POSSIBILITIES AND OBSTACLES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL MEDIA PROFILES BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES IN THE SOUTHEAST REGION OF BRAZIL

Cristiane Brum Bernardes[1]

Abstract: Through in-depth interviews, the study analyzes how the concepts of e-transparency and e-participation are mobilized by the teams that manage the institutional social media profiles of the four legislative assemblies of the Southeast Region of Brazil. From the statements made by the managers of the processes of digitization of legislative houses, it is perceived that the possibilities of communication opened by social media can contribute to the expansion and improvement of the relationship between parliamentarians and citizens. It is also analyzed how the difficulties reported by the teams serve as a warning for good practices in the area.

Keywords: Digital Democracy; Digital Parliament; Legislative Assemblies; Legislatures; Parliaments & Internet.

1 Introduction

The relationship between Democracy and the Internet, or digital technologies, has been widely discussed in various fields of knowledge for at least 20 years. As Gomes (2018) points out, if there is an increasing digitalization of life and a respective expansion of the functions performed by digital environments, including mobility and hyperconnectivity as central trends of the last decade, it would not make sense to think that the world of politics would also not be affected by these processes. Like other social tasks, activities relevant to public life are also being carried out through the digital world at an increasing speed. Therefore, if the internet moved from the age of information to the age of communication and networking production (JENSEN, 2013), it makes sense that the aim of this study is on the strategies for technological use that Brazilian subnational parliaments adopt on the so-called "social network sites" (BOYD & ELLISON, 2008)[2].

In this social context, the term Digital Democracy was broadly defined by Simon et al. as "the practice of democracy using digital tools and technologies" (2017, p. 11). In a similar sense, Gomes points out that the expression designates "(...) the set of resources, tools, projects, experiments, experiences, and initiatives in which technologies are used to produce more

[1] Professor and researcher for the Master in Legislatures at CEFOR. PhD in Political Science (IESP/UERJ). Master in Communication and Information (UFRGS). Member of the National Institute of Science and Technology in Digital Democracy (INCT-DD). Associate researcher at the Center for Public Engagement at the University of Leeds (United Kingdom).

[2] According to boyd and Ellison (2008), SOCIAL NETWORK SITES are internet services that allow individuals 1) to construct a public profile within a bounded system, 2) articulate a list of other users with whom they want to connect, and 3) view and browse their contact list and the list of others within the system.

democracy and better democracies" (2018, s/p).

Among the researchers dedicated to the theme, Margetts (2013) recalls the influence of digital technologies on electoral processes and the role of parties in the contemporary panorama, in addition to the use that social movements, interest groups, governments, and parliaments have made of the tools at their disposal. The author points out that parliaments, while being slower in adopting technology, are already the target of several transformations caused by it, such as increased transparency and the possibility of popular participation in decisions (MARGETTS, 2013, p. 425).[3]

If contemporary research deals largely with e-transparency and e-participation, as Gomes (2018) notes, it is interesting to think how these issues are being worked on internally by the institutions that conform to the representative democratic regimes: Parliaments. Therefore, the objective of this article is to understand how these two dimensions are articulated in the practice of Brazilian subnational legislatures, specifically from the discourse of the managers of the institutional profiles of legislative houses on social media platforms.

Considering the variety of studies already conducted on the strategies of digitization and the use of the internet by national parliaments (BRAGA, 2008; FARIA, 2012; BARROS et al. 2015; BARROS et al. 2016; MENDONÇA; PEREIRA, 2016; MITOZO, 2018), the focus here is on the practices of four subnational houses located in the Southeast Region: Legislative Assembly of the State of Minas Gerais (ALMG), Legislative Assembly of the State of São Paulo (ALESP), Legislative Assembly of the State of Espírito Santo (ALES), and Legislative Assembly of the State of Rio de Janeiro (ALERJ).

The comparison between the initiatives and strategies of state assemblies in the same country region allows us to assess whether there are state differences that justify different approaches in the use of technologies by these houses, or if the differences are more due to the discursive strategies chosen by political actors to deal with the new reality of digital political engagement, from different organizational scenarios. It is worth mentioning research scarcity on the institutional dynamics of state or even municipal legislatures in the country on social media, despite the comparative possibility they offer (LUCINDA, 2016; LUCINDA & BERTASSO 2017; JÚLIO NETO, 2019).

We chose the Southeast Region because it gathers the largest population contingent in the country and sustains relevant internet access rates. According to IBGE[4] data, the three most populous Brazilian states are in the region: São Paulo, with 46 million inhabitants, Minas Gerais, with 21.2 million, and Rio de Janeiro, with 17.2 million. Espírito Santo, with only 4 million inhabitants, completes the region. Counting 88.4 million inhabitants, the Southeast holds more than 42% of the

[3] The categorization by Sampaio et al. (2019) on the "democratic value" of Digital Democracy initiatives seems interesting for our analysis as well. We will return to that point later.

[4] Population data were extracted from the projections made by the Brazilian National Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) available at https://www.ibge.gov.br/apps/populacao/projecao/index.html, accessed on Nov. 8th, 2019.

Brazilian population. Regarding the percentage of internet use in Brazil, the 2017 PNAD showed that, in the region, 81.1% of households use the internet, while the national index for 2017 was 74.9% of households.

The three most populous Brazilian states also have the largest constituencies: São Paulo accounts for 22.5% of voters, Minas Gerais for 10.6%, and Rio de Janeiro for 8.4%. Together with Espírito Santo, which has 1.9% of Brazilian voters, the Region is responsible for 43.4% of the votes in the country. Consequently, since the number of elected representatives for the Legislative is proportional to the population of each electoral district, they also hold the largest seats in the Chamber of Deputies and the largest state legislatures in number of parliamentarians: 94 in São Paulo, 77 in Minas Gerais and 70 in Rio de Janeiro. In Espírito Santo, the assembly has 30 state deputies.

The collection of empirical data was carried out between August 2018 and November 2019, based on the application of in-depth interviews with the legislative houses' digital communication managers. The interviews with those responsible for managing the profiles on ALMG and Alerj social media were conducted between August 2018 and January 2019, while the profile managers of ALES and Alesp were interviewed in October 2019.

It is important to highlight that this study is part of broader research on the social media of the four legislative houses mentioned. Thus, comparative analyzes of posting content in the official profiles of the institutions on Facebook and Twitter have already been carried out and are in their final phase. The aim of this article, therefore, is the institutional discourse analysis on the use of social media produced by the managers of these tools, civil servants of parliaments. How the management of these tools is carried out, as well as the concepts and opinions expressed by the employees in charge of this task, help to explain the choices and dilemmas faced by the teams and, consequently, illuminate the consequences of those processes in the published contents.

After this introduction, the second item provides a brief theoretical overview of the studies related to the theme. In the sequence, the information collected in the interviews with the managers is compared with authors who analyze the institutional practices of parliaments in social media under two aspects: possibilities and obstacles to its use. At the end, we proposed a reflection on the practice of the studied parliaments from the concepts of e-transparency and e-participation, axes of this analysis.

2 Digitization of Parliament

In the space of more than a decade, in several countries, several authors have dedicated themselves to understanding the relations of parliamentarians with citizens through social media outside electoral periods (WILLIAMSON, 2009; ARAÚJO; GONZÁLEZ, 2011; SAEBO, 2011; TÚÑEZ; SIXTO, 2011; VIANA; OLIVEIRA, 2011; BRAGA; CRUZ, 2012; CONTREIRAS, 2012; ALMEIDA, 2014; LARSSON; KALSNES, 2014; MARQUES; AQUINO; MIOLA,

2014A; 2014B; BARROS ET AL., 2015; GEBER; SCHERER , 2015; NICOLÁS; BRAGA, 2015; TAVARES; QUIROGA, 2015; AMARAL, 2016; LARSSON, 2016; ALMEIDA, 2017; ARAÚJO; TRAVIESO-RODRÍGUEZ; SANTOS, 2017; COOK, 2017; LEV-ON; PORAT; LEHMAN-WILZIGIG , 2017; PESSONI; SANTOS, 2018; PEREIRA; SANTOS; BERNARDES, 2019; ALMEIDA ET AL., 2020). To a lesser extent, some researchers have also focused on the use of social media by parliamentary institutions, in comparative studies between national (PORTILLO; FERNANDEZ, 2013; GIRALDO-LUQUE ET AL., 2017) and subnational (MENDONÇA; PEREIRA, 2016; MUSTAFA; SHARIFOV, 2018; RODRÍGUEZ-ANDRÉS; ÁLVAREZ-SABALEGUI, 2018) parliaments.

In addition to institutional practice, the socio-political landscape has also changed with the social uses of technology. The process of acquiring political information (MARGETTS, 2013, p. 427), for example, has been strongly affected by the Internet, especially with the social network sites proliferation. Democratizing the dissemination of information, creating alternative sources, expanding deliberative processes, influencing voting, and increasing political participation are other changes observed (MARGETTS, 2013, p. 428-429).

Defender of the Democracy concept expressed by Beetham, which includes popular control and the political equality of this control, Margetts states that the Internet can ease how citizens obtain information, engage, and influence democratic institutions (2013, p. 431). However, unlike what researchers expected in the 20th century, income and educational inequalities are reinforced in the digital context, making equality in the exercise of political control difficult.

Regarding transparency, Zuccolotto and Teixeira emphasize that it is a necessary condition "so that the people can exercise interaction with representatives, control them and, at the end of the representation cycle, exercise negative power" (2019, p. 13-14). Conceming the disclosure of information by governments to internal and external actors, the concept is based on three currents of precursor ideas: "the government must act according to predictable and stable rules, communication must be frank and open with society, and there must be ways to make both the organization and society knowable" (ZUCCOLOTTO; TEIXEIRA, 2019, p. 20). They also add that the technological development of information and communication technologies and the improvement of the levels of democracy in the world caused the extension of the term's importance in the 20th century, leading governments to adopt laws of opening and transparency, both at national and subnational levels (ZUCCOLOTTO; TEIXEIRA, 2019, p. 33), and public institutions to develop, initially, initiatives for electronic transparency, and later, digital – the e-transparency.

In a way, e-transparency would be a necessary condition so that citizens' e-participation processes together with decision-making bodies can take place, which means citizens can effectively influence political decisions. Thus, according to the categorization proposed by

Sampaio et al. (2019), e-transparency would be related to the categories 1. Monitoring of accounts, construction works, and policies; 2. Open data; 3. Monitoring of representatives; and 4. Information and education for citizenship, while e-participation relates to the activities of 5. Expression of civil claim; 6. Participation; and 7. Deliberation. It is important to note that in the contemporary context, the "e" before the terms, which means electronic, can be easily replaced by "digital".

The concepts of e-transparency, which imply a greater visibility of public institutions information and results in open data and e-participation policies, activities of expression of interests, popular opinions about the State, and popular influence on political decisions, are inserted in the reflections of Margetts (2013) and Sampaio et al. (2019). But how do these two dimensions appear in the discourse mobilized by the managers of digital practices of the legislative houses?

Leston-Bandeira (2007), in a classic study on the digitization of Parliaments, raises three fundamental functions of digital processes that connect to the classic functions exercised by legislatures in representative regimes:

a) Creating new communicative possibilities with different audiences and promoting closer ties with the citizen – REPRESENTATION AND EDUCATION;
b) Disseminating information in an agile and inexpensive way, promoting transparency and public control – LEGISLATION AND MONITORING;
c) Making internal management processes more efficient, increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of bureaucracy – INTERNAL ORGANIZATION.

From the parliamentary functions enumerated by Leston-Bandeira, it is clear that concerns about the transparency and dissemination of legislative information, as a basis for the processes of representation, education and inspection, and the political participation of citizens in the decision-making process – which supports representation and legislation – must also be part of the Parliaments' digitalization process. Otherwise, the performance of parliamentary functions may be hampered.

An example of how these two concerns can be translated into digital initiatives is the Citizen Relationship Bank created by ALMG. The Institutional Relations Manager of the Minas Gerais assembly, Daniela Santiago Mendes Menezes, cited the experience as an attempt to create actions that arouse society's interest in the Legislative House. Through this system, citizens customize their access to the information available on different digital platforms of the House, expanding their range of available data about the institution. For example, the citizen can check in the commission and immediately start receiving the different information produced by the different sectors on that specific subject, following the different stages of the legislative process and the different decisions made within Parliament. The manager highlights:

> We have a great relationship with organized civil society, the system suited to expand this relationship with the citizen as an individual. To facilitate the relationship with the citizens, we ask them to authorize and change these authorizations through the portal; that is, citizens themselves control the licenses for the services. The technological part is already done, and the bank allows regular delivery of information products in a customized way, through a connection between the different House's systems (MENEZES, 2018, without pagination).

The manager's explanation shows that legislative houses are finding it necessary to expand their contact with citizens, in addition to members of interest and pressure groups, constant users of the new digital systems. Can the strategy reduce the disparities reported by Margetts, especially between organized civil society groups and socially dispersed citizens, concerning the power they have to influence political decisions? As Menezes points out,

> I think this is the path to Public Communication. Of course, this citizen is already interested in politics, is clear about its fields of interest, and already manages the internet. It would be what we call a "hot audience", which is already closer to Parliament and the political issues (MENEZES, 2018, no pagination).

The mention of the concept of Public Communication reveals a perception of the importance of advertising and the visibility of political decisions so that the population can, at least, position itself on them, which has a very close relationship with e-transparency and its normative justifications, mentioned above. However, it does not seem that digital initiatives are sufficient to end inequalities in popular control under Beentham and Margetts terms.

Specifically, about social media, Sunstein (2018) argues that they make it easier for people to obtain information and communicate it to others due to its dissemination to other social groups. According to the author, social media are a work in progress because they constantly evolve, and there are always new entrants within a collaborative logic of content production.

Therefore, do social media allow legislative houses to deepen this contact with citizens and expand e-transparency? Could it be that through them a citizen who is not normally interested in the institutional tools created by parliaments can get in touch with the representative institution and, through their participation, influence Parliament's decision-making directions? The next item specifically deals with the possibilities opened up by the use of social media by Parliaments from the perspective of literature and the managers of these tools themselves.

3 Possibilities of social media for assemblies

About Parliament, Leston-Bandeira and Bender (2013) assess that social media have considerable potential to stimulate the ability of legislative institutions to promote engagement[5]

[5] The concept of public engagement used here has the meaning formulated by Leston-Bandeira (2014), with five stages – not necessarily sequential – from the citizens' point of view: 1) access to information, 2) development of understanding about parliament, 3) perception of the importance of the institution and identification of the relevance of its activities for one's own life, 4) motivation to participate in the results of the legislative process, and 5) possibility

with the citizens, especially as they meet the following conditions: 1) direct access to citizens not mediated by external actors, 2) direct access to young people, 3) faster institutional reaction to facts and events; 4) potential to engage the citizen into a conversation, 5) potential to reach specific audiences, and 6) potential for political participation for citizens (LESTON-BANDEIRA; BENDER, 2013, p. 283).

Williamson (2013) also takes advantage of boyd and Ellison's concept of social media in his analysis of the rules that should guide their adoption by parliaments. Among the advantages of the use of social media by parliaments, are precisely the opening of space for dialogue, bringing users closer to their audience, and the creation of credibility and trust in the institution. According to him, the objectives of legislative institutions on these platforms can be summarized in four points: 1) providing new forms of communication and engagement with the public, 2) making it possible to consult legislation, 3) disseminating educational resources, and 4) promoting transparency.

The author goes on to detail the other functions that social media can fulfill for legislative institutions: encouraging higher transparency; opportunities to support minority parties or pressure groups; viral distribution; cost-benefit; better understanding of public opinion; real-time monitoring; reduction in time to obtain information; inclusion as a central element of the communication, dissemination and engagement strategy (WILLIAMSON, 2013).

Williamson also points out that social media suits to monitor trends, conversations, and feelings, something that until then could only be done through opinion polls, inaccessible to most political actors due to their cost. In other words, social media can help institutions manage the information shared by the public about legislative work, an intention shared by the ALESP team, as informed by Manuela Sá, Editor-in-Chief of the Communication Department of the São Paulo assembly.

> We were unable to talk to these people, and it would be very nice, even to obtain suggestions for content they want to see on our social media. We started putting the House's agenda on Instagram Stories because of the suggestion of a follower. She told us that the way the website presented the information was not easy to read. These suggestions are very nice; our purpose is to use social media as information management tools (SÁ, 2019, no pagination).

In a sense, in addition to the observation of citizens over representatives, social media also allow political actors to have access to the opinion of parts of society, intensifying the two directions of vertical transparency (ZUCCOLOTTO; TEIXEIRA, 2019, p. 40) and thus expanding the possibilities of accountability. Therefore, transparency is related to the levels of information, identification, and understanding of the engagement process (LESTON-

of intervention and engagement with parliamentarians in the discussion and legislative decision (LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2014). Participation, in this sense, is just a step in the process or flow, which can start at any other stage and go in different directions. In other words, there is no competitive character between participation and representation, as carried out by parliaments.

BANDEIRA, 2014), and the visibility of political information.

To take full advantage of social media potential, Alaôr Messias Marques Júnior, Director of Planning and Coordination at ALMG, points out that greater involvement of the parliamentary area and deputies in the use of these tools is necessary. According to him, there is an "attempt to engage them in this movement to improve the contact between the House and society, to convince them that this improves their direct contact with society as well."

> I think our challenge is to apply new forms of participation that meet the new Legislative functions. Most of our channels lead to legislative formulation. They are tools to support the drafting of the law, suggestions for a bill, and opinions on projects in progress. But how can we promote participation in the role of the Legislative as an EVALUATOR and MONITOR of public policies? (MARQUES JÚNIOR, 2018, without pagination).

Regarding the influence of social media on the political landscape, the study by Halpern et al. (2017) states that Facebook positively affects beliefs about the collective action capabilities of groups that engage in the tool. According to the authors, the segments that use social media as a deliberative space to encourage civic participation end up motivating participants to increase their actions in the tool itself. These indications show the platform's potential as a means for social movements to create opportunities for civic engagement. Vitak et al. (2010) complement by showing that the interaction between peers can be a more powerful stimulus to engage in political activities than generic messages sent by the political actors themselves.

In this scenario, the use of digital tools multiplies and requires greater dynamism from the political actors, especially those who work directly in networks of political dialogue. Therefore, the political communication strategies that aim at a better and greater connection between representatives and voters are expanded, as well as an expansion of trust in institutions, to overcome accountability gaps in political systems.

Social media also fulfill another function: it allows political actors and institutions to communicate directly with their audiences, without being screened by electronic media. It brings advantages and disadvantages for the institutions themselves, as noted by the professional in charge of content production for social media at Alerj, Daniel Tiriba.

> Social media gives more reach and allows differentiated work. The media has a filter, not necessarily bad or good, while social media allows you to reach those who are on the long tail as it increases the ability to speak to the population that has specific interests that will not be covered by the media. Social media will not replace the media but complement it (TIRIBA, 2018, no pagination).

On the other hand, as two other interviewees point out, deputies also have their own social media, their profiles, and their channels, no longer depending on institutional channels to communicate with their voters. With their social media, the level of information that is disseminated about the Legislative House on digital platforms expands exponentially, even

though they do not always mention the official profiles of the assemblies in their posts, as indicated by many civil servants. However, if there is no longer the particular interest of each representative in having space for dissemination in the legislative media or institutional profiles, what will be the role of these vehicles? "Wouldn't we be a meeting place between the blue and the red deputy?" asks Fabíola Farage, general manager of Press and Disclosure and manager of the ALMG Digital Presence Project.

Or, as Tiriba also mentions, the function of communication carried out by profiles aims at the transparency of legislative actions so that citizens can participate in the process:

> We perform a noble and fundamental task; we cannot pretend that something does not exist. Public agency social communication is not only about improving the image of the House, it aims at letting people know what happens inside and how the Legislature works. Obviously, there are other means of dissemination. We need more love in politics (TIRIBA, 2018, no pagination).

For some authors, social media represents an impulse to personalization in political communication (BENNETT, 2012), as they focus on individual policies, more than on institutions (ENLI; SKOGERBO, 2013, p. 757). Thus, personalized and dialogical aspects can contradict the structural communication strategies of parties and other institutions, including parliaments (2013, p. 758). As Enli and Skogerbo highlight, in fact, personalization is one of the features of the mediatization of politics at the beginning of the 21st century, together with the popularization of politics and the end of the clear boundary between political and private, public and personal spheres. After all, social media are, according to the authors, semi-public/semi-private spaces for self-representation, that is, we fulfill public and private roles in them (ENLI; SKOGERBO, 2013, p. 759).

Cass Sunstein (2018) goes further and says that an increasingly personalized experience for social media users is a serious problem for democracy, a real "nightmare" (2018, p. 85). The author also points the three principles of a communication system in a democratic environment:

1) Citizens need to be exposed to materials they would not choose on their own, with different perspectives from those they have;
2) Many or most citizens must have a broad spectrum of common experiences;
3) Citizens need to be able to distinguish between what is false and true and to understand manipulations (SUNSTEIN, 2018, p. 85).

Sunstein's perspective provides a normative justification for the public interest in maintaining the institutional profiles of legislative houses in social media. However, in addition to the political or social perspective that affirms the need for institutional spaces for debate, what would be the validity of observing profiles and blogs maintained by the political actors and institutions themselves, if the most interesting may be occurring among ordinary citizens in private platforms, in terms of debate? For Wright (2011, p. 249), there are two reasons: 1) because

the political discourse passes through institutional actors before reaching ordinary citizens since they are formulators of this discourse, and 2) because someone needs to see how these institutional actors integrate into the broader digital landscape in these institutionalized spaces.

Wright's argument is that people use various technologies to discuss politics, that is to say, the impact of the internet cannot be determined by the isolated study of a tool (WRIGHT, 2011, p. 254). Moreover, for the author, the observation of these spaces of political conversation should emphasize the discussion, and not the deliberation, once the pessimism with the results of the process derives from an idea that was designed by the theorists and that has no empirical basis (2011, p. 250-251).

Marques Júnior mentions that there is an attempt to bring participation to the institutional channels of the Legislative Houses, due to the issues of information management, "while society discusses in other spaces that we neither know nor take advantage of," in an explicit reference to social media and the profiles of other social actors. A point that is also a matter of concern for other managers is related to the filter bubbles, which can hinder the transparency and visibility of information about the legislative houses, as Tiriba recalls:

> The tool is free, it is almost free of charge for the institution since the structure that already exists for other communication vehicles is used. But the message needs to reach everyone, not just people interested in it, to foster tolerance. (...) The formation of identities is important, but what about the bubble? And when do we isolate ourselves? The social implies the collectivity, but groups are created and go to war. A certain disillusionment with the tools is created as they are causing a social strain that is frightening (TIRIBA, 2018, no pagination).

Nonetheless, as José Geraldo Prado, Communication Director of ALMG, points out, digital engagement is not the solution to all the evils that afflict representative democracies or parliaments. There are many other factors that matter for the establishment of the communicative relationship between representatives and represented.

> I believe that we cannot be overly enthusiastic about virtual participation until we have more clarity about it, about the value of each virtual vote. We need to treat it as relative, the absolute numbers may not mean all of that. Technology + money + lobby change everything in this panorama. These are issues that are out of our league to resolve (PRADO, 2018, no pagination).

Although they cannot resolve the contextual scenario of the emergence of social media, legislative houses have been increasingly demanded to make public use of these tools. If they find different ways to explore the potential of social media, as some testimonies reveal, the differences are not so many, especially with the reported difficulties. The next item discusses in greater depth the obstacles against the accomplishment of this task identified by the managers.

4 Obstacles to the use of social media by assemblies

Leston-Bandeira (2007) recognizes that there are several obstacles to the full achievement of the digitization processes of Parliaments in a broader way, namely, not only for the use of social media. The main difficulties higlighted by the author rest on four essential dimensions:

a. **Administrative organization** – conflicts between sectors, decision paralysis, fragmentation of processes, resistance to innovation, lack of flexibility for changes;

b. **Lack of resources** – material, structural or human, inadequate planning;

c. **Lack of political will** – resistance from representatives to citizen participation, resistance to transparency, fear of public monitoring, dispute over control of processes, difficulty in handling social feedback, need for public image management;

d. **Citizens' difficulties for participation** – lack of interest, cognitive and informational difficulties, lack of confidence in institutional spaces and arenas, digital exclusion.

These questions are pertinent to the practice and reflection that managers of digital tools in legislative assemblies develop, as stressed by the interviewed civil servants for this research[6]. One of the points mentioned by all of them concerns the material and human resources necessary for the proper performance of activities related to the digitization of communicative processes.

The lack of teams exclusively dedicated to the production of content for social media (item B) is a difficulty emphasized by Fabíola Farage, especially due to the need for answers to comments and questions, an argument underlined by Griffith and Leston-Bandeira (2012). At Alerj, the coordinator of the Marketing and Special Projects Center, Tainah Vieira, follows the same line of reasoning:

> We would need more attention to comments, more staff to deal with it. I think that the profiles on social media work as a SAC, therefore, we should always respond to comments. We should produce more special content for social media, with people who know how to produce social media content. We would need to work on the content in different ways, run more campaigns, better track what other agencies are doing (VIEIRA, 2018, no pagination).

Staff difficulties in managing social media are more pronounced in the São Paulo and Espírito Santo assemblies, which have very modest teams – a civil servant and two interns in both, although only in ALES the civil servant acts exclusively on social media – in relation to the more robust structures of ALMG and ALERJ[7]. At ALESP, Manuela Sá reports that although the Communication Department has 25 employees, she is the only journalist, and there are no civil

[6] To clarify the argument, we mention each of the items identified by Leston-Bandeira in the comments made by the managers as item A, item B, etc.

[7] ALMG has a Digital Media Management, responsible for the social media and the Portal content, images for social media and the Portal, and application development, especially connected to the development of the Mobile Portal. They also produce intranet content. Overall, there are five web designers, five journalists who produce content, a manager, two interns in Advertising, and an intern in Journalism. At Alerj, the Marketing and Special Projects Center has a coordinator, a content producer journalist, and two interns. The information about the teams is quite dynamic due to the political dimensions to which the employees of the legislative houses are submitted. Therefore, there might be changes in these numbers from the collection of data to the publication of this study.

servants exclusively dedicated to the production of content for social media (item B). She also highlights the need for training and preparation of professionals, so they can effectively perform the tasks with quality (item A):

> The difficulty is that there are no professionals trained to perform these tasks. Someone needs to do training to be able to use social media, civil servants must dedicate themselves to these tasks. Besides, several other things are done by these professionals, such as monitored visits, internal communication, many other functions (SÁ, 2019, without pagination).

In Espírito Santo, the Design and Social Media manager at the assembly, Lucas Albani, also reports similar difficulties. For example, the TV ALES profile on YouTube is used as a streaming channel for the broadcaster because the team does not have the human and material resources to produce exclusive content for the channel (item B). According to him, the situation has been better in recent years, but there are still issues that need to be structured based on political will.

> Public institutions are moving towards improvement to give more attention to users, but management's awareness of the activity's importance is still missing. Today at ALES we have the deputies' support, the president knows the importance of social media, we have a basic structure to work, but we would need a lot more voice (ALBANI, 2019, without pagination).

However, the issue is not always to simply demand more staff or money. Marques Júnior mentions that the organizational dimension (item A) needs improvements "for better support for the final performance of parliamentarians," since it is necessary to talk to social entities and the individual citizen. It involves, according to him, the requirement of "a change in the internal culture in the civil servants' positioning," which implies changes in the internal dimension of the administrative organization pointed out by Leston-Bandeira (2007). The manager complements:

> There is a structural difficulty to reasonably adapt to this new composition of audiences and debates. We need to redirect the House's capacity to this new place, but we cannot give up on other things that we already do (MARQUES JÚNIOR, 2018, without pagination).

Coleman (2004) stress that the time management to deal with digital tools is one of the points that explain the adoption or not of these channels. This concern, which is crucial for deputies, as pointed out by the British research (COLEMAN, 2004, p. 14), also concerns the political institutions servants in charge of the management of these tools. The number of messages circulating on social media makes it difficult to manage the information so that it can be used properly.

In addition to the large amount of data to be managed, another difficulty that managers face is related to the characteristic of social media: they are platforms developed and managed by private companies. In other words, they are not under the control of political institutions, and they

work based on their own rules, which do not direct to state publicity, but the systematization and sale of data on users' tastes and preferences. Thus, the moderation made by the managers of the legislative houses does not always succeed in promoting the debate, in addition to the lack of political will to solve some tensions with public opinion (item C). This is what the sub-director of Communication at Alerj, André Coelho (items A, B, and C), highlights.

> In 2017, the state's financial crisis hit Alerj completely. We received many negative comments and even more with the arrest of deputies shortly after. We even made paid posts on Facebook when we had a contract with the advertising agency, but with the crisis, we never renewed the contract. Everything happened at the same time, including changes to Facebook's algorithm. We suffered a lot (COELHO, 2018, without pagination).

Daniel Tiriba, in turn, addresses the issue of algorithms to highlight the need for transparency and visibility of information about Parliament to carry out the stages of information, understanding, and identification of the engagement process:

> We are in the middle of the shooting, boosting helps to reach those who have more interest. But Facebook is frustrating. It is a task of fighting against the tool. You have 40,000 followers, but it only delivers the post for 2% of that. We have a challenge there: how to pierce the bubble and the hatred to disseminate the importance of the Legislative Branch, of the diversity of opinions, of the debate, exactly to get out of the bubble. Show that the institution is plural, it represents all deputies, that they constitute a heterogeneous mass. Show that the Legislature is part of people's lives, with the services it can provide, especially the monitoring of the Executive, with Alô Alerj, to guarantee the provision of public services by the State (TIRIBA, 2018, without pagination).

Managers' arguments and examples find support in studies that analyze the functioning of algorithms[8] on social media. Sastre et al. (2018) highlight the action of what they call the "filter bubble," that is, the activity of algorithms as filters in the virtual environment. This action makes the algorithms act as prediction engines that influence and direct access to the content from the user's profile and consumption habits, which creates in the individual a sense of efficiency in the search by restricting the search on the content, according to Pariser's argument cited by the authors (SASTRE et al., 2018, p. 6).

In this way, the algorithms influence the concepts of quality and credibility of information, as they interfere with the content access system (SASTRE et al., 2018, p. 6). Common sense starts to relate a good position in the search engine with credible information, and credibility goes from being the original source of information to being influenced by the person responsible for sharing the news (2018, p. 7-8). Through this automated mechanism, the filter bubble limits the user's access to information favorable to a position, creating opportunities for the user to believe in Fake News. Sunstein calls Fake News and opinion bubbles "social media

8 According to Fanjul's definition, cited by Sastre et al. (2018, p. 13), an algorithm is a set of rules that, systematically applied to some appropriate input data, solve a problem in a finite number of elementary steps.

accidents" that lead to increased fragmentation, polarization, and extremism (SUSTEIN, 2018, p. 84). According to the author, the polarization that increases with social media will make it increasingly difficult to govern.

The political polarization issue on social media does not go unnoticed by managers, as José Geraldo Prado says when mentioning the problem:

> The digital bubble reproduces in other environments, as they avoid the circumstances of confrontation. It is one of the risks we run with the internet. Do we have to foster debate among the divergent? (...) (PRADO, 2018, without pagination).

All interviewed civil servants reveal concern about the quality of the debate that takes place on social media, especially from practical issues such as payment problems for the use of platform features (item A), the need for boosting messages, lack of quality in public contributions, aggressiveness among users, etc. (item D). As highlighted by Ana Carolina Utsch Terra, Digital Media Manager at ALMG, for the posts to reach the population in the interior of the state, the assembly must pay, sponsor the posts within the platform. An advertising agency guided the team in this direction, but the project did not proceed due to obstacles to the use of public resources in advertising (items A and C). For this reason, the posts about the "Viva Minas" program, which deals with local festivals representative of the culture of the municipalities, for example, do not appear for those who are in these municipalities, opening a gap in contact with the population that is difficult to overcome.

Another connected point is the need to monitor the social media content in order to analyze the opinion trends expressed by the public and even to understand the information needs of the population (item D). In addition to the difficulties in developing technical expertise for collecting and analyzing data generated by social media, legislatures face the challenge of lack of access to free or minimally affordable tools to perform the task (items B and C). In 2019, for example, the removal of Netvizz (Facebook's data collection and analysis app) further complicated the monitoring of social media, forcing organizational and institutional users to pay for the service to companies specialized in this. As Manuela Sá explains:

> The problem is that we have no monitoring of this material, we do nothing with the comments that come in on "What do you think?". We don't have the tools for this monitoring yet, but the goal is to have it. When questions are sent, we answer if we can, the rest of the comments we do not. Many times they comment among themselves, argue, fight, unburden, for that we do not answer. Obviously, we are unable to respond at the speed that I would like, and that would be nice. In addition to the lack of staff, the lack of social media monitoring tools is a challenge (SÁ, 2019, no pagination).

Obviously, in the social media case, an additional difficulty in monitoring is the extreme amount of data generated by posts and user comments. However, as Gomes (2018) emphasizes, the issue is not just numerical or dimensional, but of creating a computational intelligence that

can automatically collect and analyze this data, producing knowledge from them.

In ALES's case, Albani reveals that the bidding for the purchase of a Brazilian monitoring tool was already being concluded in the second half of 2019. According to him, the great advantage of social media in relation to other communication channels is the possibility of almost instantaneous feedback. But the analysis of this return is one of the challenges since the communication of the assemblies is not guided by market or commercial criteria, as he accentuates:

> We have challenges all the time, especially since we don't have a commercial measurement goal, so how do we know if a post was successful? We only work with content; we prioritize what the other needs to know because people expect the assembly to produce certain types of information. We are not here to profit, it is a logic of public communication, and unlike the parliamentarians' social media, we are also not here to improve their image for the next election (ALBANI, 2019, no pagination).

Williamson (2013) warns that entering the digital social media environment poses risks to the parliamentary institution, besides questionings to the representatives and civil servants of the legislative houses themselves. The main risks mentioned by the author are: etiquette and protocols are different from other media; risks that affect reputation if it is not authentic, honest, and transparent; need to be perceived as relevant by the audience, not by oneself; requires carefully targeted content; potential to quickly get out of control; recruitment is difficult to predict, and there is no guarantee of productive dialogue; it is not a shortcut to communicative effectiveness.

Added to these challenges is the managers' perception that the political moment is not favorable to parliaments (items C and D), as highlighted by Prado:

> We are living in a moment of disrepute, disbelief, crisis of politics and parliament. If the crisis is an opportunity, we have many now because there are changes all the time. Perceiving opportunities is our challenge (PRADO, 2018, no pagination).

Based on the reports and reflections shared by the managers of the legislative assemblies, the next item analyzes how the concepts of transparency and participation are articulated in the discourse on communicative practice carried out through social media.

5 E-Transparency and E-Participation for whom?

Based on the broad concept of Digital Democracy presented, Simon et al. define a typology of activities that can fall within its scope. They are: informing citizens, framing public issues, allowing citizens to provide information, sharing ideas, and providing technical expertise on public issues (activities that we can fit within the scope of transparency), deliberating, allowing citizens to develop and evaluate proposals, that they make decisions, and even monitor public actions (in connection with participation) (SIMON et al., 2017, p. 13).

We can observe that the activities listed are part of the theoretical framework of contemporary democracy, which begins with the dissemination of information to support citizen decisions, through the processes of transparency – liberal democracy points to the well-informed vote as the only possibility of citizen interference on the regime – until it reaches the effective participation of the population on political decisions. This participation happens by providing subsidies and expertise to the State, taking part in the deliberation and decisions, or even evaluating and monitoring the actions taken. In the same sense, Gomes (2018) points out that the concepts of e-transparency and e-participation through digital tools are part of the research concerns of those who study the initiatives, and also of the normative concerns of those who design the experiences and tools.

Regarding e-transparency, previous studies about parliamentary portals and websites indicate that the disclosure of information on the institutional and political workings of legislative houses is already consolidated in digital tools (BRAGA, 2008; FARIA, 2012; BARROS ET AL. 2015; BARROS ET AL. 2016; BERNARDES; LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2016; MENDONÇA; PEREIRA, 2016; MITOZO, 2018). Similarly, legislative institutional social media seem to be used primarily for disseminating information about the legislative agenda and process, which includes parliamentarians' opinions on distinct subjects (LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2016; GIRALDO-LUQUE et al., 2017; MUSTAFA; SHARIFOV, 2018; WORLD E-PARLIAMENT REPORT, 2018) and serves as an example of how e-transparency is developed in digitization processes. As the Alesp manager states, social media are, effectively, another channel of communication with the population, promoting active transparency (ZUCCOLOTTO; TEIXEIRA, 2019, p. 48) and greater visibility of information about the Legislative.

> The main objective of social media is to obtain transparency for the legislative process itself. It is very technical information, hard to understand, and even I said that I needed to be literate again when I came here. So the intention is to chew this content, make it simpler and more direct so that ordinary people can understand it, can understand what is being done within ALESP. We really try to translate this information, in a simpler and faster way for the citizen.
> The advantages of social media are to make information reach people more simply. The information is already on the Portal and in the Public Journal, but there it has a very technical language, often inaccessible to ordinary people. Our effort on social media is to simplify information for the citizen (SÁ, 2019, without pagination).

But, in addition to their broad informative potential for e-transparency, as evidenced by the research and daily use that political actors make of them, would social media sites have any chance of stimulating e-participation?

To obtain a more efficient and effective result from social media, Williamson (2013) recommends the establishment of strategic goals for social media use. According to the author, the main questions to be analyzed and defined in advance by the teams, therefore, are:

1) **Who** we want to engage,
2) **What** we want people to do,
3) **How** we intend to use contributions,
4) How we will **respond**.

The perspective proposed by the author reveals a clear concern with the dialogical potential of these tools, therefore, with the feedback – whether informative or opinionated – that the population can give to representatives through them. In ALES's case, Albani reveals that the concern with responding to users' comments and questions is central to the management of the institutional profile.

> We encourage comments, often in the caption or on the images themselves. We do not hide criticism comments, only if they are hateful, offensive, or aggressive. Also, we reply to all comments to show the person who commented that we are seeing their opinion, that they are not talking to themselves. We also try to answer questions and inquiries by inbox as quickly as possible.
> I spend almost 24 hours looking at social media, I often answer from home, unless it is something that needs some research to answer (ALBANI, 2019, without pagination).

However, the difficulties faced by the teams creating these communication channels (MENDONÇA; PEREIRA, 2016) reveal that Leston-Bandeira's (2007, p. 664) considerations about the fundamental role of bureaucracy in the process of digitization of parliaments may not yet have been completely understood by managers and parliamentarians, resulting in a lack of political will to carry out e-transparency and e-participation processes through parliaments' social media.

Despite the study by Enli and Skogerbo (2013) focusing on the use of social media by legislative candidates during election campaigns, some considerations may apply to the broader scenario of political communication in the inter-election period. Thus, political actors use their Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter profiles, among others, for marketing and visibility, mobilization of voters and citizens, and as an opportunity for dialogue (ENLI; SKOGERBO, 2013). While the institutional profiles of legislative houses are not responsible for electoral marketing, increasing the visibility of the institution remains an important goal, as well as mobilizing citizens for political action and establishing a public dialogue between the institution and society. This is confirmed by Célia Abend, Communication Director at Alerj.

> We try to engage in campaigns through social media, as we notice that people are tired of traditional politics. When it comes to society, we can capture them for discussion, in a more positive way (ABEND, 2018, without pagination).

Without the establishment of an effective dialogue (e-participation) and the possibility of monitoring with quality the data generated by social media (e-transparency), how can the legislative houses serve the interests of the population? It is a question that the managers themselves are asking, as Albani's statement demonstrates:

> I think we need to ask what people want, to bring this debate to social media. We know that we have a very good response from the live sessions on Facebook, many of the house's advisors watch, many activists from the countryside who do not have access to TV Assembleia watch. But we receive a lot more support than debate, people don't come in to ask, or ask questions or things like that.
> The most interesting laws, the things that have to do with the State, have nicer feedback. There is no point in putting laws that are not relevant. What has the greatest impact on people's daily lives is what has the most return. There is no point in talking about us, if the topic has no impact, there will be no good feedback on the House.
> The audience profile is adults aged 25 to 45/50, usually from the state itself and nearby states, equally divided between men and women. I believe people most involved with politics in those states also access our content (ALBANI, 2019, without pagination).

How are these profiles building a dialogical relationship with citizens, if managers can barely respond to incoming comments? As Enli and Skogerbo (2013) weight, are the profiles engaging in political discussions with citizens? And to what extent do they take advantage of opportunities for dialogue with the population to better connect with them, receive feedback on political issues and engage more people in actions? Is the dialogue within social media being carried out with ordinary citizens or only with politically engaged users, that is, the cultural or political elite of each state? Without adequate monitoring of the content and, mainly, of the comments to the posts submitted by citizens, it is quite difficult for the teams to understand these issues.

As pointed out by Crivellaro et al. (2014), social media can facilitate the emergence of social movements and the potential for understanding the complex, contingent, and contextual politics, which is included in everyday concerns. The meeting and mobilization potential provided by social media can lead to the construction of collectives brought together by common interests or demands, that is, platforms can help in the construction of social bonds between dispersed citizens. In this sense, reading others' posts serves to see where opinions are leaning and thus can help us express divergent or convergent views. Discussion forums and spaces for collective organization, profiles, and pages on social media can also show, according to the authors, how the political system excludes citizens to the extent that voices that traditional channels could not hear before, now can reach representatives. Still, how can these voices be effectively heard by those with decision-making power?

Finally, it is interesting to notice the fact that institutional profiles do not exactly fit the phenomenon of personalization in the strictest sense. In other words: what identity do institutional profiles build? As collective and deliberative institutions, highly visible and publicly controllable, parliaments are the privileged place of conflict in contemporary societies, as they are the forums where distinct factions express themselves (LESTON-BANDEIRA, 2014, p. 444). Institutions full of controversy and paradoxes, do not have just a spokesperson to speak on their behalf and may be destined to be unloved by the population, as highlighted by Leston-Bandeira (2014, p.

443). How to build an identity with a coherent voice on social media, if Parliament houses government and opposition, and all the possible variations between these two poles? These are still open questions, which allow different possibilities for e-transparency and e-participation that the legislative houses will experience on social media.

6 Conclusion

From the questions raised by the literature and the testimonies, it is clear that both civil servants and theorists are concerned with ensuring the quality of the debate held on social media and their effective results for the legislative process. How to give transparency to political decisions made within the Legislative? How to reach people? How to make social media, which are private platforms, a place of public participation? How can the contributions of citizens be taken into account by representatives? How can citizens be satisfied with the social media engagement process? Or is social media just a space for venting discontent with politics? These are questions that remain unsatisfactory for most analysts and the managers of these tools themselves.

Simon et al. (2017) recommend careful planning before creating or executing the tools. The necessary steps for this, according to the authors, along the lines of that proposed by Williamson (2013), take into account what are the objectives of the engagement process, what will be done with the collaborations, what is the necessary support from the decision-makers to carry out the process, which process is necessary for the complete development of the initiative, which tools are most suitable for constructive participation by users (SIMON et al., 2017, p. 66). The authors also warn that digitalization is not the only answer to democratic processes, as citizen engagement and education can be achieved through traditional methods. In this sense, they emphasize that:

> A participation exercise will only be successful if people feel that there is value in their contribution – either because they are able to influence and shape decisions, or because it taps into some sort of intrinsic motivation, or because the issues at stake are substantive. It encourages more people to participate, and to do so in a useful way." (SIMON et al., 2017, p. 67).

In their analysis of various examples of digital democracy tools, Simon et al. conclude that they can increase the quality, legitimacy, and transparency of the decision-making process (2017, p. 87) and, to some extent, include citizens who are not part of social organizations or movements (MENDONÇA; CUNHA, 2012, p. 181). However, for such initiatives to become common, some challenges need to be considered: developing a more nuanced understanding of participation, addressing digital inequality, understanding the motivations for participation, balancing aspirations and reality, harnessing new technologies, understanding what works and what are the limitations of digital democracy.

Also, the authors highlight something that legislative assemblies' civil servants already seem to have understood: for digital democracy initiatives to have a real impact on the legislative process and political results, they need to be embraced by those in positions of power, including the opposition (SIMON et al., 2017, p. 91). It is a way to overcome the difficulties of political will pointed out by Leston-Bandeira (2007), and consequently, create conditions for the administrative organization of legislatures to adapt to the digital scenario, surpassing the lack of resources recurrently mentioned by the managers, and attending to the citizens' needs for information about parliaments.

From this support from the parliamentarians themselves and from a certain level of autonomy of the teams in the execution of tasks, including to reach the technical and human resources they need, it seems that digitization becomes more effective. However, it remains difficult to integrate the political voice in technically developed activities, as highlighted by Leston-Bandeira (2014). Concerning the production of content for social media, the need for institutional profiles to remain "neutral," that is, without advocating political positions or opinions on the topics that are addressed, greatly complicates the activity. Which is treated on social media, obviously, in an eminently opinionated way. In other words: what is the validity and attractiveness of a profile that does not have an opinion on the subjects it posts? Note here that this need stems from the difficulty of personalizing a profile of a collegiate institution, such as parliaments.

The analysis of the empirical practices of political actors, based on the statements of social media managers in legislative assemblies, brought several elements to the debate on the communication strategies of Brazilian political institutions and important clues about the dilemmas for the use of digital tools in a scenario of disconnection and disbelief in politics. We can observe that despite occasional differences from the internal organizations of the parliaments, the dilemmas faced by the managers of the four legislative houses analyzed are quite similar.

It seems that the informational preponderance of profiles – connected to the development of e-transparency through social media platforms – and their impersonal visibility strategies can complicate the discursive choices of managers in these tools, also reducing their reach with the public. In a way, the managers point to the lack of political will directed towards e-participation and the effective dialogue with the citizen – an open possibility with social media – as an obstacle to the more intense use of these tools.

From these aspects, the collective debate on parliaments' strategies to reconstruct symbolic representation can happen between theorists, researchers, managers, and citizens. E-transparency is a necessary condition for e-participation, but, as the testimonies demonstrate, it is not enough for the process to be effective. At least, not on the social media profiles maintained by legislative assemblies in Southeast region of Brazil.

References

AMARAL, Marcelo Santos. **Congresso no Twitter**: parlamentares e partidos políticos em 140 caracteres. 2016. Tese em [Administração]. Salvador: Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA).

ALMEIDA, Helga do Nascimento de. Análise dos usos das NTICs pelos parlamentares brasileiros: um estudo sobre o Facebook e o Twitter pelos deputados federais brasileiros em 2013. **38º Encontro Nacional da ANPOCS**. Trabalho apresentado no GT 22 – Mídia, política e eleições. 2014.

ALMEIDA, Helga do Nascimento de. **Representantes, representados e mídias sociais**: mapeando o mecanismo de agendamento informacional. 2017. Tese em [Ciência Política]. Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG).

ALMEIDA, Helga do Nascimento de; PEREIRA, Marcus Abílio Gomes; FERREIRA, Maria Alice Silveira; QUINTÃO, Thales Torres. "Tamo junto?" Parlamentares e mídias sociais: uma tipologia dos padrões de atuação de deputados federais no Facebook. **Revista Sociedade e Cultura**. v. 23, p.1-47, 2020.

ARAÚJO, José Rúas; GONZÁLEZ, Borja Dapena. Los diputados del Parlamento Gallego em Facebook. **REDMARKA UIMA**, Universidad de A Coruña. Ano IV, n.7, p.77-106, 2011.

ARAÚJO, Ronaldo Ferreira; TRAVIESO-RODRÍGUEZ, Crispulo; SANTOS, Sarah Rubia de Oliveira. Comunicação e Participação Política no *Facebook*: análise dos comentários em páginas de parlamentares brasileiros. **Inf. & Soc.:Est**., v. 27, n. 2, p. 279-290, 2017.

BARROS, Antonio Teixeira de; BERNARDES, Cristiane Brum; RODRIGUES, Malena Rehbein. O Parlamento brasileiro e as novas mídias: balanço da experiência recente da Câmara dos Deputados. In: SATHLER, André; BRAGA, Ricardo de João. (orgs.). **Legislativo Pós-1988**: reflexões e perspectivas. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, Edições Câmara, 2015. P. 183-221.

BARROS, Antonio Teixeira de; BERNARDES, Cristiane Brum; RODRIGUES, Malena Rehbein. Brazilian Parliament and digital engagement. **The Journal of Legislative Studies**, Kingston upon Hull/UK, n. 22, p. 540-558, 2016.

BENNETT, W. Lance. The personalization of politics: Political Identity, Social Media, and Changing Patterns of Participation. **The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,** n. 644, p. 20-39, nov. 2012.

BERNARDES, Cristiane Brum; LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina. Information vs Engagement in parliamentary websites – a case study of Brazil and the UK. **Rev. Sociol. Polit**., Curitiba, v. 24, n. 59, p. 91-107, 2016.

boyd, Danah; ELLISON, Nicole. Social network sites: definition, history, and scholarship. **Journal of Computer-mediated Communication**, n.13, p. 210-230, 2008.

BRAGA, Sérgio Soares. **Podem as TICs auxiliar na institucionalização das Democracias?** Um estudo sobre a informatização dos Órgãos legislativos na América do Sul e no Brasil. Brasília: Editora Plenarium, 2008.

BRAGA, Sérgio Soares. O Uso das Mídias Sociais é Um Bom Preditor do Sucesso Eleitoral dos Candidatos? Uma análise das campanhas on-line dos vereadores das capitais das regiões sul, sudeste, e nordeste do Brasil no pleito de outubro de 2012. **Revista Política Hoje**, Recife, v. 22, n. 2, p. 125-148, 2013.

BRAGA, Sérgio Soares.; CRUZ, Letícia Carina. **Elites parlamentares e novas tecnologias**: um estudo sobre o uso da internet pelos deputados estaduais brasileiros da 16ª legislatura (2007-2011). *Working papers/textos para discussão*, 4. Curitiba: Observatório de Elites Políticas e Sociais do Brasil/Núcleo de Pesquisa em Sociologia Política Brasileira/Universidade Federal do Paraná, 2012.

CENTRO DE ESTUDOS AVANÇADOS EM DEMOCRACIA DIGITAL (Ceadd). Democracia

digital no Brasil: uma prospecção das melhores iniciativas federais de 2015. **Relatório de Pesquisa**, 2015.

COOK, James M. Twitter Adoption and Activity in U.S. Legislatures: A 50-State Study. **American Behavioral Scientist**, v. 61, n.7, p. 724–740, 2017.

COLEMAN, Stephen. Connecting parliament to the public via the Internet: Two case studies of online consultations. **Information, Communication & Society,** v.7, n.1, p.1-17, 2004.

CONTREIRAS, Patrícia. Deputadas Parlamentares e Redes Sociais – O Mito das Redes como Facilitadoras de Proximidade entre os Políticos e os Cidadãos. **Media & Jornalismo**, n.21, p.145-158, 2012.

CRIVELLARO, Clara; COMBER, Rob; BOWERS, John; WRIGHT, Peter C.; OLIVIER**, Patrick. A pool of dreams: Facebook, politics and the emergence of a social movement. Proceedings of the SIGCHI.** Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Toronto, Ontario, Canada, p. 3573-3582, April 26 - May 01, 2014.

ENLI, Gunn Sara; SKOGERBØ, Eli. Personalized Campaigns in Party-Centred Politics. Twitter and Facebook as arenas for political communication. **Information, Communication & Society**, v.16, n.5, p.757-774, 2013.

FARIA, Cristiano Ferri Soares. **O parlamento aberto na era da internet***:* pode o povo colaborar com o Legislativo na elaboração das leis? Edições Câmara, Brasília, 2012.

GEBER, Sarah; SCHERER, Helmut. My voter, my party, and me. American and German parliamentarians on Facebook. **Journal of Information Technology & Politics**, v.12, n.4, p.360-377, 2015.

GIRALDO-LUQUE, Santiago; VILLEGAS-SIMÓN, Isabel; BUGS, Ricardo Carniel. ¿Cómo usan los parlamentos las redes sociales? Un estudio comparado y longitudinal aplicado a países de América y Europa (2010, 2015 y 2017). **Revista Latina de Comunicación Social,** n.72, p. 1.278-1.299, 2017.

GOMES, Wilson. **A Democracia no Mundo Digital:** história, problemas e temas. São Paulo: Edições SESC São Paulo, 2018.

GRIFFITH, Jeffrey; LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina. How are Parliaments Using New Media to Engage with Citizens? **The Journal of Legislative Studies,** n. 18, p.496-513, 2012.

HALPERN, Daniel; VALENZUELA, Sebastian; KATZ, James E. We Face, I Tweet: How Different Social Media Influence Political Participation through Collective and Internal Efficacy. **Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication**, v. 22, p. 320–336, 2017.

IBGE. 2018. **Projeções da População**: Brasil e unidades da federação: revisão 2018. Disponível em: https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101597.pdf . Acesso em: 25 out. 2019.

JENSEN, Jacob Linaa, Political participation online: the replacement and the mobilisation hypothesis revisited. **Scandinavian Political Studies**, v. 36, n. 4, p.347-364, 2013.

JÚLIO NETO, Gilson Arão. Desafios da comunicação pública face aos fluxos comunicacionais: Um estudo sobre a TV Assembleia/ES. **XXIV Congresso de Ciências da Comunicação na Região Sudeste.** Vitória/ES, 2019.

LARSSON, Anders Olaf. Online, all the time? A quantitative assessment of the permanent campaign on Facebook. **New Media & Society**, v.18, n.2, p.274-292, 2016.

LARSSON, Anders Olaf; KALSNES, Bente. 'Of course we are on Facebook': use and non-use of social media among Swedish and Norwegian politicians. **European Journal of Communication**, v.29, n.6, p.653-667, 2014.

LEV-ON, Azi; PORAT, Chen Sabag-Ben; LEHMAN-WILZIG, Sam. A Facebook post is born: exploring the process of generating MP1s social media presence. **The Journal of Legislative Studies**, v.23, n.4. p.549-565, 2017.

LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina. The impact of the internet on parliaments: a Legislative Studies framework. **Parliamentary Affairs**, v. 60, n.4, p.655-674, 2007.

LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina. The pursuit of legitimacy as a key driver for public engagement: The European Parliament case. **Parliamentary Affairs**, v. 67, n. 2, p.437-457, 2014.

LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina. Why Symbolic Representation Frames Parliamentary Public Engagement. **British Journal of Politics and International Relations**, v.18, n.2, p.498-516, 2016.

LESTON-BANDEIRA, Cristina; BENDER, David. How deeply are parliaments engaging on social media? **Information Polity**, n.18, p.281-297, 2013.

LUCINDA, Karine Aparecida. **Comunicação Pública via Mídias Sociais**: Estudo de caso da Assembleia Legislativa do Estado de Santa Catarina**. [**Monografia] Jornalismo. Florianópolis/SC: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), 2016.

LUCINDA, Karine Aparecida; BERTASSO, Daiane. Comunicação Pública via Mídias Sociais: estudo de caso da Assembleia Legislativa do Estado de Santa Catarina. **VII Congresso da Associação Brasileira de Pesquisadores em Comunicação e Política (VII COMPOLÍTICA).** Porto Alegre/RS, 2017.

MARGETTS, Helen. The Internet and Democracy. In DUTTON, Williams H. (ed.) **The Oxford Handbook of Internet Studies**. Oxford/UK: Oxford University Press, 2013.

MARQUES; Francisco Paulo Jamil Almeida; AQUINO, Jakson Alves de; MIOLA, Edna. Deputados brasileiros no Twitter: um estudo quantitativo dos padrões de adoção e uso da ferramenta. **Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política**, Brasília, n. 14, p. 201-225, 2014a.

MARQUES; Francisco Paulo Jamil Almeida; AQUINO, Jakson Alves de; MIOLA, Edna. Parlamentares, representação política e redes sociais digitais: perfis de uso do Twitter na Câmara dos Deputados. **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v.20, n.2, p.178-203, 2014b.

MENDONÇA, Ricardo Fabrino; CUNHA, Eleonora Schettini Martins. **Relatório Aprimoramento de Eventos da ALMG.** Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Departamento de Ciência Política. Projeto "Aprimoramento de Eventos da ALMG". Belo Horizonte, maio de 2012. 255 p.

MENDONÇA, Ricardo Fabrino; PEREIRA, Marcus Abílio. Dilemas na apropriação das TICs pela ALMG. Uma análise sobre a percepção dos gestores. In R. F. Mendonça, M. A. Pereira & F. Filgueiras. (orgs.) **Democracia digital.** Publicidade, instituições e confronto político. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2016. P.189-216.

MITOZO, Isabel Batista. **E-Participação nos Parlamentos**: desenvolvimento e uso de Iniciativas pela Câmara dos Deputados brasileira e pela *House Of Commons* britânica. Tese [Ciência Política]. Curitiba: Universidade Federal do Paraná, 2018.

MUSTAFA, Abdulsalam; SHARIFOV, Mahammad. Towards Enhancing Citizens Engagement: A Review of Parliamentary Websites in the 36 State Houses of Assembly in Nigeria. **JeDE97-M**, v. 10, n. 2, p. 97-111, 2018.

NICOLÁS, Maria Alejandra; BRAGA, Sérgio. As elites parlamentares sul-americanas e as NTICS: perfil sociopolítico e o uso da *web* por deputados e senadores do Brasil, Argentina, Chile, Paraguai, Uruguai e Venezuela. **Revista NEP** - Núcleo de estudos paranaenses da UFPR, v. 1, n.1, p. 61-82, 2015.

PEREIRA, Marcus Abílio; SANTOS, Manoel Leonardo; BERNARDES, Cristiane Brum. Parlamentares conectados: um estudo sobre a utilização de tecnologias de informação e comunicação (TICs) na Câmara do Deputados (2014/2018). In: **Anais do 2º Congresso do INCT.DD**. Salvador/BA, 3 e 4 de outubro de 2019b. P.1-44.

PESSONI, Arquimedes; SANTOS, Rita de Cássia Donato dos. A presença social dos Deputados Federais do Grande ABC no Facebook. **C&S**, São Bernardo do Campo, v. 40, n. 2, p. 83-111,

maio/ago. 2018.

PORTILLO, José Romero; FERNÁNDEZ, Manuel Mena. Parlamentos en Twitter. Análisis de los contenidos y la interactividad en @Congreso_Es y @HouseofCommons. **Revista Comunicação Midiática**, v.8, n.2, p. 232-259, mai./ago. 2013.

RODRÍGUEZ-ANDRÉS; ÁLVAREZ-SABALEGUI. Presencia y Actividad de los Parlamentos Autonómicos en las Redes Sociales: Pocos Avances em el Fomento de la Participación Ciudadana. **El profesional de la información**, v. 27, n. 5, p. 994-1003, 2018.

SAMPAIO, Rafael Cardoso; BRAGA, Sérgio; CARLOMAGNO, Marcio Cunha; MARIOTO, Djiovanni Jonas França; ALISON, Murilo Brum; SILVA, Tiago Philippini Ferreira Borges da. Estado da arte da democracia digital no Brasil: oferta e sobrevivência das iniciativas (1999-2016). **Rev. Serv. Público**, Brasília, v. 70, n. 4, p. 693-734, out/dez 2019.

SAEBO, Oystein. Understanding Twitter Use among Parliament Representatives: a Genre Analysis. In: TAMBOURIS, E.; MACINTOSH, A.; BRUIJIN, H. **Third IFIP WG 8.5 International Conference**, Eletronic Participation. 1° de setembro, 2011.

SASTRE, Angelo; OLIVEIRA, Claudia Silene Pereira de; BELDA, Francisco Rolfsen. A influência do "filtro bolha" na difusão de *Fake News* nas mídias sociais: reflexões sobre as mudanças nos algoritmos do Facebook. **Revista GEMInIS**, São Carlos, UFSCar, v. 9, n. 1, p.4-17, jan. / abr. 2018.

SIMON, Julie; BASS, Theo; BOELMAN, Victoria; MULGAN, Geoff. **Digital Democracy**. The tools transforming political engagement. UK: Nesta, February 2017. 99 p.

SUNSTEIN, Cass. Is Social Media Good or Bad for Democracy? **SUR 27**, v.15, n.27, p. 83-89, 2018.

TAVARES, Daniel Nardin; QUIROGA, Tiago. O reforço do "homem cordial" nas conexões entre senadores e cidadãos nas redes sociais online. **Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros**, n.60, p. 110-128, 2015.

TÚÑEZ, Miguel; SIXTO, José. Social networks, politics and commitment 2.0: Spanish MPs on Facebook. Revista Latina de Comunicación Social, vol.66, p.210-234, 2011.

VIANA, David Henrique de Moura; OLIVEIRA, Bernardina Maria Juvenal Freire de. Redes Sociais e Política: Twitters dos vereadores de João Pessoa/PB. **SimSocial** – Simpósio em Tecnologias Digitais e Sociabilidade. Mídias Sociais, Saberes e Representações Salvador - 13 e 14 de outubro de 2011.

VITAK, Jessica; ZUBE, Paul; SMOCK, Andrew; CARR, Caleb T.; ELLISON, Nicole; LAMPE, Cliff. It's Complicated: Facebook Users' Political Participation in the 2008 Election. **Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking**, v. 0, n. 0, 2010.

WRIGHT, Scott. Politics as usual? Revolution, normalization and a new agenda for online deliberation. **New Media & Society,** v. 14, n.2, p.244–261, 2011.

WILLIAMSON, Andy. **MPs Online**: connecting with constituents. London: Hansard Society, 2009.

WILLIAMSON, A. **Social Media Guidelines for Parliaments**. Geneva, Switzerland, Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2013.

WORLD E-PARLIAMENT REPORT. Genebra: União Inter-Parlamentar, 2018.

ZUCCOLOTTO, Robson; TEIXEIRA, Marco Antônio Carvalho. **Transparência**: aspectos conceituais e avanços no contexto brasileiro. Brasília: Enap, 2019.

Entrevistas

ABEND, Célia. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Diretora de Comunicação da Alerj. Conversa informal telefônica em 03/09/2018.

ALBANI, Lucas. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Publicitário, Gestor de design e de mídias sociais da ALES. Entrevista por vídeo do Whatsapp em 25/09/2019.

COELHO, André. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Sub-diretor de Comunicação da Alerj. Entrevista por vídeo do Whatsapp em 12/11/2018.

FARAGE, Fabíola. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Gerente geral de Imprensa e Divulgação e gestora do Projeto Presença Digital da ALMG. Entrevista presencial em 15/08/2018.

MARQUES JÚNIOR, Alaôr Messias. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Diretor de Planejamento e Coordenação da ALMG. Entrevista presencial em 16/10/2018.

MENEZES, Daniela Santiago Mendes. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Gerente de Relações Institucionais da ALMG. Entrevista presencial em 14/11/2018.

PRADO, José Geraldo. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Diretor de Comunicação da ALMG. Entrevista por Skype em 22/10/2018.

SÁ, Manuela. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Diretora de Redação do Departamento de Comunicação da ALESP. Entrevista por vídeo do Whatsapp em 24/10/2019.

TERRA, Ana Carolina Utsch. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Gerente de Mídias Digitais da ALMG. Entrevista presencial em 16/10/2018.

TIRIBA, Daniel. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Jornalista e designer encarregado da produção de conteúdo para as redes sociais na Alerj. Entrevista presencial em 28/09/2018.

VIEIRA, Tainah. **Redes Sociais das Assembleias Legislativas**. Coordenadora do Núcleo de Marketing e Projetos Especiais da Alerj. Entrevista presencial em 28/09/2018.