeds, based on their own portals and transparency websites, as well as in a joint work based on professional journalistic communication.

In the work of França and Eloy (2019), it is evident how the role of the press can be a factor in convincing people that everyone can become aware of what is decided and what is done in the most varied spheres of the State, to the extent that the character of public information, the achievements of the State, can be more communicable in accessible and diversified terms.

For Takahashi (2000), in this era of human social interaction mediated by the internet, the government must increasingly promote access to public information, which, if published in accordance with the law, promotes social control over the state. The term electronic government, or e-gov, started to be used in Brazil in the 80s, after the success of e-commerce in the private sector and has always been linked to the use of information and communication technologies - ICTs.

Among the decisive reasons for the adoption of information and communication technologies - ICTs in a strategic and intense way by governments in their administrative procedures, it stands out the use of applications and possibilities given by ICTs, whether by the population, by private companies, by organizations of the third sector and by the State itself (DINIZ, 2009).

Diniz *et al.* (2009) point out more reasons:

To the forces coming from the movement of State reform, the modernization of public management and the need for greater efficiency in the government. Consequently, topics such as performance, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, control mechanisms, quality of public spending and accountability, related to the process of modernizing public management, were associated with the process of building e-government programs. The breakdown of these themes into public policies and concrete initiatives, spelled out in government programs, requires the use of technology, making e-government programs leverage elements of new levels of efficiency in public administration. (DINIZ, 2009, p. 2).

Thus, e-gov aims to raise administrative efficiency to a new level, concomitantly seeking to reduce costs, which can happen in several ways with the improvement in the development of internal activities, decrease in the acquisition of goods and hiring of personnel, reduction and/or elimination of distortions in management, combating corruption, among others.

Since the strategic use of information and communication technologies - ICT's has been the driving force behind this new model of public management called e-government, e-gov is understood as a group of modernizing actions linked to public administration. In addition to being one of the main configurations for the modernization of the State, e-government is intensely supported by a new look at the possibilities for the use of communication technologies by society, people and organizations (DINIZ, 2009).

The e-gov seeks to build a link between the operational and the strategic, identifying other means of relationship with society, revealing itself, therefore, as a mechanism for improving public services and interaction with society. The establishment of the strategy defined as e-government is a complex set of processes based on technology, which has strongly and very significantly modified the relations, on a large scale, between civil society and the State.

So, it can be concluded, in view of all the above, that electronic government, in addition to providing data, information and online services to society, constitutes new channels of direct relationship between government and citizen, which translates into a important tool to lead to a better government, based on the assumption that its priority is the promotion of citizenship (PALUDO, 2012).

Still in the topic of electronic government, there are some sub-concepts such as: e-governance, a term related to a broader view of interaction between government, citizens and other

agents through technology, seeking to simplify and improve processes; e-democracy, referring to the use of technologies in favor of democratic practices; and e-government, which aims to provide online services to society.

Even with some delay in relation to private organizations, there was a visible evolution in the management of information and communication technology - ICT in the public sector, which made information management to be used in a less operational and more strategic and effective way.

The evolution of e-gov in Brazil can be noticed with the advancement of time and with the progress of technologies. Since 1970, the first conceptions for the use of information and communication technologies - ICT in government have been registered. However, until 1996 they were only used in internal routines, only for data processing and storage. Between 1996 and 1999, the government started to provide some information to citizens and from 1999 to 2003 it was already possible to have access to information and some online services. From 2003 to the present day, services are available in a more personalized and secure way (DINIZ, 2009).

It is important to highlight that in the e-government model there are three ways of interaction, namely: 1) government-to-citizen, which is the interaction between the government and the citizen, where there is a demand to offer information and services to society with quality and agility; 2) government-to-business, characterized by transactions between governments and suppliers; and 3) government-to-government, which are relations between governments and spheres of government. It is important to note that all of them have the same objective to give agility and transparency to the processes of the State (PALUDO, 2012).

For Uhler (2006, p. 14) public information is “certain types of information that are produced by public authorities [...] in the performance of their duties, and that are seen as a public good”. This type of information is considered a subsidy for economic and social growth. In addition, CGU (2011, p. 8) says that “information under the custody of the State is always public, and access to it should be restricted only in specific cases [...] the information produced, stored, organized and managed by the State in the name of society is a public good”. Access to this information is an important path for strengthening democracy through the promotion of social control over the State. In line with Law 12,527, also known as the Access to Information Law, we must consider that:

I - information: data, processed or not, that can be used for the production and transmission of knowledge, contained in any medium, support or format;

II - document: it is a unit for recording information, whatever the medium or format;

III - confidential information: that which is temporarily submitted to the restriction of public access due to its indispensability for the security of society and the State;

IV - personal information: information related to the identified or identifiable natural person;

V - treatment of information: it is a set of actions related to the production, reception, classification, use, access, reproduction, transport, transmission, dis-

tribution, filing, storage, elimination, evaluation, destination or control of information [...]. (LAW 12.527, November 18, 2011).

In the scenario presented so far, we realize how relevant are the issues related to social control and public information. Aware of this, it is extremely important to reflect on how these two themes are related. First, it is necessary to understand that social participation depends fundamentally on the circulation and access to information; however, access in itself is not enough, as it concerns only the availability of content, it is necessary to advance in this concept. As Ribeiro (2009, p. 42) presents, the government has to:

Create ways for citizens to have access to information in a clear and easy as possible way. It must be proposed that the citizen may know its structures and its decisions. There must be a decrease in administrative opacity. The government must not only promote transparency through the availability of information, but must ensure that this information reaches citizens and is understood. (RIBEIRO, 2009, p.42)

The bridge between information and the understanding of its content is what we can call accessibility, which, ultimately, not only means access to the amount of data and information transmitted, but also the search for a more understandable form of presentation. Access to public information alone is already a right guaranteed by the Federal Constitution of 1988. In its item XXXIII, of Article 5, contained in Chapter I of Title II it says that:

[...] everyone has the right to receive information from their public bodies of information of their particular interest, or of collective or general interest, which will be provided within the term of the law, under penalty of liability, except for those whose secrecy is essential to the security of society and the State. (CF, 1989).

However, there are some obstacles for this information to be used in effecting citizen participation in the control of government administration acts. The power structure, although allowing civil society to act, has to develop or adapt the instruments that make the intermediation between government and citizen through information so that they become more effective, providing real popular participation.

The use of information from public service bodies/entities contributes to social development and to the exercise of citizenship. Thus, more than providing accurate information to citizens, it is up to public entities to make them easily accessible. A better interaction between the State and the citizen has an impact on the expansion and qualification of the latter's rights, in addition to increasing the efficiency of government services (MAISIRA; BORGES; JAMBEIRO, 2007, p. 09).

Facilitating access to information helps to consolidate citizenship and inhibit government practices that are contrary to the interests of the majority of the population. Vaz (2005, p. 10) states that "in order to guarantee civil society entities the right to search for data and receive information of interest to municipal public bodies, it is essential to create legal security standards and administrative procedures for access to information".

In addition to these rules, it is essential that government officials recognize that public information is a right of citizenship and its availability must be free, clear and accessible so that social control takes place in the most consistent and qualified way possible.

In an effort to define a regulatory framework on access to public information under State custody, Law 12,527 (mentioned above) was created, which seeks to establish procedures for public administration to respond to requests for information from citizens, establishing that access is the rule and secrecy is the exception.

This advance shows the stimulus to the creation of a new moment of society, which is guided by the interactions mediated by technologies and internet to promote the access culture, generating care regarding the increasing performance of society in general and of people in specific in structuring accountability (VAZ, 2005).

CHAPTER 4

PEOPLE AND ONLINE SOCIAL NETWORKS

In addition to organizations, be they public, private or from the third sector, in fact before them, people interact with each other, due to their needs, wants and desires. The direct social interactions, already dealt with in the developments of chapter 1 of this book, have been changed extremely strongly in their approach and convergence with structured digital media on the world of the internet and digital telephony.

Such social relations or direct interactions, would be markedly demarcated in a new plan with the creation and popularization of smartphones, which brought, in addition to the basic multifunctionalities (camera, calculator, text editor and even telephony), the portability of Internet access and new applications for digital telephony languages. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, in addition to dialoguing with distant people, the smartphone already enabled group meetings with images of people who were part of the virtual dialog environment.

One of the first tools, called online social networks or internet social networks, or even digital social media, was Orkut. Having been created in January 2004 by Turkish engineer Orkut Buyukkokten, now resident in the United States, who earned a doctorate in Computer Science from Stanford University, the goal of this network was initially to help users to create new friendships and further strengthen their relationships. According to Mocellim (2007), in the first semester Orkut had about two million participants and in three years it reached 40 million people using the online social network.

Dornelles (2006), on studies about the forms of sociability established by Orkut, presents a text that appeared (in the time frame of his research) on the website www.orkut.com as a presentation of the network:

Orkut is unique because it is a network of trusted friends. That way it doesn't grow much, nor very quickly and everyone knows someone who is already part of the network. If you know someone who is already an Orkut member, that person can invite you, otherwise, wait for someone soon to invite you. It is an online community aimed at friends. The main objective is to make your social life and that of your friends more active and stimulating. Orkut's social network can help you maintain existing relationships and establish new ones, making it possible to meet people who would never have met before. Orkut makes it easy to find people who share hobbies and interests, find love relationships or establish new professional contacts. You can also create and participate in various online discussion communities, re-establish contact with former high school classmates, or exchange cookie recipes. If you have not yet received

an invitation to join Orkut, be patient. We would love to immediately include everyone who wanted to participate. However, we are trying to ensure that Orkut becomes an intimate community. It is our mission to help you create a close and intimate network of friends. We hope to soon provide you with the path to social happiness. (DORNELLES, 2006, p. 166-167).

Orkut has established itself as a first major media structure capable of promoting social interaction between physically distant people and quickly reached many millions of followers. Innovation went viral, becoming a major phenomenon of human social relations at the turn of the 20th to the 21st centuries (LONDON, 2013). On the other hand, being a first major phenomenon among the many later social networks online, Orkut was also critically analyzed and, based on several studies, some deviations from the social use of this electronic-media interface started to be listed. Highlights of these studies are the indications of the existence and maintenance of pages for deceased people and also for the practice of cyberbullying, which could lead to processes of collective violence against a certain person and their profile based on a person's particular conceptions, which in theory would initiate the process of "virtual lynching" from the public exposure of some fact or social situation.

In 2004, Mark Zuckerberg (together with some university colleagues) created, within the academic context in which he was inserted (he was a student at Harvard), Facebook, one of the most important and millionaire expressions of the possibilities brought by the new information and communication technologies when converged with human sociability. Although it has experienced some scandals about leaking information in recent years, it still remains the fastest growing online social network in recent decades.

The initial intention was to create a digital platform of much broader alignments than Orkut and that would allow users to display opinions in texts, publish pictures or figures and opinions, only (in principle) for students at their university. However, it quickly expanded to other universities and schools, quickly connecting, in a few months, many thousands of students from more than 800 educational institutions, reaching one million users before the first year (ARRINGTON, 2005).

In the years 2005 and 2006, Facebook advances beyond the North American borders and also becomes fully accessible to people and companies outside the student-university environment, with the only registration restriction for the minimum age of thirteen years of age. In 2011, Facebook passes Orkut in number of people registered as users, becoming the largest online social network (LONDON, 2013).

It should be noted that the initial purpose of Facebook was to consolidate itself as a product/service with the mission of "offering people the power of sharing, making the world more open and interconnected" (FACEBOOK, 2020). In this sense, Facebook can be defined as a website or a digital platform that, supported and structured on the new information and communication technologies (and on the internet itself), connects people and their profiles, enabling a new way of sociability with numerous tools, in a way, a successor to the pioneer Orkut.

Among the tools and possibilities of the online social network Facebook, we highlight the features of creating a group of people with whom you have social relationships, called "friends", communicating with these and other "non-friends", creating an order of priorities and "authorizations" for their "friends", according to the user's privacy preferences. The addition of the

messenger creates the possibility of dialogues and web-meetings to the online social network. However, the device for sharing photos, pictures and messages is a tool that enhances the fast dynamics of communication, within a perspective of production/emission of information and content.

The architecture of Facebook also makes it possible to build your personal identification text, omitting information and highlighting others and, finally, the presentation of a “banner”, a kind of personal page cover, which connects the user to political campaigns, to your football team or even the possibility of declaring love. Finally, among other features, Facebook alerts the birthdays of the user’s list of “friends” daily, favoring remembrance and enabling the strengthening of social relationships.

In 2006, within a global communication trend in times of hypervelocity, the North American web designer Jack Dorsey created Twitter as an online tool for micro messages, revolutionizing several social segments, especially the political environment (both government and electoral). The purpose of this online social network was for users to publish micro messages of up to 140 characters (MISCHAUD, 2007; HONEYCUTT; HERRING, 2009).

The Twitter user can build his page from the options and choices of “following” or being “followed” by other users. These connection possibilities being established through links to access the different pages, and the messages published are called “tweets”, these interactions being the support of this mechanism as an online social network. (BOYD; ELLISON, 2007; ELLISON; STEINFIELD; LAMPE, 2007).

The continued use of Twitter for conversation is possible, using the sign “@” in front of the name of the target user (name on Twitter), and this message will then appear as “@Replies” on the target user’s page (HONEYCUTT; HERRING, 2009).

Twitter, as highlighted above, has become a specific social network for the production of content and/or for communication through micro messages, a very robust way of communicating in times of high speed of social relations in general and of mediated new communication technologies in particular.

Finally, among so many online social networks, we highlight Instagram, created in 2010 by the American Kevin Systrom and the Brazilian Mike Krieger, graduated in Computer Designer from Stanford University (California/USA). Initially compatible for Apple equipment, with iOS technology, and later for Android technology, in 2012 Instagram would be bought by Facebook for a billion-dollar figure.

Instagram’s main and differential is the sharing of photos and videos, where the platform provides a large number of tools for the editing of images and editing of videos. The functionality of publishing images/footage from a defined location from which such information is produced or published is highlighted. Finally, the use of the hashtag (“#”) makes it possible to identify an address or campaign for easier and faster access.

CHAPTER 5

INDICATIVES FOR NEXT STUDIES

In the last three decades, society has been undergoing rapid and profound changes in its economic, geopolitical and social structures, but a very important highlight, portrayed in this book, is the change in human sociability from digital media in general and from social networks online, which would have the potential to bring distant people and human groups together, but also to distance people and human groups that are close.

Sociability, whose theoretical basis is well structured, among others in Émile Durkheim, Ferdinand Tönnies and Franz Boas, became the target of orientations based on much faster environments, where relationships are characterized by being more ephemeral, more superficial, less lasting and even very fluid, according to Zygmunt Bauman (BAUMAN, 2001).

It is noted that human social relations, or sociability, have been significantly altered, and the new configurations of these have been assimilated differently by the various social segments in their cultural elements and socio-economic and even technological limitations; also, according to the interests and possible convergences with the *modus vivendi* of each group. The global orientation of economic interests is also superimposed on all the elements highlighted here, within the field of capitalist macro-structures concretely visible through large capitals or transnational companies, which guide large private investments worldwide.

This uneven situation of access and use, highlighted above, reconfigured human sociability in a differentiated way and also access to new possibilities of participation, social control and emancipation in this “new society” or media society, in turn, guided by social relations mediated by new information and communication technologies.

From a critical perspective, including the structuring of movements of current national societies (or contemporary nations), each with its history and its social scars (or wounds still open), it can be said that countries with weakened public education policies over the past seven or eight decades (perhaps in the context of the last century) have greater difficulties in including their population in the most important media processes in contemporary times, referring a good part of this to superficial participation through online social networks and perhaps placing them in predisposition to massive orientation, whether due to political ideologies or consumer orientations, in another context widely criticized by the social scientists of the Frankfurt School.

A massive scenario, which in addition to the consumption of goods and services, is a fertile field for political regrowth without depth and without preliminary constitution of intellectual capital (minimally educated) and even less of social capital, offers itself as very promising for dominant groups of liberal societies. This is an immense challenge of the media society, the

promotion of digital inclusion with emancipation from intellectual (schooling) and social (participation/effective citizenship) capital, it seems that in many excerpts we would be “trying to lay the roof of a house before the foundations are completed”.

However, digital media also enhance the chances for people, who win the inclusion stage, to be more enterprising in communication processes (including content production) and generating income opportunities, however requiring creativity and innovation as indispensable characteristics to human behavior in these lines of capital confrontation that always pass through human social interaction.

Thus, digital media are presented as key possibilities that open up to the human imagination according to their social and socio-cognitive connections, from the perspective of social capital and political understandings, citizenship and business.

Furthermore, public, business and even third-sector organizations in society are increasingly seeking to master the diverse instrumentalities made possible by digital media in contemporary media society. Thus, with this convergence between organizations and the media field, countless new spaces of interaction are being opened, new information being produced and new knowledge being demanded from society in general and academia in particular.

Private organizations, among them companies, are the ones that have advanced (and are advancing) in the domain of the potential of digital media. New companies have emerged in this field, such as Ifood and Uber, and others have undergone radical transformations as companies linked to journalism that are now returning to the public, who, mediated by the new information and communication technologies, can be consumers of the products and also producers of locative information and in some online formats.

Organizations integrated into the State, such as city halls, city councils, secretariats, ministries and municipalities, in addition to the necessary legitimacy of public policies that occur through interaction with citizens and society in general, follow the path started by the Fiscal Responsibility Law (Complementary Law No. 101/2000), which advanced the Public Accounts Transparency Law (Complementary Law 131/2009) and also the Law on Access to Public Information (Law No. 12,527/2011), among others that encourage the use of media instrumentalities. In this sense, a whole field of convergence between the theories of democracy and communication, within the scope of contemporary public management, has been sculpted by the State and its governments, under the watchful eyes of civil society.

Still within the organizational field, third sector organizations (TSO), including associations and private law foundations, follow a growing curve of their participation in meeting social, environmental, cultural demands, among others, within the contemporary composition of welfare mix and reflexes in the Brazilian constitutional order. Accordingly, TSOs need to conduct more effective, efficient and effective projects at a later time of the action directly executed. Thus, these organizations need to maintain and advance, among others, in the elements of legitimacy and participation, legality and quality in their processes and products.

The third sector and its organizations have, in general, much difficulty in accessing and mastering the new information and communication technologies that support the media bases, remembering that this depends a lot on its matrix, understanding that the Brazilian third sector has European roots (in a more charitable matrix, where most associations are located) and

American roots (in a matrix closer to business movements, where private law foundations are more common), which in the later are closer to the innovations and use of technologies.

The indications that this book leaves are related to the complexity inherent to human social relations and to the interactions by them provoked, which demand the search for theoretical guiding threads for a minimally adequate understanding. It is indicated that such anthropological processes cause profound reflexes in people's cultures and values, changing the landscapes, the territory and the environment in which the human being is inserted.

The good understanding of digital media, in its theoretical foundations and possibilities for solving contemporary problems in society, also implies the structuring and appropriation of innovative perspectives for future scenarios of sociability and human social interaction. However, it is also necessary to read critically how such instrumentalities put into the media society can be used for processes to promote violence, for the subordination of social classes and even for the weakening of democracies, in an opposite direction to what is expected, to promote the culture of societal peace, social opportunities and strengthening democracy.

REFERENCES

ADLER, Richard.; FIRESTONE, Charles. **The conquest of attention:** advertising and new forms of communication. São Paulo: Nobel, 2002..

AMANTE, Lúcia. Facebook and new sociability: contributions of research. In: PORTO, C., and SANTOS, E., orgs. **Facebook and education:** publish, like, share [*on-line*]. Campina Grande: EDUEPB, 2014, pp. 27-46. Available in: <http://books.scielo.org/id/c3h5q/pdf/porto-9788578792831-03.pdf> access in 20/08/2020.

ARAGÃO, Fernanda Bôto Paz; FARIAS, Fabíola Gomes; MOTA, Márcio de Oliveira; FREITAS, Ana Augusta Ferreira. Liked, commented, bought. Instagram digital social media and consumption. **Administrative Sciences Magazine**. Vol. 22, n.1, 2016. Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/4756/475655250006.pdf> access in 20/08/2020.

ARAÚJO, Silvia Maria; BRIDI, Maria Aparecida; MOTIM, Benilde Lenzi. **Sociology:** a critical look. 1a.ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.

ARON, Raymond. **The stages of the sociological thinking**. 7a ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008.

ARRINGTON, M. 85% of college students use Facebook. **Tech-Crunch**, 2005. Available in: <http://www.techcrunch.com/2005/09/07/85-of-college-students-use-facebook> . Access in 20/08/2020.

ASSUNÇÃO, Raquel Sofia; MATOS, Paula Mena. Adolescents' perspectives on the use of Facebook: a qualitative study. **Journal of Psychology in Study**. Vol. 19, n.3. 2014. Available in: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S1413-73722014000300018&script=sci_arttext&tln-g=pt . Access in 20/08/2020.

BARNES, J.A. Class and committees in a Norwegian Island Parish. in: LAINHARDT, S. (org.) Social networks. **A development paradigm**. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

BARROS JÚNIOR, Antonio Walter Ribeiro; Badaró, Claudio Eduardo; FEITOSA, Lourdes Conde; SOUZA, Marcos Alves; MAXIMINO, Sílvio Motta. **Anthropology:** a reflection on man. Bauru/SP: Edusc, 2011.

BATISTA, Carmen Lúcia. **Public information:** between access and social information. Master's Dissertation in Information Science (USP), 2010. 202 pages. Available in <https://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/27/27151/tde-05112010-110124/publico/2349823.pdf> . Access in 20/08/2020.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Liquid modernity**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.

BOAS, Franz. **Cultural anthropology**. Translation of Celso de Castro. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2004.

- BOTT, Elizabeth. **Family and social network**. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1976.
- BOYD, D.; ELLISON, N. Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. **Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication**, 13(1), 2007. Available in: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html> . Access in 20/08/2020.
- BRANCALEONE, Cássio. **Community, society and sociability**: revisiting Ferdinand Tönnies. *Journal of Social Sciences*. vol. 39, n.1, 2008. pág 98 a 104.
- BRASIL. **Federal Comptroller General - CGU**. Available in: <https://www.gov.br/cgu/pt-br>. Access in 20/08/2020.
- BRESSER-PEREIRA, Luiz Carlos. The emergence of the republican state. **Magazine Lua Nova**, n.64, 2004. Available in: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0102-64452004000200008&script=sci_arttext . Access in 20/08/2020.
- BUENO, Wilson da Costa. Communication as a mirror of corporate cultures. **Imes Magazine - Communication**, ano I, nº 1, jul/dez 2000.
- CASTELLS, Manuel. **Network society**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011.
- CASTELLS, Manuel. **Network society**: an overview. Espanha: Alianza, 2006.
- CASTELLS, Manuel. **The internet galaxy**: reflections on the internet, business and society. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003.
- CASTRO, Celso. **Basic Anthropology Texts**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2016.
- CIRIBELI, João Paulo; PAIVA, Victor Hugo Pereira. Networks and social media on the internet: reality and perspectives for a connected world. **Mediation Magazine**. Vol.13, n.12. Belo Horizonte: Mediação, jan/jun/2011.
- COASE, Ronald H. The nature of the firm. In: _____. **The firm, the market and the law**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- CORRÊA, Elizabeth Saad. Digital communication and new institutional media. In: KUnS-Ch, Margarida M. Krohling (Org.). **Organizational communication**. Vol. 1. histórico, fundamentos e processos. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2009. p. 317-335.
- CORREIA, Pedro Miguel Alves Ribeiro; MOREIRA, Maria Faia Rafael. New forms of communication: Facebook history, a necessarily brief history. **Magazine Alceu**, Vol. 14, n. 28, 2014. Available in: <http://revistaalceu-acervo.com.puc-rio.br/media/alceu%2028%20-%20168-187.pdf> . Access in 20/08/2020.
- COSTA, Cristina. **Sociology**: introduction to the science of society. 4ªed. São Paulo: Moderna, 2010.
- CURVELLO, João José Azevedo. **Internal communication and organizational culture** – 2. ed. rev. e atual. – Brasília: Casa das Musas, 2012.
- DEGENNE, Alain; FORSÉ, Michel. **Social networks**. Paris: Armand Colin, 1994.

DEITEL, A. et al. **Internet and word wide web: how to program**. 2a.ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2003.

DINIZ, Eduardo H. et al. Electronic government in Brazil: historical perspective from a structured model of analysis. **RAP - Journal of Public Administration**, v. 43, n. 1, p. 23-48, jan./ fev. 2009.

DORNELLES, Jonatas. Orkut is the third form of sociability. **Journal of Social Sciences Unisinos**. Vol. 41, n.3, pág 163-171. Available in: http://www.revistas.unisinos.br/index.php/ciencias_sociais/article/view/6265 . Access in 20/08/2020.

ELLISON, N. B.; STEINFELD C.; LAMPLE, C. The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. **Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication**, v. 12(4), 2007. Available in: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol12/issue4/ellison.html> . Access in 20/08/2020.

ESCUDEIRO, Regina. **Public communication: the voice of the citizen in the public sphere - building a new professional paradigm**. Curitiba: Editora Appris, 2015.

FAUSTINO, Raquel; OLIVEIRA, Tamires Morete; MAHER, Terezinha Machado. Cyberbullying on Orkut: aggression by language. **Language, Literature and Teaching Magazine - UNICAMP**, maio de 2008, v.3. Available in: <http://revistas.iel.unicamp.br/index.php/lle/article/view/124/105> . Access in 20/08/2020.

FERNANDES, Rubem César. **Private but public: the third sector in Latin America**. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 1994.

FERREIRA, Aurélio Buarque de Holanda. **New Aurélio Portuguese Language Dictionary**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1986.

FUSCO, Camila. **This will be your computer**. Exame. São Paulo, n.39, p.30., 28/set/2010.

FRANÇA, H. E. C. ELOY, C. C. **Journalism and transparency: a survey on the use of tools to access information by press professionals and their effects on news production**. 2019. Text available in: <http://www.ufpb.br/evento/index.php/ixsesa/ixsesa/paper/view/4651/2827> . Access in: 14 de agosto 2020.

GABRIEL, M. **SEM e SEO: dominating search marketing**. São Paulo: Novatec, 2009.

GALGANO, Francesco. **The businessman**. 3. ed. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli S.p.A., 1980.

GALINDO, Daniel dos Santos. **Advertising: whole and active**. São Paulo: Futura, 2002.

GALINDO, Daniel Santos. Advertising theories and strategies. In.: KUNSCHI, Margarida Maria (org.). **Strategic management in organizational communication and public relations**. São Caetano do Sul/SP: Difusão Editora, 2008.

GIL, Angel Infestas. **Sociology of business**. Salamanca: Amarú Ediciones, 1991.

GIL, Henrique. A passagem da Web 1.0 para a Web 2.0 e... Web 3.0: potential consequences for “humanization” in an educational context. *Educatic. Informative Bulletin*. ISSN 2183-0878. Nº 5. p. 1-2. 2014.

GLEICK, James. **The information: a history, a theory, a flood**. New York: Patheon books, 2011.

GOMES, Wilson. **Democracy in the digital world: history, problems and themes**. Salvador: Editora SESC, 2018.

GOMES, Wilson; MAIA, Rousiley C.M. **Communication and democracy: problems & perspectives**. São Paulo: Paulus, 2008.

GONÇALVES, Flavio Silva. Broadband internet access infrastructure in continental countries. In: SILVA, Sivaldo Pereira; BIONDI, Antônio (orgs.). **Pathways to universal broadband internet: international experiences and Brazilian challenges**. São Paulo: Intervezes, 2012, p. 115 a 150.

HALL, J.A.; YKEMBERRY, G.J. **The state**. Lisboa/Portugal: Estampa, 1990.

HOBBSAWN, Eric. **The era of extremes: the brief century XX**. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia das Letras, 1995.

HONEYCUTT, C.; HERRING, S. C. Beyond microblogging: conversation and collaboration via Twitter. **Proceedings of the Forty-Second Hawai'i International Conference on System Sciences**. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press, 2009. Available in: <http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/honeycutt.herring.2009.pdf>. . Access in 20/08/2020.

JENKINS, Henry. **Convergence Culture**. São Paulo: Aleph, 2008.

KLAUS, George. **Dictionary of cybernetics**. Frankfurt/Main: Fisher, 1969.

KOTLER, Philip; KELLER, Kevin Lane. **Marketing administration**. São Paulo: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006.

KREEPS, Gary L. **communication in organizations**. 2a. ed. Buenos Aires: AddisonWesley Iberoamericana, 1995.

LAPLANTINE, François. **Learning anthropology**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2006.

LATOUR, Bruno. **Reagregating the social: an introduction to the actor-network theory**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2012.

LEMOS, André. City and mobility. Cell phones, post-massive functions and information territories. **Magazine Matrizes**. n.1, outubro/2007. Available in: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/matrizes/article/view/38180/40911> . Access in 20/08/2020.

LEMOS, André. **The city in the information society**. Rio de Janeiro: E-Papers, 2005.

LESLEY, P. **The Nature and Role of Public Relations**. In Lesly, Philip - *Lesly's Handbook of Public Relations and Communications*. 5ª Edição. Chicago: Contemporary Books. pp. 3-19. 1997

- LÉVY, Pierre. **Cyberculture**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2000.
- LONDON, Jack. **Goodbye facebook: the post-digital world**. Rio de Janeiro: Valentina, 2013.
- MALMANN, Alexandre. The social network Twitter and the process of trivializing the bullying phenomenon in Brazil. **Anais of the II Research Seminar of the Faculty of Social Sciences of UFG**. 03 e 04/11/2011. Federal University of Goiás. Available in: https://files.cercomp.ufg.br/weby/up/253/o/Alexandre_Malman.pdf . Access in 20/08/2020.
- MANFIO, V. BITTENCOURT, C. M. **Information, transparency and social control in the democratic rule of law**. 2019. Available in: <https://online.unisc.br/acadnet/anais/index.php/sidssp/article/view/19545> . Access in 20/08/2020.
- MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. **Theory of digital media: language, environment and networks**. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2014.
- MATTELART, Armand. **The globalization of communication**. Bauru/SP: EdUSC, 2000.
- MCKENNA, R. The five rules of new marketing. **Magazine HSM Management**, 22, 14-22. setembro/outubro, 2006.
- MERCKLÉ, Pierre. **Sociology of social networks**. Paris: Le Découverte, 2004.
- MISCHAUD, E. **Twitter: expressions of the whole self**. An investigation into user appropriation of a web-based communications platform. Master's thesis in Politics and Communication. London School of Economics and Political Science, 2007. Available in: http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/mediaWorkingPapers/MScDissertationSeries/Mischaud_final.pdf. Acesso em: 20/01/20220
- MOCELLIM, Alan. Internet and identity: a study on the orkut website. **Magazine In Tese**. Vol.3, n.2. 2007. Available in: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/emtese/article/view/13477/12360> . Access in 20/08/2020.
- MORAES, Nelson Russo; BRAGA JÚNIOR, Sérgio Silva; LOURENZANI, Ana Elisa Bressan Smith. Dialogue about the concepts of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and marketing for social causes (MCS) within the scope of corporate social investment (ISC). **Brazilian Marketing Magazine - REMARK**. Vol.14, nº2, 2015.
- MORAES, Nelson Russo de; BAPTISTA, Renato Dias. Organizational communication: the challenges of a hyper-speed environment. In. MENESES, Verônica Dantas; GHIZONI, Liliam Daisy (org.). **Research in communication and society: from the diversity of narratives to the diversity of processes**. Palmas/TO: EdUFT, 2019, p. 85 a 94.
- MIRANDA, Orlando (org.). **To read Ferdinand Tönnies**. São Paulo: USP, 1995.
- MORGAN, G. **Organization images**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1996.
- NICOLAU, Marcos. Flow, connection, relationship: a communicational model for interactive media. In: **Media Cultures Magazine**, year I, n. 01, Graduate Program in Communication at UFPB, agosto/dezembro de 2008.

OTHON, Renata Alves de Albuquerque; COELHO, Maria das Graças Pinto. Brand communication on social networks on the internet: styles of advertising approach on Instagram. **Magazine Observatory**. Vol. 2, n. 3, 2016. Available in: <https://sistemas.uft.edu.br/periodicos/index.php/observatorio/article/view/2276/8879> . Access in 20/08/2020.

OLIVEIRA, Maria José da Costa. Public communication and non-state sectors. In: _____. **Public communication**. Campinas/SP: Alínea, 2004.

PALUDO, Augustinho Vicente. **Public Business**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Elsevier, 2012.

PORTUGAL, Sílvia. The hands that cradle the cradle: informal maternity support networks. **Critical Journal of Social Sciences**, n.42. Coimbra: RCCS, 1995.

PORTUGAL, Sílvia. Contributions to a discussion of the concept of network in sociological theory. **Notebooks of the Workshop of the Center for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra**. Oficina do CES nº 271, março de 2007. Coimbra/Portugal: CES, 2007. Available in: <https://eg.uc.pt/bitstream/10316/11097/1/Contributos%20para%20uma%20discuss%C3%A3o%20do%20conceito%20de%20rede%20na%20teoria%20sociol%C3%B3gica.pdf> . Access in 20/08/2020.

POST, J. E.; PRESTON, L. E; SACHS, S. **Redefining the Corporation: Stakeholder Management and Organizational Wealth**. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2002.

RECUERO, Raquel; GRUZD, Anatoliy. Cascades of fake political news: a case study on Twitter. **Magazine Galáxia**, n.41. mai/ago/2019. Available in: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S1982-25532019000200031&script=sci_arttext&tlng=pt . Access in 20/08/2020.

RECUERO, Raquel; ZAGO, Gabriela. In search of the “networks that matter”: social networks and social capital on Twitter. **Magazine Líbero**. Vol. 12, n.24, 2009. Available in: <http://201.33.98.90/index.php/libero/article/view/498/472> . Access in 20/08/2020.

RIBEIRO, Manuela Maia. **The use of information and communication technologies as tools to combat corruption: compbrasnet and the transparency portal**. Santos/SP, 2008.

RUE, L. W.; BYARS, L. L. **Management: Skills and Application**. 8th Edition. Irwin: Chicago, 1997.

SANTAELLA, Lucia. **Communication and research: master’s and doctoral projects**. São Paulo: Hacker Editores, 2001.

SOBREIRA, Rosane Vieira; ANDRADE, R.S.; BARROS, S.; JAMBEIRO, O. Salvador connected: information services offered by the City Hall and its secretariats. In: XXII Brazilian Congress of Library, Documentation and Information Science, 2007, Brasília. **Anais of the XXII Brazilian Congress of Library Science, Documentation and Information Science** *co-nectada*, 2007. v. 1.

TAKAHASHI, Tadao. Ministry of Science and Technology. National Council of Science and Technology (2000). **Information society in Brazil: green book** Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia. Brasília: Conselho Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia.

TAYLOR, J.R. **Rethinking the theory of organizational communication**: how read an organization. Norwood: Ablex, 1993.

_____. Engaging organization through worldview. In: MAY, S. e MUMBY, D. K. (ED.) **Engaging organizational communication theory and perspectives**: multiple perspectives. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2005.

THOMPSON, John B. **The media and modernity**: a social media theory. 9 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2008.

TÖNNIES, Ferdinand. **Community and Society**. Tradução de Charles P. Loomis. Michigan/EUA: Michigan University Press, 1957.

TORRES, C. **The digital marketing bible**. São Paulo: Novatec. 2009.

UHLIR, Paul F. **Policy guidelines for the development and promotion of public domain government information**. UNESCO, 2006.

VAZ, J. C. **Electronic governance**: where is it possible to go? Citizen mobilization and democratic innovations in cities. São Paulo, Special edition for the World Social Forum 2005, p. 14-19, 2005.

WASSERMAN, Stanley; FAUST, Katherine. Social network analysis. **Methods and applications**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

WATTS, Duncan J. Six degrees. **The science of a connected age**. New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 2003.

WELLMAN, Barry. **Structural analysis**: from method and metaphor to theory and substance. in: WELLMAN, B.; BERKOWITZ, S.D. (orgs). **Social structures**. A network approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pág. 19 a 61.

WELLMAN, B.; BERKOWITZ, S.D. Introduction: studying social structures. in: WELLMAN, B.; BERKOWITZ, S.D. (orgs). **Social structures**. A network approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pág. 1 a 14.

ZÉMOR, Pierre. **Public communication**. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995.

