

SOCIABILIDADE EM REDES SOCIOTÉCNICAS: apropriações e reconfigurações
SOCIABILIDAD EN REDES SOCIO-TÉCNICAS: apropiaciones y reconfiguraciones

Geilson Fernandes de Oliveira

Doctor in Media Studies (UFRN). Professor of the Journalism in Multimedia course at the State University of Bahia (UNEB). Researcher at INCT-CPCT-Fiocruz.
geilson.fernandes@gmail.com



0000-002-3278-4044

Maria das Graças Pinto Coelho

Doctor in Education. Full Professor at the Department of Communication at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) and at the Graduate Program in Media Studies (PPGEM/UFRN). ricardogomesbio@gmail.com



0000-002-6820-008X

Received: 03.20.2024

Accepted: 12.10.2024

Published: 06.03.2025

ABSTRACT:

The present work aims to promote reflections on the concept of sociability, paying special attention to its appropriations and reconfigurations with regard to its emergence in the context of sociotechnical networks, that is, to understand its manifestations and nuances in the context of the information society and network. To this end, discussions are held on this phenomenon, articulating the debates developed by Simmel (1983; 2000; 2006) and some of his commentators, as well as other authors who debate about this concept in the face of technological and informational processes that resize social relations, such as Castells (1999; 2003), Santos and Cipryano (2014), Recuero (2008; 2009), among others. In fact, it is observed that the changes around the sociability engendered in sociotechnical networks bring, despite the reconfigurations, the basic elements of their processes, which are reappropriated and favor their greater circulation and consolidation.

KEYWORDS: Sociability; Network sociability; Reconfigurations.

Introduction

In contemporary societies, which are strongly marked by the virtualization and digitalization of their processes, ways of being, existing, and behaving are constantly being modified, given the accelerated emergence of new information and technologies. In this context, the ways of being with others are also undergoing transformations. Today, many forms of relating to and being with others are mediated by technologies, as seen in conversations promoted through applications or social media websites, for example. In these, forms of interaction and exchange no longer require sharing the same space and time to form social relationships.

Understood as a fundamental element for the formation and development of societies, sociability, according to Simmel (1983; 2000; 2006), refers to the ways of being with, for, or even against others. It is this phenomenon that this work focuses on, which aims to engage in discussions about the concept of sociability, considering both its more "traditional" models, based on face-to-face relationships, and its reconfigurations in light

of the emergence and consolidation of sociotechnical networks¹. From this perspective, it is of interest to investigate the meanings surrounding the concept of sociability, as well as its uses, appropriations, and reconfigurations in the contemporary scenario, when forms of sociability are being resized.

To this end, a literature review on the concept is conducted, as well as reflections based on it, with the aim of understanding what kind of sociability we are talking about today, given the understanding that reality is multifaceted and that society and forms of sociability, as Simmel (1983) aptly pointed out, are not fixed or static.

Sociability: Premises and Definitions

Although the concept of sociability is central to thinking about the relationships that are established in social life, it is notable that there is no definition that fully accounts for all its nuances and characteristics. According to Cipryano (2013, p. 97), the term commonly refers to orders of meaning related to a quality of being sociable, a type of inclination toward collectivity, or a capacity to put certain rules of social interaction into practice.

From these characteristics, it is identified that sociability is related to being with others, involved in an act where there is sharing of a particular situation through processes of interaction. In daily life, the exercise of sociability takes place through the exchanges that individuals establish and foster with each other, marking a scenario where reciprocity is realized among the subjects involved in that context of action. According to Maffesoli (1987), sociability refers to the shared experience between individuals, which extends to the sharing of certain values, behaviors, and emotions, expressing a multiplicity of ways of "being together." In this sense, sociability is linked to the construction of a "common" place between the parties involved, even if only momentarily.

In a constant process of production, never entirely given, sociability, in Simmel's (1983) conception – one of the most important intellectuals who dedicated himself to this issue – refers to a form of socialization, understanding the latter as "[...] the form (realized in countless different ways) by which individuals group themselves into units that satisfy their interests" (Simmel, 1983, p. 166), which "[...] whether sensual or intellectual, temporary or lasting, conscious or unconscious, casual or teleological, form the basis of human societies" (Simmel, 1983, p. 166). As a form, it is the process of

¹ According to Cebrian (1999), sociotechnical networks are not just about a network of computers or a cluster of people, but rather an interconnection between human beings, which is made possible and mediated through technologies.

socialization that will enable the fabric of relationships and their contents, as well as foster the maintenance of society, seen by the author as a result of the actions and reactions of individuals among themselves, i.e., their interactions.

This is precisely one of the most innovative points in the sociologist's thinking: his notion of society. Simmel (1983) avoids seeing it as a given or static totality, which he also does with the concept of sociability. In his conception, these concepts can be understood more as processes, something that is in a continuum of becoming, never finished. In light of this, for the author, it is essential to keep in mind that human beings are tied to the fact of living in reciprocal action with one another, thus forming society, which is only possible due to the existence of forms of socialization, the logical a priori that enables it (Moraes Filho, 1983, p. 22; Simmel, 1983, p. 61), since sociability processes concern the game through which society is made, as "[...] society in general refers to the interaction between individuals" (Simmel, 1983, p. 165).

Understood from the Simmelian perspective as a pure form of socialization, denoting an appropriation of Weberian ideal types, sociability is seen as an ideal typical form in which mutual interactions occur. As part of the basic social process, the concept of socialization reveals the dynamism that composes social life, and it cannot be confused with association or socialization, as it refers not to the contents but to the forms through which individuals interact. Socialization can only occur when previously isolated individuals begin to relate to, be with, and for the other (Simmel, 1983).

Furthermore, socialization can vary in degrees, depending on the level of intimacy that permeates the interaction, "[...] ranging from the fleeting union to take a walk together to family relationships, from indefinite-term relationships to belonging to the same state, from transient encounters in a hotel to the close union of a medieval guild" (Simmel, 1983, p. 60), depending on its contents, which in these scenarios correspond to the purposes or impulses that lead individuals to act mutually, involving everything that can be present in the processes of interaction between individuals.

These contents are also not predetermined; they are realized in moments when exchanges emerge, and can "[...] generate or mediate influences on others, or receive such influences [...]" (Simmel, 1983, p. 166). The forms through which sociabilities are realized, in turn, reinforce the premise of mutual interaction flows between individuals, in the sense that being with, for, or against another is seen as the primary goal, providing sharing and satisfaction around the bonds established.

The bonds are also composed from objective and/or subjective purposes, allowing for distinct and very specific forms of constituting reciprocal actions that weave sociabilities, as Simmel (1983) states. The composition of these bonds often arises from

specific needs, such as when people unite in economic associations, blood brotherhoods, religious societies, and/or criminal gangs, as argued by Simmel (1983, p. 168), highlighting the issue of reciprocity, as occurs in other forms of sociability, which are based on a feeling of satisfaction among the members involved in being socialized.

In addition to the bond and the sharing of a sense of satisfaction from being socialized, another characteristic of the concept of sociability pointed out by Simmel (1983) is its playful nature, a necessary condition for sociability to fulfill its purpose, since “[...] its aim is nothing more than the sociable moment itself, and at most, its remembrance” (Simmel, 1983, p. 170). However, the playful aspect should not be thought of as corresponding to an absence of reality, but rather as a strategic abstraction of certain contexts and relationships so that exchanges can proceed successfully. In interaction processes, its development considers qualities that can stimulate a more harmonious relationship, such as refinement, cordiality, kindness, etc., with the aim of not overly emphasizing the personalities involved, once again revealing the crafting and maintenance of a game through which society is produced.

As the basis for forms of socialization, playfulness is expressed and can also be understood when analyzing Goffman's (1999) work on the representation of the self in everyday life, through which the author reflects on the “performance” activated by individuals to construct and maintain their public personas. In these processes, the playful element is activated to promote coherence in the interactions and social exchanges that also constitute sociability.

Thus, it is expected that the exchanges between the individuals involved will occur in a balanced way, since in its pure form, one of the key attributes of sociability is the pursuit of reciprocal action, which is why its playful aspect is important. Sociability, then, is the game in which “everyone pretends to be equal, and at the same time, each one pretends to be particularly revered; and ‘pretending’ is no more a lie than the game or the art is a lie due to its deviation from reality” (Simmel, 1983, p. 173). The sense of deviation from reality, in this case, refers to the fact that in interaction processes, individuals do not present themselves entirely (even when they claim to be as truthful as possible), but follow determined precepts that make them present themselves in one way and not another. It is worth noting that this characteristic does not imply a denial or falsification of the real, but rather its construction, grounded precisely in the playfulness of social processes, as everyday experiences and languages are permeated by it.

It is the playful aspect inherent in the forms of socialization that gives social relations the sense of a game. The perception of social games implies that, through various modes of appropriation, individuals share and make use of their forms of

interaction as if they were part of a game. Its sociological significance, imbued with manifest playfulness, also seems to be equally shared. To be or to be socialized, in this sense, is to be immersed in the game that ensures and sustains the vitality of society. However, the thresholds of this game, or of sociability in its pure form, become visible when there is a violation of the use of playfulness, more specifically, when subjects interact not motivated by the satisfaction of being together, but “[...] by objective purposes and contents, and when their subjective and entirely personal aspects are felt” (Simmel, 1983, p. 171). In these cases, the goal of the interaction ceases to be sociability itself, becoming a “formal and superficially mediating connection.” There is, thus, a reconfiguration around this interaction, which does not mean that it ceases to be characterized as a type of sociability, but rather an alteration concerning its distance from the ideal typical model proposed by Simmel (1983).

Conversation is an elucidative practice of these interactive dynamics that compose and highlight sociability as a playful form of socialization. As one of the most basic forms in which sociability manifests, conversation, according to Simmel (1983, p. 176), is “[...] the most generic vehicle for everything that men have in common,” being the most extensive and used instrument in symbolic exchanges throughout human life in society. As a pure form of sociability, in conversation, content is indispensable.

[...] in the seriousness of life, people converse because of some content they want to communicate or understand, while in a social gathering, they converse just to converse. In the first case, the conversation achieves its true goals, but not in the naturalistic sense that would make it mere chatter, but as an art of conversation, which has its own artistic laws. In a purely sociable conversation, the subject is simply the indispensable means for the lively exchange of words to reveal its charm (Simmel, 1983, p. 176).

As seen, different modes of conversation reveal distinct degrees of socialization. Consequently, conversation demonstrates itself as a valuable type of interaction that can show various aspects of the production of bonds and sociabilities. Simmel (1983, p. 177) even states that, among all sociological phenomena, except for “looking at one another,” conversation would be the most elevated and pure form of reciprocity. Its purpose would not only be the subject of the conversation, but the conversation itself, as the topic discussed only matters when it translates the pleasure of meeting the other. This explains why, in moments when anecdotes or jokes are told, the most important aspect is not the content of what was told, but the being together, a pure form of socialization also cemented through playfulness. “Conversation is thus the realization of a relationship that, so to speak, aims to be nothing more than a relationship – that is, in which what is

usually the mere form of interaction becomes its self-sufficient content" (Simmel, 1983, p. 177).

Considering the conditions of production of his writings, it is worth highlighting that Simmel (1983; 2000) refers especially to sociabilities established through face-to-face relationships, given the lack of the majority of contemporary technological and media devices in his time, through which other forms of sociability have emerged. However, this does not mean that much of his theoretical framework developed and discussed here loses its validity. Quite the opposite, such changes further demonstrate the productivity of the author's writings in understanding the new relationships that are currently being formed, especially those arising from social networks expressed by social media sites. According to Braga (2011, p. 100), "in social networks, Simmel's theory seems to acquire a considerable field of application, as these environments are governed by a dynamic of sociability, of 'speaking' (in writing) for the pleasure of speaking".

Networked Sociability

Nowadays, many of the "social games" exist in an entanglement between face-to-face social networks and sociotechnical networks. Likewise, these "social games" in the network bring with them the playful character of sociability, as well as the satisfaction of being together with and for the other. It is a fact, however, that due to their emergence or existence in sociotechnical networks, such socializations can be seen as trivial, ephemeral, or superficial, especially in the early stages of this phenomenon. Today, some prejudices still persist, but perspectives that view networked sociabilities as forms of interaction that go beyond the mere pastime highlight the fact that this is a form of socialization already consolidated across different age groups (with a particular focus on those composed of young people). According to Marques (2009, p. 2):

On the web (and also outside it), citizens daily build and appropriate certain communicative contexts in which they can sustain conversations about their interests and needs, thus developing not only emotional bonds of proximity and belonging, but also the capacities for argumentation, reflection, and cognitive mastery of the different types of information to which they are exposed.

Thus, new ways of "being together" with others are produced, even when based on more fluid or informally established exchanges. Thinking about this form of sociability, which emerged with the advent of the web and Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), is still, however, a challenge for many researchers, especially due to its volatility and ephemerality. In *The Internet Galaxy*, Castells (2003, p. 107) argues that "the great

transformation of sociability in complex societies occurred with the replacement of spatial communities by networks as fundamental forms of sociability". His argument is linked to the notion that social relations had their scope expanded through communication at a distance and in networks, which led to transformations in models of friendship and work situations, which underwent significant reconstructions.

Castells' (2003) interest in networked sociabilities seems to be more closely tied to concerns about the nature of the bonds that individuals form through technologies, which he sees as the material supports of the "new" processes of interaction. According to the author, the bonds of networked sociabilities are mostly 'weak ties,' which, in his words, "[...] does not mean that they are negligible," but "[...] sources of information, work, performance, communication, civic engagement, and entertainment" (Castells, 2003, p. 107). Today, this view seems to lose some of its validity, considering that many "Strong" ties are now engendered by technologies and their networks. Moreover, it is not so much a matter of transitioning from one to the other (from what would be the physical territory to the digital or virtual one), but rather of complex processes fostered, above all, by the appropriations individuals have made and continue to make of these technologies, as well as by the very concept of sociability as a process always in motion and a product of its time, as Simmel (1998) had already noted.

In this sense, the transformations around sociabilities brought about by mediation also appear as developments of the ways in which individuals appropriate technologies – their constitution not only as telematic networks, but as proper social networks. Thus, a shift occurs in relation to the use of the web, reviving the perspective pointed out by Lemos (2015) regarding the technical and symbolic dimensions of cyberculture. In the beginning, the internet and its functionalities were used with instrumental objectives – such as research, information and data dissemination, learning, etc. – or even as a way to gain social status. However, it soon began to gain relevance for interactive and collaborative exchanges when social networks emerged, given the emergence of a web with a more relational character.

The moment that marks the significant shift from the instrumental web to the social or relational one can be seen with the rise of what is called web 2.0 (O'Reilly, 2005). Commonly referred to as the second generation of the internet, web 2.0 is primarily characterized by the openness for user participation, enhancing the ways of organizing, sharing, and publishing information, while also expanding the spaces and possibilities for interaction between the individuals involved in this process. While the first generation of the web was characterized by sites as isolated units, with web 2.0, a network structure emerges with greater functionalities and integration with other resources. O'Reilly (2005)

emphasizes, as an example, the shift from content publication (highlighting it as mere emission or transmission) to participation, as seen with blogs and their space for producing comments or subscription systems, quite different from the previously static and atomized internet pages. In fact, participation also begins to be encouraged through the new systems, which are appropriated by individuals and foster what some authors have called the culture of participation (Shirky, 2010), expressive culture (Allard, 2007), or participatory culture (Jenkins, 2008). The interaction models on the web change, triggering rearrangements in the forms of sociability, evoking its meaning as something never given or stable.

Networked sociability carries with it many of the characteristics of forms of sociability marked by face-to-face interaction. However, due to the particularities of mediated exchanges, some elements end up being left aside, leading to real losses in interactive processes, which was initially a concern. Thompson (2011; 2018) addresses this issue when referring to mediated interactions and online mediated interactions. According to the author, mediated interactions always involve the use of a technical medium (such as paper, electric wires, computers, the internet, etc.), through which the relationship is made possible, where symbolic contents are shared between individuals situated in divergent space-time contexts, without the need for co-presence.

Based on this perspective, as there is no sharing of the same spatial and temporal reference points in the exchanges established online, mutual understanding of the symbolic contents exchanged cannot be presumed, leading to a narrowing of symbolic cues between participants (such as a glance, a wink, a raised eyebrow, etc.), which may result in communication noise or the production of ambiguities. The individuals involved in these processes, therefore, must resort to their own resources to interpret the exchanges, which may require further clarification. However, much of these concerns seem to have already been overcome through the processes of appropriation of network elements, as other symbolic cues have been developed to overcome communicational and interactive noise. One example is the use of emoticons, initially formed through specific characters to express moods (=D, :(, :), :P, :@, etc.) via textuality, now transformed into a wide variety of emoticons (Recuero, 2009; 2008), a resource that reinforces the playful perspective of sociability forms, since strategies are articulated to provide the sense of sharing an encounter, thus sharing a common experience, a way of being with others.

These aspects are reconfigured and highlight strategies and transformations of what Thompson (2018) recently termed online-mediated interaction. The main difference in relation to mediated interaction is that online-mediated interaction is directed towards

a multiplicity of recipients (many-to-many), rather than one-to-one (Thompson, 2018, p. 20). This shift from unidirectionality to multidirectionality brings transformations beyond forms of sociability (such as the ability to interact with previously unknown individuals or with multiple people at once), and also affects the visibility of the content produced (a message from any individual, when set to public mode, can be seen, commented on, or shared by countless people). Social networking sites, in the author's view, are the perfect setting for online-mediated interaction.

One of the characteristics of sociability in networks, especially when considering online-mediated interaction, is that it leaves traces, even though these are often configured in diffuse and scattered discourses. On social networking sites or apps aimed at social relationships, these traces are mostly textual inscriptions, along with images and videos. When they involve interaction processes between individuals, these traces can offer readings and interpretations of the forms of association or the interactive exchanges between individuals, considering their interests, motivations, and choices. They can also point to the emergence of other sociabilities, reflecting changes over time. A characteristic of these sites that cannot be overlooked, according to Santos and Cypriano (2014), is that they are:

[...] environments for the public expression of subjectivities, they give rise to innovative forms of public debate, insofar as, once published, information is subject to all sorts of comments, corrections, additions, modifications, transforming the public sphere into a place where collectives discuss issues of interest to them, without the usual limitations imposed by time and space (Santos & Cypriano, 2014, p. 74).

As the name suggests, social networking sites² are services primarily intended for the composition of networks based on social relationships, aiming to expand them, as indicated by Recuero (2009). Their access is generally free, and as networks of relationships, their variety pre-defines certain interests of their users. There are, for example, sites whose purpose is the formation and maintenance of networks of friends, such as Facebook; while others are designed for more specific purposes, aiming at the formation of professional networks, such as LinkedIn. Some are specific for sharing videos, like YouTube, or provide support for photo sharing, like Flickr and Instagram, or

² According to Recuero (2009), social networks exist before and independently of social networking sites. The difference between conventional social networks (which structure communities, tribes, or other traditional groupings) and internet social networks lies in the fact that in the latter, the ties and interactions found in traditional social networks (based on face-to-face relationships) are transposed to another environment: the internet. In other words, "social networking sites are the spaces used for the expression of social networks on the Internet" (Recuero, 2009, p. 102).

are strictly for exchanging messages, like WhatsApp and Telegram³. The specificity of each social networking site directly influences the forms of sociability that are formed within them. However, in all of them, it is important to highlight the promotion and cultivation of social bonds (whether weak or strong), enabling networks of sociability that produce datified traces.

Considering the multiplicity of social networking sites, as well as their objectives and content, Keenan & Shiri (2009, p. 439) classify them into two categories: social networking sites focused on people and social networking sites focused on activities. The first group refers to those sites that emphasize social interaction primarily through personal content, mostly centered around individual profiles (such as Facebook, Twitter, and the former Orkut). On the other hand, social networking sites focused on activities emphasize social interaction through the specific content they offer, and thus have a thematic focus for their users. There is a wide variety of such sites, whether for listening to music or watching videos (like YouTube – which focuses more on posting and viewing videos than on interpersonal interactions), dating (Badoo, Par Perfeito, Tinder, among others), finding jobs (LinkedIn), etc.

However, there are cases where the categories mentioned by the authors can hybridize, meaning that there is an intermediation between people-focused social networks and activity-focused social networks. This occurs thanks to the constant updating, sophistication, and convergence of these sites, which begin to offer tools that serve multiple purposes. An example is YouTube, which, in addition to providing video posting and viewing services, also includes space for conversation, a characteristic also found today in Facebook, where video production and sharing are no longer restricted to textual and image-based exchanges.

Specifically, these social networking sites mobilize and foster sociability at different levels and forms, generating a variability of social networks (friendships, family, school or work colleagues, etc.). Their primary focus on people and the creation of bonds aims to represent or continue social networks that already existed. Evidence of this is the initial encouragement of forming friendships or contacts with individuals or content previously known to users, so that those who are unknown are placed on the margins of an individual's network (Recuero, 2009).

Social networks on the internet encourage the production of sociability by representing existing connections, making them accessible via the web. Their emphasis is

³ Although they are structured as apps rather than actual social networking sites, some phenomena can be characterized as social networks (such as WhatsApp and Telegram), given the dynamics, uses, and appropriations made of them by people.

on presenting and motivating identities that can interact in a comfortable, private, and familiar environment. These aspects are particularly reinforced, according to Keenan & Shiri (2009, p. 443), due to the use of real names/identities⁴ (at least in most cases, as these sites generally have policies against fake profiles), restricted access to profiles (only friends or those allowed can view the user's full profile), social environment (following the characteristics of a more relational web, 2.0), and a simple media interface (ease of navigation and usability).

With these characteristics, it can be observed that from the formatting and structure of these sites, there is a deliberate effort to encourage sociability, whether through reactive interactions, like "liking" (and its variations) or sharing; or mutual interactions, where more elaborate relational exchanges take place (as seen in conversations within comment sections) (Primo, 2007). Much of the encouragement for sociability or relational aspects is proposed by the site itself and is expressed through its network architecture or interface design⁵. This is evident in the sense of closeness and intimacy that the network proposes, as seen in the question posed in the text box on its homepage, such as "What are you thinking, + username?" on Facebook or "What's happening?" on Twitter.

With a diversity of interactive modalities that favor the emergence of sociabilities (from posts on personal profiles, comments made on other users' posts, dialogues promoted through tools designed for private exchanges, etc.), constituting itself as a comprehensive yet unique social network, it is observed that the possibility of the emergence and maintenance of a wide variety of sociabilities is present. In the current context, these sociabilities are becoming increasingly frequent and, more than that, more consolidated, overcoming stereotypes or prejudices⁶.

The analysis of these forms of sociability points to the existence of a mutual characteristic (Primo, 2007) between the user-social network and between user-user, configuring symbolic exchanges that are made through conversations established in spaces designated for comments or in tools designed for promoting private dialogues.

⁴ The use of real names by Facebook users, for example, was characterized by Keenan & Shiri (2009, p. 443) as a novelty and a milestone for social networking sites, as prior to this, there was a network culture where the use of nicknames was common.

⁵ According to Keenan & Shiri (2009, p. 441): "Interface design, the visual and structural design a system, governs how a user interacts with that system. In terms of online applications, interface design is both the visual representation and the behind-the-scenes mechanics of a system. A poor interface design ruins the experience of a user".

⁶ In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, exchanges of messages through sociotechnical networks gained new significance, with the quantity of messages exchanged increasing, whether through text, audio, or video conferences. This indicates that the context is an essential factor in the formation of sociability forms, which, as previously mentioned, are never static.

This sociability emerges when a user comments and reveals, through their discursive production, a specific position about a post or initial message, which soon fosters the production of other exchanges – whether in relation to the post, the message, or as responses to other comments – all of which are examples of moments when social relationships emerge and give space to exchanges that form specific types of sociability.

As a form of association, these exchanges reveal interactions that mostly occur between subjects who may either have a prior connection and be linked within the network by friendship bonds or not. Their characteristics point to a sociability rooted in brevity (interactions through short comments), instantaneity (they occur within that space and seem not to extend beyond it), and a lack of interest or radicality that can easily emerge (the user may, at any time, stop responding and engaging in dialogue with the other). These aspects echo some of the discussions by Bauman (2004) on social relations made through the internet, especially regarding the greater ease with which bonds are dissolved.

In this context, the characteristics viewed by Bauman (2004) as “fragilities” contribute to a picture where sociabilities are contrasted when compared to others – especially those that are carried out in face-to-face contexts. However, it is important to emphasize that these are also forms of association, as they present forms – conversation and interaction – and content – agreement or disagreement, deepening of issues raised by the post or other users, and private exchanges. At the same time – and despite the points mentioned – sociabilities that reinforce existing bonds, re-establish lost ones, and even create new social relationships can also be forged. These relationships redefine the space of co-presence, demonstrating a multiplicity of possibilities and pointing to the need for more careful and less generalized perspectives.

Final Considerations

In a scenario where behavior models and ways of being and existing undergo constant modifications, it is not surprising that the ways of being with the other, for the other, or against the other – which constitute the concept of sociability – have also undergone transformations. In this article, observing and reflecting on these changes was our main interest.

For this purpose, we drew on the reflections developed by Georg Simmel – a theorist who already assumed, in his notion of sociability, more than the possibility of reconfiguration, but the actualization of this process as something natural, given the changes through which society itself passes – as well as other authors who currently

discuss this theme, considering it from the perspective of its reconfigurations in contemporary society.

Indeed, understood as a free, playful, and selfless way of being with the other, sociability today is the result of relationships that occur across a multiplicity of spaces and processes, which reshapes, transforms, and reconfigures it, yet without losing its essence: the relational aspect, of exchange and affect in terms of the relationship between one subject and another. In this sense, sociabilities are formed more by the need, by the pleasure or satisfaction that arises from it. Being with or for the other is, then, mobilized by the need to belong, interact, take a stand in a debate, etc., channeling modes of satisfaction (the gratuitousness of the relationship) and playfulness (the ways in which positions and interactions appear to cement togetherness) that demonstrate important reconfigurations compared to other forms of association.

In sociotechnical networks, there is a (re)appropriation of these elements, which is evidenced from the architecture of the various sites, networks, and applications to the exchanges that effectively take place there. Thus, what we observe are reconfigurations that aim to address precisely this need to be with the other, even if at first this seemed so unreal or distinct compared to more traditional models. In light of this, the need to pay attention to the highlighted aspects and their transformations becomes clear, as with the expansion of forms and models, it is even more necessary to reflect on forms of sociability in the present moment, since they speak volumes not only about social relationships but also about society itself, its structures, and especially its subjects.

References

- Allard, L. (2007). Émergence des cultures expressives, d'internet au mobile. *MédiaMorphoses*, 21(1), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.3406/memor.2007.2272>
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Amor líquido: sobre a fragilidade dos laços humanos*. Rio de Janeiro: Zorge Zahar Editor.
- Braga, Adriana. (2011). Sociabilidades digitais e a reconfiguração das relações sociais. *Desigualdade & Diversidade – Revista de Ciências Sociais da PUC-Rio*, 9, ago/dez, 95-104.
- Castells, M. (2003). *A galáxia da Internet*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- Castells, M. (1999). *A sociedade em rede*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Cebrián, J. L. (1999). *A rede: como nossas vidas serão transformadas pelos novos meios de comunicação*. São Paulo: Summus.
- Cipryano, C. P. (2013). Nas travessias da interface: as novas formas da vida social em rede. *Tese*. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG).
- Goffman, E. (1999). *A representação do eu na vida cotidiana*. Petropolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Jenkins, H. (2008). *Cultura da convergência*. São Paulo: Aleph.

- Keenan, A., & Shiri, A. (2009). Sociability and social interaction on social networking websites, *Library Review*, 58(6), 438-450.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530910969794>
- Lemos, A. (2015). *Cibercultura: tecnologia e vida social na cultura contemporânea*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- Maffesoli, M. (1987). *O tempo das tribos*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.
- Marques, A. C. S. (2009). A conversação informal na internet: aspectos afetivos e políticos. *Anais do XVIII Encontro da Compós*. PUC-MG, Belo Horizonte - MG, 1-14.
- Moraes Filho, E. (org.). (1983). *Simmel*. Sociologia. São Paulo: Ática.
- O'Reilly, T. (2005). *What Is Web 2.0 - Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software*. O'Reilly Publishing.
- Primo, A. (2007). O aspecto relacional das interações na Web 2.0. *E-Compós*, Brasília, 9, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.30962/ec.153>
- Recuero, R. (2009). *Redes Sociais na Internet*. Porto Alegre, Sulina.
- Recuero, R. (2008). Práticas de sociabilidade em sites de redes sociais: interação e capital social nos comentários dos fotologs. *Anais do XVII Encontro da Compós*. São Paulo, SP, 1-16.
- Santos, F. C. dos, & Cipryano, C. P. (2014). Redes sociais, redes de sociabilidade. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 29(85), 63-78. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0102-69092014000200005>
- Shirky, C. (2010). *A cultura da participação: criatividade e generosidade no mundo conectado*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Simmel, G. (2006). *Questões fundamentais da Sociologia: indivíduo e sociedade*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Simmel, G. (2000). Culture of interaction. In: Frisby, D., & Featherstone, M. (Eds.). *Simmel on culture*. Londres: Sage.
- Simmel, G. (1983). Sociabilidade – um exemplo de Sociologia pura ou formal. In: Moraes Filho, E. (Org.). *Simmel*. Sociologia. São Paulo: Ática.
- Thompson, J. B. (2018). A interação mediada na era digital. *Matrizes*, 12(3), 17-44. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v12i3p17-44>
- Thompson, J. B. (2011). *A mídia e a modernidade: uma teoria social da mídia*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

RESUMO:

O presente trabalho tem como objetivo promover reflexões sobre o conceito de sociabilidade, atentando, especialmente, para as suas apropriações e reconfigurações no que diz respeito a sua emergência no contexto das redes sociotécnicas, isto é, compreender as suas manifestações e nuances diante do cenário da sociedade da informação e em rede. Para tanto, são realizadas discussões sobre este fenômeno, articulando os debates desenvolvidos por Simmel (1983; 2000; 2006) e alguns de seus comentadores, bem como de outros autores que debatem sobre este conceito diante dos processos tecnológicos e informacionais que redimensionam as relações sociais, tais como Castells (1999; 2003), Santos e Cipryano (2014), Recuero (2008; 2009), entre outros. Com efeito, observam-se que as alterações em torno das sociabilidades engendradas em redes sociotécnicas trazem em si, apesar das reconfigurações, elementos-base de seus processos, os quais são reapropriados e favorecem a sua maior circulação e consolidação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Sociabilidade; Sociabilidade em rede; Reconfigurações.

RESUMEN:

El presente trabajo tiene como objetivo promover reflexiones sobre el concepto de sociabilidad, prestando especial atención a sus apropiaciones y reconfiguraciones en cuanto a su emergencia en el contexto de las redes sociotécnicas, es decir, comprender sus manifestaciones y matices en el contexto de la sociedad de la información y la red. Para ello, se realizan discusiones sobre este fenómeno, articulando los debates desarrollados por Simmel (1983; 2000; 2006) y algunos de sus comentaristas, así como otros autores que debaten sobre este concepto frente a procesos tecnológicos e informativos que redimensionan las relaciones sociales, como Castells (1999; 2003), Santos y Cipryano (2014), Recuero (2008; 2009), entre otros. De hecho, se observa que los cambios en torno a la sociabilidad engendrados en las redes sociotécnicas traen, a pesar de las reconfiguraciones, los elementos básicos de sus procesos, que son reapropiados y favorecen su mayor circulación y consolidación.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Sociabilidad; Sociabilidad en la red; Reconfiguraciones.