

Ancoragens de Interação em Grupos Mdiatizados: proposta quantiqualitativa¹

Interaction Anchorages in Mediatized Groups: a quantiqualitative approach

Fernando Luiz Nobre Cavalcante²

Michael Manfred Hanke³

Resumo: *Este artigo discute acerca das possíveis análises a enquadramentos temáticos debatidos por grupos mediatizados. Propõe uma matriz analítica, problematizando similitudes entre a comunicação face a face e a interação em grupos mediatizados, apoiando-se na abordagem de ancoragens de quadros de interação, cunhada por Erving Goffman. Procede a uma proposta metodológica, baseando-se no entendimento de que as funcionalidades técnicas de grupos de WhatsApp permitem identificar marcadores para análises quantiqualitativas dirigidas às Ciências da Comunicação e aos Estudos da Mídia.*

Palavras-chave: *mediatização profunda; método quantiqualitativo; análise de WhatsApp; comunicação face a face; enquadramento temático.*

Abstract: *This paper sets out a debate on the possibility of analyzing frames of relevance discussed by mediatized groups. It proposes an analytical model problematizing similarities between face to face communication and interaction into mediatized groups, based on the proposal of anchoring of interaction frames conceived by Erving Goffman. It launches a methodological proposal based on the understanding that the technical functionalities of the WhatsApp groups allow*

- 1 The article is a partially modified extract of the PhD Thesis in Media Studies of Cavalcante (2019).
- 2 Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP). Campinas, SP, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2803-5291>. E-mail: fernandocavalcante@gmail.com.
- 3 Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN). Natal, RN, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6102-7328>. E-mail: michaelhankebeaga@yahoo.com.br.

to identifying brackets for quantiquitative analysis addressed to the fields of Communication Sciences and Media Studies.

Keywords: *deep mediatization; quantiquitative method; WhatsApp analyze; communication face to face; frame of relevance*

Introduction

Recent retrievals of the symbolic interactionism of the Canadian sociologist Erving Goffman preserve two of his most important contributions. *The presentation of self in everyday life*, published in 1959, re-read by Thompson (2018), in which the concepts of *front and back stage* guide the rejuvenation of his theory and *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*, published in 1974, in which Persson (2018) dedicates himself to the reinterpretation of the frame analysis. Both essays, in conjunction with Hepp and Hasebrink (2015), ponder on the concepts undertaken by Goffman to the media and communication studies. The revision of the works of the sociologist already brought reflections about understanding media by its logic, in its format as “[...] Procedural board through which social action comes about” (SNOW; ALTHEIDE, 1979, p. 15 apud HEPP, 2013, p. 39). This written document explores the studies of frame analyses⁴, operationalizing a concept that is not discussed, but is productive for the qualiquantitative methods in investigations about media groups:⁵ The concept of interaction anchorage. The debate expressed in the article is, above all, a calling for the figurational modality of the media interactional order. Due to the format, the content-capturing lens can be less myopic.

Converging notions of media logic to the proposed social-discursive semiotics, the network of investigation titled communicative figuration⁶ proceeds to important counterposition to the media studies. From the understanding about the digital scrutinized in the communicational modalities in a comparative panorama – paying attention to processual configurations of media in the core of their historicity

4 Adopted in this article also as “thematic framework”, re-reads the original *Frame Analysis* (1986 [1974]) and the Brazilian edition *Os Quadros da Experiência Social: uma perspectiva em análise* (2012), from Editora Vozes.

5 Regarding the instant messaging communication apps, such as *WhatsApp*, *WeChat*, *Telegram*, *Slack*, *Google Hangouts* and *Facebook Messenger*.

6 The network of investigation Communicative Figurations is a group initiative from the Universities of Bremen and Hamburg with the Research Center in Media, Communication and Information (ZeMKI) and the Institute of Information Management (IFIB) at University of Bremen. <https://www.kommunikative-figurationen.de>.

(AVERBECK-LIETZ, 2014) – to the understanding of the metaprocess media, contextualizing, thus, that the stages of individualization, commercialization and globalization are permeated by numberless subprocesses of social transformation (KROTZ, 2007). In effect, the figurational approach is justified in this study by the centrality of networks of actors intertwined by the thematic framework of the media repertoire (HEPP, 2019). The term mediatization here approached instigates Brazilian researchers to the considerations of the concept of deep mediatization⁷, summarized by the focus in the centrality to the differentiation of media, exponential rise of connectivity and the quick innovative increment of media and in the process of datafication⁸ (COULDRY; HEPP, 2016; HEPP; BREITER; HASEBRINK, 2018; HEPP; 2019).

Raising the notion that the order of interaction in a mediatized group underlies the availability, criterion and the technical functionality imposed to the medium where the interaction occurs, this essays approaches the qualitative procedures coming from the ethnomethodological studies in the field of Communication Sciences and Media Studies. We find gaps to quantitative crossings, when limiting markers of interaction, named brackets of interaction, coming from the Goffmanian literary revision. We consider that the technical functionalities, permeated by the route of communication of these human groupings centered in media, scripting mimesis of language through writing, speech and gesture, being measurable brackets of opening and closing of figurative actions, centered in thematic boards of representation games.

The first section of this article approaches the interaction studies developed by Erving Goffman (2012a) to the approaches on mediatization, suggesting that the representational game purified by the thematic framings are the link between face-to-face and mediatized interaction.

7 The translation “deep mediatization” is offered by Editora Unisinos which chose for a more literal sense from Couldry and Hepp (2016) in *A Construção Mediada da Realidade*. The author did not have access to the book because the closure of the article coincided with the graphic production of the book.

8 According to Hepp, Breiter and Hasebrink (2018), citing Karanasios et al. (2013), the neologic term *datafication* refers to the growing digitization of media with software-based technology..

Later, applies the notion of interaction anchorages, coming from the Goffmanian proposition of studying boards of interaction, to the empirical evidences coming from the technical functionalities of WhatsApp groups. In the end of the second section, a methodological matrix is expressed, in the intent of guiding future quantiquitative studies focused on WhatsApp groups and other apps with similar representative features. We insist that the prominent dominion of private technology companies providing communication services among users must be extended to the independent or academic studies in the field of Communication Sciences and Media Studies.

Thematic frameworks in the figurational approach of mediatization

Thematic framework is the act of analyzing frames of interaction. In the cutout of this study, we intent to understand the intertwine of members configurates as a constellation of actors that figure in representational games dramatized to the weave of relevant themes in a mediatized group. The basis proposed by Hepp, Breiter and Hasebrink (2018) and Hepp (2019) in the figurational approach of mediatization studies have a considerable appreciation for the procedural configuration perspective, by Norbert Elias and social figuration, by Erving Goffman. The authors update these theoretical perspectives in consideration of the importance of understanding media as a communicative transmedia intertwining. Double influence re-reads concepts of how media dynamics are processed and intertwined in everyday life – inspired in the theoretic basis of figurations, in Elias (2011) – and around the incorporations of daily figurations of media – in Goffman (2012a) – expanded to the analysis of frames (*frames of relevance*) and the thematic framework. By thematic framework, we evidence the understanding, in Hepp (2019, p. 139), of the new intertwined human groupings by platform of collectivity “based in common relevance (taste) boards being mediated by platform in certain constellations of actors (HEPP, 2019, p.139, our

translation). In the inspiration of the conception of thematic framework being one of the characteristics of the figurative approach in the era of deep mediatization, Hepp and Hasebrink (2015) argue the importance of the re-reading of Goffman.

Maybe the most complex point in *communicative configurations* is the *thematic framework*. By using this term, we refer less to the “framework analysis” as it is known in the media and communication content research. Our term is much more based in the foundation of the social theory and in the analysis of frames drafted by Erving Goffman [...] (HEPP; HASEBRINK, 2015, p. 84; our highlight)

In the understanding of the analyses of conversational frames, Goffman refers to a social board as a mental scheme that allows users to organize experiences. Goffman (2012a; 2012b) supplies key elements to understand the symbolic structure in everyday interactions and take in the face-to-face dialogue communication the proper empiric nature to observe the interactive system of relationship between people – especially the position of games and roles in which the actors are positioned in the thematic cutouts of reality. Examining the ranges of everyday activities, he finds cognitive and symbolic evidences that permeate interactions of social agents. In *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, book released in 1974, the author understands a limitation that the phenomenological studies dealt about the “multiple realities” and the “province of meanings”. These modules, discussed by William James and Alfred Schutz, allowed Goffman to expand the idea of organization of experience, refusing a distinction between the reality of everyday life and the other dominions of reality. “Speaking here about “everyday life”, or, as Schutz says, the “world of fully aware practical realities”, is simply a shot in the dark” (GOFFMAN, 2012a, p. 50).

Goffman expresses, with a foundation, that the participants of a social situation move around two main questions, when daily confronted. “What is happening here?” And “In what circumstance we think that things are real?” (2012a, p. 31). This notion, in a mediatized group, is linked to the set of technical features of representation. The act of

inserting oneself or abstaining oneself from certain themes will depend on the relevance conceived to the frames of framing a certain interactional flow as thematically important or not. “The practices, the relevance boards and the power relations filled with tension within the constellation of actors are always a part of the construction of the subject (HEPP, 2019, p. 150, translation). Although he had criticism about Schutz proposition, Goffman proceeded as a persistence, giving continuity to the empirical comprehension of the need of actors of the “definition of situation” – which was initially employed by Schutz. Hanke (2018), while remembering Thomas Theorem – “If people define certain situations as real, they are real in their consequences” – are deepened in the Schutzian approach on relevance structures, the mechanism of socio-cultural incorporation of knowledge, imbricated by the dichotomy “*in-group/out-group*” (HANKE, 2018, p. 150).

The borders between the formats of organization of the “world” of daily experiences and “the world of worlds” employed by James and Schutz, under Goffman’s point of view (2012a, p. 28), even though they were fundamental for the distinction of their varied dominions of reality, were lacking the methodological plan of elaborating on the constitutive rules of daily activity. The activities are a model for the transformation that Goffman sees in the ideas on “literality”. The understanding about this concept, with the support of the boards of analyses, puts in context the idea of transformation as a process in which an everyday activity is associated to a primary model of frames, interchanged into “copies” submitted to modalization and remodelling. In a primary scheme, Goffman exemplifies that certain social frames, coming from daily scenes of surprises, prowess, messes, coincidences and jokes, transform to the touch of the interactional meeting, in other words, “literalize themselves”, creating copies of reality by the maintenance of transformed frames of interaction: copies of reality. These everyday scene convert into something significant that in other moments would be without meaning. Especially, in a mediatized group, by the technical features available, these transformations can be intensified.

The interactional order is one of the points of intersection of the parameter of comparison of the face-to-face communication of the mediatized group. By interactional order, we understand the forces of frame ritualization and vulnerability (PERSSON, 2018, p. 26). In a mediatized or physical group, it gets more notorious when the consensual work of members in understanding “what is happening here?” And “in what circumstances will this be real?” Guides the “clarification of board”, as Goffman (2012a, p. 415) points out. This complementary relation and similar dichotomy in other objects of sociologic study, for instance the Weberian concepts of charisma and rationality, follows Goffman in a methodologic optics, when vectorizing the transformative types of interaction boards. There is the second argument for the comparative scheme of this article – the singular characterization of frames.

In Goffman’s analytic proposition, the primary schemes, characterized by a particular *schemata* of interpretation – of recognizing a determined event as part of an activity – can intensify the representational similarities of a theatrical board by the transformations of frameworks, from the levels where the actors are more familiarized with the codes of interaction, titled keys⁹ to the fabrications, in which, by an asymmetrical relation, at least one of the actors does not know the conventions of interaction. In other words, in addition to instrumentalizing the empirical instruments in distinction of fabrication and interactional keys, the sociologist punctuates the third analytical prism, titled layerings, which intensifies the dramatic scripting of a re-keyed frame, being re-transformed by internal laminations (side-by-side keys) or external (bigger complexity of fabrications). What characterizes the quanti-qualitative proposition of this article are the markers to identify the formation of frames, titled by Goffman as anchorages or brackets, delimitators of a scene, announcer of the beginning of finishing and frameworks (GOFFMAN, 1986 [1974]; NUNES, 1993; GOFFMAN, 2012a; PERSSON, 2018; CAVALCANTE, 2019). The next section opens up the second

9 Assumed by Goffman (2012a, p. 72) as a set of norms referring to the terms “keys”. Made viable by the processo f transcription called *keying* and *rekeying*.

argument of comparison between face-to-face communication and mediated communication, according to what was proposed in this article, materializing the delimitations, anchorages, into technical features of WhatsApp, in order to find the frames conceptualized by Goffman.

Although taken as a great empirical source of elements of face-to-face interaction contained in stories extracted from American mainstream newspaper, popular books and biographies, comic books, scripts from theatric plays and other materials for literary critics, as well as everyday conversations, Goffman has inspired the comprehension of frame studies to media studies (PERSSON, 2018; MACKENZIE, 2019; PUENTE BIENVENIDO, BRUNA, 2019). Bringing the new branches of mediatization in his study defies the barriers *quali versus quanti* imposed in his time. As much as Goffman's observations are strictly qualitative, the fixation in understanding patterns impules this experiment to reapply these concepts. Within the Goffmanian proposition to mediatized groups, the interactional orders of vulnerabilities of frames of collective experiences, easily can conduct the actors of scene – and the researcher immersed in the group – illusion, delirium or mistake, as reminded by Goffman (2012a, p. 545). The smaller the amount of information of frames of interaction, the smaller is the chance of vulnerability of ruptures. This order can also occur in mediatized groups. The “closest” the group is, the more definable their conduct system tends to be, imbuing a proportional relationship between vulnerability and rituality as transformative forces of thematic frameworks. In generically opened groups, the chances of fragmentation of boards are higher. Even so, the application of the proposed anchorages will apply.

Quanti-qualitative vectors for studies of interaction anchorage in WhatsApp groups

This section is dedicated to conceptualizing the interaction anchorage as markers to everyday literacy, reinvigorating the Goffmanian conceptualization of parenthesis or anchorages (brackets) to interactions

ARTIGO

in mediatized groups. The notion of mediatized group as associated to the figurational approach is reinforced. Seen as a space where computer-mediated communication occurs in the context of deep mediatization divided by a constellation of actors, their communicational practices intertwined and the media repertoires and thematic frameworks of “tastes” and identifications. Therefore, a mediatized group is the front stage for the yes and the no of the thematic dynamism of interactional relations. The imperative hypothesis of this article is that the technical features of medium are masters of strength of transformation of an interactional order, precisely about the vulnerabilities and ritualities of their representational uses in the communicational process.

From end to end, the interactional order of the group is figured by continuous thematic frameworks to the game of balance between ritualization and vulnerability. One interaction in the WhatsApp app can occur since there's a contact with the data of the agenda in the mobile phone of a person. The intention of the act of saving a telephonic contact can give clues of imminent scenes of interaction. Getting in touch with a third party, this act precedes the formation of the board. It also happens, since the signed contact until the contrary act, that the exclusion of contact can mean a rupture of the imminent board. In a group, the direct communication with a contact, either saved or not, is conducted by the “@”, followed by a number identification. Something similar happens when you enter a WhatsApp group, due to the fact of a link have a access key, to then, use a number of features available with the intent of establishing a connection with one or more humans of interaction. By tapping, the user can choose, from hypertextual elements of computer writing, to audio recording or image registry through photos and videos. In the second touch, followed by the vulnerability, with the breach of link, there's the rupture of the group interactional order. This differentiation of message format guarantees the first vector of analysis proposed in the work reported.

The Goffmanian anchorages of report of participating or leaving an interaction by i) Gossips of “see by the one who saw”; ii) Voyeurisms

of “look without anyone looking”; and iii) Espionage of “read without anyone seeing”, today, are delivered to media features. These boil down an interaction formed by text messages, sound or images, anchored to the possibilities of visualizing the status of typing and reading messages. The status of typing, such as notifications and message data, are also a technical feature that allows the actor to follow or not the dynamic of interaction. It is proposed to find patterns on what is considered anchorage of manners upon which the definition of situation of interactional order can be ritualized by the actor of a mediatized group. The technical features of status, data reading and types of messages are here considered quanti-qualitative delimitations. More than the establishment of the interior character of a frame, as observing everyday scenes, Goffman assured in his proposition of frame analysis a bigger attention to rituals (as rules) of interaction through the prism of content format, of the “definition of situation”.¹⁰ The sociologist argues recurring to the word ritual by understanding that his system of rules would depend of the ways in which the person was aware, when shaping symbolic meanings of their acts (PERSSON, 2019, p. 31). Identifying them, categorizing them in text, image and audio of an interaction of a mediatized group, also reinforced the definition of forms of communication, core of the approach of communicative figuration, as seen in the section immediately before this one.

The expression of differentiation of formats (text, image and audio) can anchor the frames to be qualitatively analyzed after the first quantitative crossing through categorization in useful and useless messages – in which useful would mean textual components – and omitted messages (emitted by notifications of the group system). The interpretation of structural base of a text in a message will be the parameter to study the formulations, keys and layerings of the process of transformation of the interactional board. It is recommended defining a calculus for the textually analyzable messages (useful), composed by textual characters

10 In the foreword of *Frame analysis*, Bennett Berger understands that “‘defining the situation’, shaped the meanings generated” (GOFFMAN, 1986 [1974]).

of any type, from there pondering average, median and standard deviation of the amount of textual characters per message. The two following crossings come from this definition to understand the variations proposed by the bracket scheme. $Qty_Charact_Total = Total\ of\ characters\ of\ the\ message$

The anchorage of shapes are quantifiable internal parenthesis for qualitative framework, suggested by the investigation of types of incidence of messages of an interaction tensioned by the rituals of observing the functionalities of notifications and status of reading of a message. The emission of any type of message sent to a group can be anchorable to a imminent board, through the features of notification and information about the data that a user can come to use. The total incidence of messages, categorized under textual, sound or image, in the long term of a mediatized interaction – pondered the qualitative evidence around notifications, status of typing and reading the messages received by the actors – are markers of a figurative scene. This is translated by the frequency of message exchange in a group, anchored by the features of status and notifications in WhatsApp.

The second vector of analysis is regarding the transformational depth of interactional boards, observing the (re)transformation of a thematic framework, contextualizing what Goffman used to call as layerings. It is the act of rekeying a previous key or re-transforming in a complex formulation. In other words, intensifying the vulnerability of a board in ambiguities, complicating the effort of framing the participants. What is the intention of sending this link? Was it ironic, the use of this symbol? Why did they emphasize my name in the group? Should I send an e-mail now? These are some of the questions that, by the incidence of anchorage of layering, may arise by the participants, making the board more blurred than it would be.

The symbologic network of WhatsApp is permeated by emoticons or emojis which, beyond their multiple meanings, in its significant are neologisms resulting from the fusion between the words (SAMPIETRO, 2016) emotion and icon in English for the first definition and

resulting from the fusion between image and characters in Japanese for the second one. Nine categories of emojis are on WhatsApp currently, totalizing around 110 options of symbols: people, animals, foods, sports, means of transportation, electronics, signals and flags. Emojis follow the Unicode pattern, which allows a computer code system to manipulate, read and interpret every symbol used, therefore, it can vary according to each mobile operational system. *Stickers* – customizable stickers – are images in their essence, however, they denote the same symbology of an emoji. They express emotion or denote the instants of mood variations of a personality. Constantly, the company increments innovations in their technical features, for instance, what happened in 2017, with the status feature, which contains messages (text or static/moving image) with a 24h duration, available to all contacts saved in the mobile phone book of a user.

Emails, links (“www...”), symbols (*emojis/stickers*) and contact mentions (“@Fulano”), in this study, are gathered as potentializing elements of anchorage of a mediatised interaction. Specifically, these are anchorages for the framework of layering, potentially reproducing keys or complex fabrications, as defined in the previous section. Layering are internal or external re-tonalizations. Both are anchorages of interaction by being delimited to the scene of the board and practicing them. Being technical features, they announce and express representational acts, a link of the act of pointing to a external path, the use of emojis of expressing emotions or gestures, a “@someone” when approaching the actor of the contact. As mimic technique of language, they are disposed as markers of internal activities in a stage. “In fact, players and the equipment used in very different activities can employ the same service in an intimate intertwining of use” (GOFFMAN, 2012a, p. 310). They are like frames, according to Goffman, because they shape the interaction board as form, but also interfere as content of the board. “These markers, such as a wooden frame in a painting, are presumably not a part of the external world of activities, but are before both things, internal and externa, an oxymoronic condition [...]” (GOFFMAN, 2012a, p. 312).

They are timely anchorage of openings and closings and special delimitating anchorages.

In a mediatized interactional order, as a gesture of face-to-face communication, a certain emoji can be a marker of the beginning of a thematic board (and thematizable). By an interactional anchorage, these markers call a certain representational board and are permeated by strips of activities, such as a “[...] Flow of activity in course, including here the sequence of events” (GOFFMAN, 2012a), relevant to a certain constellation of actors in a mediatized group. Being a WhatsApp, in the condition of emoji replacing a gesture in the intention of communicating with two or more people, there can have patterns marked by this determined set of emojis. A lot of hearts sent in a certain month, in comparison of a six-month interaction, for instance, can mean something relevant, a significant board of a determined theme. The use of this emoticon can also anchor external laminations, in other words, very complex fabrications related to the use of ambiguities, of power relations or evidence of illusion or self-illusion – called vulnerability to the Goffmanian notion. We reinforce that an emoji can also be shown as an element of Goffmanian ritualization in the group – permeated by normalization, exaggeration and simplification, as synthesized by Persson (2018, p. 34), while summarizing the concept of ritualization in Goffman’s works. Quantitatively, we can see that in the hypothetical period focused there were a bigger standard deviation of emoji characters. Qualitatively, the same period can be the symbolic intensification of messages about Valentine’s Day. Thematically, frames about this date were permeated by heart emojis in a ordinary June marked by short gaps between the exchanged messages. This is the exercise proposed in the few lines allowed to the study on relation.

Understanding the stages of (re)transformations of boards by vulnerability and ritualities, categorizing them in fabrications and key frames via re-tonalizations in layers, qualitatively, may demand the process of separating “the bad from the good”, of anchorable elements by layering symbology of expression, for instance, emojis in the underlying text.

This hypothetical and minuscule framework will help in the comprehension. “*Are u going to the party tonight?* (Actor 1); www.linkoftheparty.com (Actor 1) “👤” (Actor 2); Silence in the group”. In the three strips of activities occurred, including the silence in the mediatized group, if there were a pattern in this type of communication by the actor, there possible might have an insight that that was a relevant frame. How does this pattern can be seen? By the practice of data mining, through the feature “export chat” which WhatsApp (still¹¹) allows the researcher to do. In the following scheme, two calculations will help delimitate¹² frames for qualitative readings. The example given of the minuscule frame, quantitatively, can be read: “[Text character] (Code for Actor 1); [Symbol character] (Code for Actor 1); [Symbol character]” (Code for Actor 2), [Long gap].” This structure can be recurring in the group and the pattern will be more concise if it is more generic. This datatization of interactional nature may be one of the most clear characteristics of deep mediatization. Other than that, the possibility of seeing in the constellation of actors of the group of actors of those in the example repertoire of the media, becoming available since reading links, intrinsic in the approach of communicative figuration. “Therefore, it becomes clear that we can only properly understand the internal dynamic of information repertoire if we also pay attention to the inter relation of their representations” (HEPP, 2019, p. 95; translated).

Four applications gather the concept in internal and external layering to the anchorage of boards of interaction. In a WhatsApp group, calling a participant by his/her name, set in “@someone”; the extensions of intention pronounced by the reference to links in their [www](#); the direct directioning to the center of the contact contained in the presumption of emails extended to future relations of their “@”; and the components, par excellence, of the dramatic scripting, symbols or emojis of “=)”

11 In Germany, this function was deactivated in 2020. That opens a long debate on the Laws for Protection of Personal Data, something that this article will not cover.

12 We recommend delimitating eventual patterns initially for data mining of a a computer file of “txt” extension, processed by a software of data modeling such as Microsoft Power BI (paid) or open code *softwares (free)* such as *Python* or *R*.

randomly distributed, are new configurations of laminations. Internal, considered in the result of the quantitative formula. External, excluded in order to preserve the model of a supposed “mediatized face to face interaction”. The calculation of quantity of net characters (Qty_{net_char}), which excludes calls (Qty_{char_call}), links (Qty_{char_links}), e-mails (Qty_{char_emails}) and characters of emoji or symbols ($Qty_{char_emoji/symbol}$) out of the total quantity of characters. Excludes to firm the anchorages that these anchorable elements can layer in a board to be debated:

Beyond the anchorage layering, increase the importance of seeing a text for its lexical aspect, without interference of numbers, punctuation or laughter. Formulations and keys are possibilities of transformation through which primary boards go, in Goffman’s understanding. The article would not comprise these specificities, but these are some of the examples of these transformations: Make believe, competitions, ceremonies, technical reconstitutions and repositions are examples of keys of a board. Playful mistakes, tricks, vital proof, paternal elaborations, deceit, forged proof are examples of the formulations analyzed by Goffman. In a mediatized interactional board, that can be observed by the structure of message composition. Initial and final words, therefore, may give tone and formulation to a thematic framework. This is the third analytical proposition of the study. We understand, in this step, that is the opportunity of explicating formulations and keys of actors in a mediatized group. A formula is proposed to identify the textual integrality of messages exchanged with the potential of elements of formulation and keys by the actors.

The amount of textual characters of a message, in the third proposition for the quali and quanti crossing of the analysis of anchorage is tensioned to the composition of the initial and final words of the announcements of entrance and exit to exemplify the mining of the intent of formula. To analyze the big picture of a message in a WhatsApp group requires detailing in its content by qualitative methodologies. Cutting out frames, however, talks about the complexity of timely diffused and

fragmented messages of a group interaction. Unifying lexical meanings to the textual whole, can be proceeded in this perspective. Understanding that initial and final words are anchor announcement of a debate is assuming a centrality in the analytical body to be modelled in the field of analysis. Therefore, it becomes necessary to delimitate, parallel to the qualitative depth, quantitative spectrums here considered as the amount of text characters. This calculation must maintain the integrality of a message, since it considers only the analyzable text, grammatical and lexically, The amount of text characters deepens the purity of a message – that in the sense of excluding the brands of benign formulations, specifically the playful mistakes and the alleged keys referring to jokes , both belonging to the Goffmanian conception of anchorage of boards of interaction. The net amount of characters, matter settled ahead, excludes calls, links, e-mails and emojis or symbols. The proposition of quantity of text characters results in the subtraction of laughter characters (for instance, “he” “ha” “lol”), punctuation (for example: “:”), “?”, “.”, “!”) and numbers (“0”, “13”, “2020”).

The final application on the contextualization of anchorages related to the time of the interaction can be extended to future studies. A mediatised group is constituted of a full collection for the organization of the experience of subjects involved in a purely interactive representation. The fourth vector of structuration of thematic frames in mediatised environments can be anchored by time patterns – both by the speed of the interaction and the intervals of silences in a group. In the intervals of the interaction, categorized in silence or pauses that denote the time speed of the interactive sequence, by the quantitative prism, months, days of the week and time can also be compared. According to this understanding, the short or long intervals, synthetized in silences, can be tangencialized to thematic frames that evidence i) a source of involvement of the constellation of actors in the board in which they are emerged; ii) a rupture of the board, literal or partial; and iii) an arrangement of omission of the internal acts of the interaction by the focus on the external outside the board. These contextualize the notion that:

“The issue of the internal brackets can be approached examining the way of handling time in dramatic scripts” (GOFFMAN, 2012a, p. 329).

With the intention of contributing with future studies about anchorages, the following board synthesizes the applications that the study of these discursive elements, traceable through the technical features of WhatsApp, can allow methodologically through quantiquality biases.

Board - quanti-qualitative proposition of mediatised anchorages

Convergence of the Media and Face-to-Face Interactional Order	Mediatized Anchorages	Quantitative evidences	Qualitative evidences
Modalities of attention	Text, sound, image and videos exchanged	Quantity of types of messages	Distinction of text messages, images and sounds
Layerings	Keywords in a message and “call characters”, “links characters”; “e-mail characters”; e “symbol characters”.	Quantity of net characters	Transformational depth of boards of interaction
Formulations and Keys	Initial and final words and “Laughter characters”, “Punctuation characters” and “number characters”	Quantity of text characters	Structure of textual formation of messages of na interaction
Time elements	Silence and pauses	Quantitative of messages with super-fast, fast, regular, lengthy and short and long breaks	Comprehension of time of interactions of the participants and period

Source: Own adapted elaboration from Cavalcante (2019).

Conclusion

Understanding a constellation of actors with the support in relevance boards in its modalities of communication, by its repertoires of media summarizes the synthesis of the proposition of this experiment. Researching in hoc sensu, a mediatized group, implies understanding how their members are rearranged being configured in network. In addition, it becomes necessary to observe the figurative-representational game of this constellation of actors along with the boards of relevance that are intertwined to their media repertoires in everyday life. We therefore justify the choice of this article for deepening the concept of thematic framework to Goffmanian readings, extracting from his theory empirical evidences, especially, when relating those to technical functionalities of mediatized groups as detectable markers that prepare a representational game settled to media in new human agglomerations. Future work can use the analytical categories explored in the concepts of anchorage of interaction and understand the limitation and amplitudes that the technical features of other instant communication apps can offer in the analysis of mediatized groups.

The media research with the quanti-qualitative methodological technique makes the analysis of statistics or linguistics close and far from the barriers that for decades separated theoretical currents. Such perspectives are conducted by the processual line of observation within the research. By the four propositions of anchorages of interaction, a set of data of a mediatized group can be converted into observations made fruitful and qualifiable. These frame delimitation strategies by quantitative biases can be considered triangulable counterposed notions of anchorage under qualitative techniques. As much as this article did not dive in analysis of content of the set of information processed by the calculation of the net quantity of characters, here we point paths so that in future studies, these points can be deepened.

By the internal brackets of anchorage of a mediatized interaction, we retrieve the idea that i) modalities of attention per receiving notification, along with the possibility of visualization of status of typing and reading

the types of messages of the actors in the mediatized group, text, sound or image; ii) transformational depth of boards of interaction; iii) initial and final words of entries and exits of a message; and iv) silence and pauses in a mediatized interaction, standardly can be observed through the perspective of a portrait quanti-qualitatively triangulated.

In the glimpse of the post-human data-driven storytelling, we expect that this study adjusts the effort of free software communities, especially R and Python, that have been developing a plausible work in the free computational packs available for WhatsApp analysis. We also want that this proposition adds to the research on frames of relevance in figurations that threatened democracy.

Referências

- AVERBECK-LIETZ, S. Understanding mediatization in “first modernity”: Sociological classics and their perspectives on mediated and mediatized societies. In: *Mediatization of Communication*, v. 21, p. 109, 2014.
- BUZATO, M. E. K. Dadificação, visualização e leitura do mundo: quem fala por nós quando os números falam por si? *Revista Linguagem em Foco*, v. 10, n. 1, p. 83-83, 2018.
- CAVALCANTE, Fernando Luiz Nobre. *Vínculos de ancoragens e enquadramentos temáticos: olhares itinerantes às interações midiáticas em grupo*. 2019. 292 f. Tese (Doutorado) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos da Mídia, Centro de Ciências Humanas, Letras e Artes, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, 2019. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufrn.br/jspui/handle/123456789/28635>. Acesso em: 31 maio 2020.
- COULDRY, N.; HEPP, A. *The Mediated Construction of Reality*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.
- DOYLE, K. Facebook, Whatsapp and the Commodification of Affective Labour. *Communication, Politics & Culture*, 2015.
- ELIAS, Norbert. *Introdução à Sociologia*. 3. ed. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2011.
- GOFFMAN, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books, 1959.
- GOFFMAN, E. *Frame Analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1986 [1974].
- GOFFMAN, E. *Os Quadros da Experiência Social: Uma perspectiva de análise*. Tradução: Gentil A. Titton. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012a.
- GOFFMAN, E. *Ritual de Interação: Ensaio sobre o comportamento face a face*. Tradução: Fábio Rodrigues. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012b.
- HANKE, M. Truth as Objectified Knowledge in In-Groups. *Schutzian Research. A Yearbook of Lifeworldly Phenomenology and Qualitative Social Science*, n. 10, p. 141-153, 2018.

- HEPP, A. *Culture of Mediatization*. Tradução: Keith Tribe. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.
- HEPP, A. The communicative figurations of mediatized worlds: mediatization research in times of the “mediation of everything”. *MATRIZES*, v. 8, n. 1, p. 45-64, 24 jun. 2014.
- HEPP, A. *Deep Mediatization: Key Ideas in Media & Cultural Studies*. [s.l.] Routledge, 2019.
- HEPP, A.; BREITER, A.; HASEBRINK, U. (ed.). *Communicative Figurations: Transforming Communications in Times of Deep Mediatization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- HEPP, A.; HASEBRINK, U. Interação Humana e Configurações Comunicativas: transformações culturais e sociedades midiaticizadas. Parágrafo: *Fiam-Faam*, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 3, p. 75-89, 2015. Disponível em: <http://revistaseletronicas.fiamfaam.br/index.php/recicofi/issue/view/46>. Acesso em: 10 out. 19.
- KARANASIOS, S.; DHAVALKUMAR, T.; LAU, L.; ALLEN, D.; DIMITROVA, V.; NORMAN, A. Making sense of digital traces: An activity theory driven ontological approach. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64 (12): 2452-2467, 2013.
- KROTZ, Friedrich. The Meta-Process of ‘Mediatization’ as a Conceptual Frame. *Global Media and Communication*, 3(3): 256-260, 2007.
- NUNES, João Arriscado. A Análise de Quadros e a Sociologia da Vida Quotidiana. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, Coimbra, n. 37, p. 33-49, jun. 1993. Disponível em: <http://hdl.handle.net/10316/11598>. Acesso em: 22 jan. 2020.
- PERSSON, A. *Framing social interaction: Continuities and cracks in Goffman’s Frame Analysis*. [s.l.] Taylor & Francis, 2018.
- PUENTE BIENVENIDO, H.; BRUNA, C. S. Mirada sociológica al *software* lúdico: la dramaturgia de Erving Goffman en los videojuegos. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, [s. l.], n. 166, p. 135-151, 2019. Disponível em: http://www.reis.cis.es/REIS/PDF/REIS_157_041483963221459.pdf. Acesso em: 16 mai. 2019.
- SAMPIETRO, A. Emoticonos y multimodalidad. El uso del pulgar hacia arriba en WhatsApp. *Aposta. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, n. 69, p. 271-295, 2016.
- SNOW, R.; ALTHEIDE, D. *Media logic*. [s.l.] Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1979.
- THOMPSON, J. Mediated interaction in the digital age. *MATRIZES*, v. 12, n. 3, p. 17-44, 26 dez. 2018.

About the authors

Fernando Luiz Nobre Cavalcante – PhD in Media Studies and researcher associated to the post-doctorate program in the Department of Applied Linguistics at UNICAMP. In the present article, the author participated in the theoretical-methodological outline, typing and revision of the text.

Michael Manfred Hanke - Professor in Communication Sciences (1998, Essen, Alemanha) and PhD in Languages (1991, Dr. phil., University of Essen). Professor at the Graduate Program of Media Studies at UFRN. In the present article, the author participated in the tutorship and supervision of the PhD thesis in Media Studies that originated this study.

Date of submission: 16/12/2019

Date of acceptance: 31/05/2020