



# 23<sup>RD</sup> INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS RESEARCH CONFERENCE

Connecting Theory and Research with  
Public Relations Practice

Doubletree by Hilton  
Orlando Downtown  
Orlando, Florida, USA

March 5–7, 2020

Edited by:  
Branden Birmingham  
University of South Carolina  
Bora Yook, Ph.D.  
Fairfield University  
Zifei Fay Chen, Ph.D.  
University of San Francisco  
[iprrc.org@gmail.com](mailto:iprrc.org@gmail.com)

## **How Public Relations Can Create Ritual Narratives to Ease the Pains of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in the Workplace**

*Paulo Roberto Nassar de Oliveira*  
*Emiliana Pomarico Ribeiro*  
Aberje  
Universidade de São Paulo (Brazil)

*Luiz Alberto de Farias*  
*Vânia Penafieri de Farias*  
Universidade de São Paulo (Brazil)

### **Abstract**

The paper aims to generate reflections on how Public Relations professionals can help to reduce the so-called “pains of the 21st century” in the workplace – such as anxiety, depression, fear, tiredness, stress – from the creation of new narratives of communication, with messages and campaigns that are more ritualistic and humanized.

*Keywords:* organizational communication; public relations; new narratives; employee communications.

In many organizations, there is a growing climate of saturation, pressure, and anxiety caused by informational excesses, unreachable goals, and paradoxical narratives that fuel organizational bullying. The main aspect of this study involves understanding how so-called ritual narratives – planned by Public Relations professionals – can contribute to ease the “21st-century pains” in the workplace. Although there is a considerable number of studies on Organizational Communication and Employee Communication, there are still few of them addressing how PR professionals can be agents of transformation of the organizational environment by contributing to these new narratives.

The goal is to strengthen studies and practices in the field of Public Relations since procedural dynamics in organizations can generate pains that hinder the assertiveness and effectiveness of communication. Therefore, the paper intends to generate reflections for a better confrontation of the challenges imposed by the organizational culture, based on humanization based communications.

To illustrate and understand the pains felt in the work environment, we held a discussion with about 200 professionals from Brazilian organizations, participants of the courses “Humanization of Internal Communication,” organized by Aberje – Brazilian Association for Business Communication, between 2015 and 2018. The next step was a critical-interpretive process about new narratives created by PR professionals, adapted to these new ways of feeling the world of work. The study proposes reflections on the challenges imposed on the organizational environment, providing an overview of the many impacting factors of professional performance and quality of life of people in their work environments. Thus, it is expected that the results – aimed at a critical look at contemporary organizational scenarios – will bring contributions to studies and communication practices, from a more human, ritualistic, and transformative perspective in the face of increasingly complex and challenging power relations in organizations.

### *21st Century Pains*

Between 2015 and 2018, about 200 communication professionals from Brazilian organizations took part in discussions while participating in the courses “Humanization of Internal Communication,” held by Aberje – Brazilian Association for Business Communication. Two questions were asked: “How do you feel in your daily work?” and “Why do you think you feel this way?”. They were required to record their feelings and perceptions on paper and then share their responses with the room.

The most relevant answers on how they feel in their daily work were: 97% tired, 94% anguished, 93% pressured, 92% stressed, 89% overworked, 86% anxious, and 78% frustrated. When asked about the main reasons that make them feel that way, communicators highlighted the issues of hyper connection (which provides anxiety, a sense of urgency, excess of information being thrown at them, and the need to be connected 24/7), lack of recognition (also understanding that there is not much space or time for feelings in the work environment), small and multifunctional teams (which creates overloads), lack of budget for campaigns, lack of time, lack of focus (due to high daily demand), pressure and self-pressure to achieve results.

These spontaneous answers brought more negative than positive responses. Besides, when asked why they feel this way, they justified mostly the negative questions. These responses suggest a reflection of the metaphorically called “21st-century pains”, enhanced by the issues of hyperconnection, immediacy, and self-pressure to obtain a high performance to reach goals – goals, that, many times, do not have an obvious meaning. If, on the one hand, “technological developments could free man from work; on the contrary, they seem to put you under psychic pressure” (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 217).

Without plunging into deep interpretations about the anthropological understanding of each disease – since each culture, context, and society establish their standards of normality and abnormality – and

without detailing individual factors that make someone more susceptible to a certain pain, one can consider the insights of contemporary thinkers and reflect about these new contexts of “a world full of confused signs, prone to change quickly and in an unpredictable way” (BAUMAN, 2004, p.7) and the possible impacts that these changes have on minds and in the bodies of countless people.

For Harari (2016), we are experiencing a great race in the 21st century. We run all the time – and fast – to avoid economic collapse or ecological disintegration, or to seek the so-called individual and collective happiness endlessly. And this rush to reach those desires ends up affecting both the psychic and the physical bodies of the human beings of the 21st century. Even after centuries of economic growth, technological developments, and scientific progress – an era in which one would imagine that life should become serene and peaceful and increasingly free of care and worries, at least in the most developed countries – the reality is quite the opposite. “On the individual level, it results in high levels of stress and tension (...) Despite all our achievements, we feel under constant pressure to do and produce even more” (HARARI, 2016, p.223).

For Han (2015), postmodern individuals are empowered and led to believe that they can do anything to increase their productivity. In this way, they end up exercising what the author calls the positivity of power, often imposing violence on their own psychic and physical bodies, in search of high performance at work. They even assume responsibility for failure and guilt for not achieving the goals imposed by organizational strategies.

In this scenario, the subject of obedience emulated by Foucault (2010) is replaced by the issue of performance that promotes a self-exploration of the subject’s abilities, becoming both the explorer and the exploited. Likewise, sociologist Richard Sennett (2010) reflects on this context in which individuals start to have new work relationships where there is no long-term logic. Therefore, they feel under pressure – by mechanized processes of productivity, by superiors, by peers and, mainly, by themselves – to produce positive results at all times, in several simultaneous projects, are more likely to fall ill, as well as to corrupt their social bonds. Along the same lines, Vicent de Gaulejac (2007), says that

performance and profitability are measured in the short term, “in real-time,” putting the entire production system under permanent tension: zero delay, exact time, tense flows, immediate management, etc. It is about doing more, always better, always more quickly, with the same means and even with less staff. (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 45)

Consequently, the subject of performance in the 21st century is a faster and more productive professional than that of obedience in the 20th century, even though he remains disciplined in doing what has to be done. Only, from then on, they become aggressors of themselves and their relationships with others. For Han (2015, p.91), the performance society creates exhausted, depressed, and worn out people, as if they are tired of struggling with themselves. This psychic disorder of a depressive character, preceded by mental and physical exhaustion, is called burnout.

Burnout, which usually precedes depression, does not refer so much to that sovereign individual who lacks the strength to be master of himself. On the contrary, burnout is the pathological consequence of self-exploration. The imperative of expansion, transformation, and reinventing oneself has the counterpoint of depression, which presupposes an offer of products linked to identity. The more frequently you change your identity, the more you boost production. The industrial disciplinary society depends on a firm and unchanging identity, while the non-industrial performance society needs a flexible person to increase production. (HAN, 2015, p.97)

According to psychologist Ana Rossi, from Isma-BR, (apud SENDIN; TATIANA, 2018), 96% of people who suffered burnout do not feel able to work, despite that 92% continue to go to their workplace to work, since they are afraid of being fired or replaced if they ask for leave. Bauman (2004) states in his reflections that this self-exploration, as well as its consequent depression, stress, or anxiety, are consequences of an inability to achieve a perfect fit between effort and reward in everyday life since it seems impossible to match the speed and pace of the flow of time. Pain is a picture of frustration, which “he called the ‘inadequacy complex’ and pointed out, according to his own definition, as one of the great afflictions of ‘liquid-modern’ life” (SENADOR, 2018, p. 102).

In this sense, in Brazil, mental illnesses accounted for more than 37% of the reasons that motivated workers to leave their professional activities in 2016 (TRT / MG, 2017). With a share of 5.8% of the population suffering mental illnesses, Brazil has the highest rates of depression in Latin America. At the same time, among the Americas, it is second only to the USA (5.9%). At the global level, the World Health Organization predicts that in 2020, depression will be the most disabling disease in the world (ONU BR, 2017).

According to a survey on work and well-being produced by the American Psychological Association (Levine, 2018), there is a growing feeling of helplessness and lack of control taking hold in corporate environments, which are increasingly hostile, competitive, and less welcoming. In the USA, for example, depression has direct and indirect costs estimated at US\$ 250 billion. Meanwhile, presenteeism –defined as a fall in productivity in the workplace – accounts for 50% of these costs. Despite the suffering and evident impairment of the professional performance, depression is the most underdiagnosed disease, with 45% of depressed people not receiving the correct treatment, according to data from the World Health Organization,

In a survey conducted by the International Stress Management Association (Isma-BR), nine out of ten Brazilians in the job market experience symptoms of anxiety, while 47% suffer from some degree of depression (SENDIN, 2018). Hyperconnectivity, shortening of deadlines, a state of emergency for finding solutions, and the need for absence of errors endorse this permanent state of an environment of emergency in which the worker meets

(...) increasing tensions, linked to the shortening of deadlines, the imperative of “tense flows,” the requirement of “fair time,” the consequences of “zero failure,” and “downstream management.” Each one is invited to work faster, to eliminate “lost” times, to justify any delay and setback. (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 199)

Moreover, so many tensions can also lead to stress, a reaction that has physical, psychological, mental, and hormonal components that harm human beings. Gaulejac (2007, p.205) points to the appearance of possible somatic and psychosomatic disorders that doctors classify in five categories that may be connected and be a consequence of self-exploitation at work, triggered by stress: 1) psychological disorders: anguish crises, phobias, panic states, insomnia; 2) digestive disorders: gastric ulcers, epigastric cramps, ulcerative hemorrhagic rectocolitis; 3) dermatological diseases: psoriasis, eczema, hives; 4) cardiovascular disorders: myocardial infarctions; 5) behavioral disorders: migraine, smoking, physical violence, alcoholism, suicides, etc.

Chanlat (2007) predicted an increase in the number of people going through these “21st-century pains” because of work, as organizations increasingly show themselves as “a place conducive to suffering, physical and psychological violence, boredom, and even despair [...]” (CHANLAT, 2007, p. 25). In the same vein, Gaulejac (2007, p.82) is also critical of the organizational strategies that subject

individuals to adapt to the “working time,” to the productive and financial needs, which are most of the time “detached from time of human life” because

they force men to suffer an abstract, programmed time, contrary to their needs. The temporality of work leads to the imposition of rhythms, cadences, ruptures that move away from biological time, from the time of the seasons, from the time of human life. The abstract measure of time allows you to disconnect it from physiological or psychological needs: sleep, food, procreation, aging, etc. (GAULEJAC, 2007, p.82)

Thus, employees need to be faster, in a more accurate, more productive, and more concrete manner. They have no time and space for many reflections, thoughts, errors, emotions, and subjectivities. They feel alone in a race, responsible for achieving great numerical results and without the expected recognition. The immediacy in resolutions and productions is one of the significant behaviors observed in today’s society. And all this causes a feeling of impatience, irritability, and lack of availability for others (SENADOR, 2018, p. 39).

For Gaulejac (2007), the organizational environments usually contain strategies that follow an obsession with numbers, behind cold and objective rationality, which make many workers lose their sense of measure. They are “close relations between the financial economy and the libidinal economy, between the managerial norms and the psychic mobilization, between the management of companies and the management of oneself” (GAULEJAC, 2007, p. 37), so that they bring up resistances and disappointments in the organizational environment, in addition to feelings of fear and guilt. Commonly, at first, violence is hardly recognized and named in a way that “erodes the motivation, security, and self-esteem of workers daily” (FARRAH, 2016, p. 47). Over time, many times,

[...] what started as a pleasurable job, in which professional sense and fulfillment was sought [...] and found, ends up becoming a cumbersome and unwanted burden, with which the individual drags on, without energy, without a will, without finding meaning to that routine, from which you only want to get away (SILVA, 2016, p. 65).

Thus, what is here called a “21st-century pain” is a metaphor that reflects how behaviors and experiences are transformed according to changes in the social, economic, and cultural contexts and also the arrival of new interactions made possible by new technologies. It’s a new reality within the organizational environment, which can potentiate some of these pains in this new century, precisely because of the uncertainties it provides. And, the big question is that such difficulties make people put their emotional, inner life, adrift (SENNETT, 2010, p.19).

After all, how not to suffer, trying to always be the best in the race of the organizational environment, to achieve a supposed success in unattainable goals, following processes and more processes, in a context that bombards everyone with countless information and takes away them out of focus, without time and space, often to generate meaning for themselves and what they do with their lives?

Alvin Toffler (1973) was one of the first to write about information overload even before the spread of digital media. The author already warned that the growth of technologies would increase the production of information so quickly and in such large volumes that people would have difficulties in processing and absorbing large loads of information, in discerning its relevance, and in making sense of it, analyzing them, and turning them into something really useful for their lives, that is, transforming information into knowledge and concept.

The diverse information that reaches people every day – consequently stimulating their focus – triggers difficulties in managing what is most important and what should be focused on to generate meaning. This is what is suggested by the concept of “the attention economy,” coined by Thomas H. Davenport and JC Beck (2001) in the book of the same name to designate attention management. It is seen as a limited asset of increasing importance due to the growing number of the content generated by the most varied media, especially by digital media.

The difficulty in maintaining focus on a single task, due to the range of information on offer, is precisely what Holmes (1997) calls “Attention Deficit Syndrome,” characterized by the individual’s inability to “focus his attention during any reasonable length of time” (HOLMES, 1997, p.331). Related to this phenomenon, Lipp (2000, online), from the PUC-Campinas Stress Laboratory, comments:

The brain has filtering mechanisms that prevent the absorption of excess information. But, when a person wants to pay attention to everything, they neutralize the filter and start to absorb everything. But they cannot process this flood of information accurately and end up having a decrease in the ability to reason analytically (LIPP, 2000, online).

Therefore, the affluence of information creates the poverty of attention. Digital technologies – which enhance the rapid arrival of information, bombarded every second, on several bright screens that flash messages, continuously – sustain a life immersed in distractions. Some of the surveys even indicate that people peep on their smartphones about 150 times a day. Apple released a study of iPhone users, suggesting that they unlock the device about 80 times a day (SENADOR, 2018, p. 65). Consequently, it means that, due to technologies in all environments, everyday life is an ocean with waves of information, distraction, and blur. And the more distractions there are, the more disagreements about the purpose of the work and consequently the lack of motivation for its fulfillment.

The flood of data that hits us leads to sloppy shortcuts, such as selecting emails by subject, skipping many voice messages, reading over notes, and memos. It is not just that we have developed attention habits that make us less efficient, but that the weight of the messages leaves us very little time to reflect on what they really mean simply. (GOLEMAN, 2013, p.17)

Thus, cognitively overloaded, with a constant flow of emails, texts, messages, accounts payable, people reach a brain state contrary to the clear focus for discoveries, being more prone to errors and loss of self-control. Thus, the attention deficit hinders deep reflection and decision-making, as well as the ability to gain insights and be creative. “Amid the turmoil of our daily distractions and our to-do lists, innovation stalls; in free time, it flourishes” (GOLEMAN, 2013, p. 50).

With digital technologies and the countless flashing applications that notify new information, lack of focus is intense. As a consequence, there are difficulties in having different ideas, often accepting a routine full of rules and protocols, which hinder innovation and humanization in relationships. One feels that it is not possible to keep up to date with everything that happens in the world. The feeling that arises – even if unconscious – is usually of “guilt” about the accumulated readings, the news that did not reach the ears, what was not seen, not commented on, nor opinioned.

All of these findings are symptoms that Wurman (1999) considers as indicators of the difficulty of people in dealing with the massive information load, which only makes people more anxious, often with low self-esteem and with a negative feeling that their knowledge is superficial. For Wurman,

“almost everyone has some degree of information anxiety. We read without understanding, we see without realizing, we hear without listening” (WURMAN, 1999, p.38).

Notably, these processes of interactions in this virtual world through mobile interfaces influence emotions and cause reflexes in social relationships and activities, making them, according to Bauman (2004), apparently more ephemeral and superficial. The author demonstrates that human connections are now simultaneously more frequent but also too brief and banal.

The attention deficit is also linked to a lack of focus on the other, preventing empathic relationships, which also affects moods. For, an empathic relationship requires joint attention – the mutual focus of the people they relate to. And, in the context in which we live, there is usually an effort on our part to have this type of human moment, “taking into account the ocean of distractions that we all face daily” (GOLEMAN, 2013, p.15), both because of informational excesses and personal distractions.

Personal distractions are those with a constant focus on ourselves: our appearances, our content, our interactions, and repercussions on what we comment, publish, and share. In a way, there is a “fear of being forgotten, isolated, of losing social visibility. While some are very fond of this moment of isolation, of meditation, for others, however, this is desperate” (SENADOR, 2018, p. 121).

People’s fear is intimately embedded in their stories. And this insecurity in the face of new technologies, social networks, the large amount of information in the present, instant relationships, short-term activities, and superficial experiences generate in people a need to record their stories, proliferating, without control, an attempt to produce a large set of virtual memories in the private field (GARDE-HANSEN, 2011). It is an attempt to individualization against massification. It is an attempt at subjectivity, in a world where objectivity and rationality prevail.

The present is not experienced deeply, only registered for a past with no time to be evaluated in the future. Besides, the excessive use of the internet leads individuals to become, many times, antisocial beings, focused so on themselves that they have difficulties in living with co-workers, friends, and even with their families (SENADOR, 2018, p. 126). When this happens, these individuals may be experiencing another pain of this 21st century: nomophobia, which is the “disorder of the digital age characterized by the discomfort and anxiety caused when the person is without a digital connection” (SENADOR, 2018, p.25).

That is, this pain corresponds to the fear of being unable to communicate, via cell phone or computer, over the internet. It is the fear of going offline. It is a digital dependence on “interaction between people and telecommunications equipment, especially smartphones, due to the unavailability of access to cell phones (...) or internet connection, which can cause feelings of discomfort and anxiety” (SENADOR, 2018, p. 107).

Therefore, an internet addict usually suffers from depression, insomnia, and a loss of interest in social activities, which directly affects their work, with reduced productivity daily and even the possibility of physical problems. The demand for help to fight technological dependence has increased due to psychological factors such as anxiety disorders, low self-esteem, social phobias, attention deficit, and hyperactivity, among others, and social factors, such as loneliness, isolation, and lifestyle in large urban centers (SENADOR, 2018, p. 110 – 111).

According to the book “Dependência de internet: manual e guia de avaliação e tratamento” (which can be translated as “Internet addiction: manual and assessment and treatment guide”), produced and organized by Kimberly S. Young and Cristiano Nabuco de Abreu (2011), once dependent, individuals may tend to see their virtual reality as more valid than their lives in real-time.

The vertiginous expansion of smartphones has extraordinarily popularized access to social media, making our daily lives integrate with them in such a way that we start to live almost in a



parallel universe – the digital universe - where relationships develop primarily in social networks. How will this influence our lives, our work, our daily lives? GAULEJAC, 2018, p. 23)

The boundaries between the imaginary, the spectacle, and everyday life have been definitively blurred, blending mediatized fiction and “real” life in an ambiguous space. Individuals have the means to achieve notoriety and success, exempting themselves, for this, from the stages and processes traditionally associated with artistic ascension. The perspective of the self (myself) can represent anxiety in capturing the “era that will never come back” (SEMPRINI, 2010).

As this “selfie” society reflects, when thoughts wander, they do not go to reflections on the other, which leads individuals to see themselves only slightly. The lack of relationship with the other deteriorates the capacity for gratitude. For Han (2015) and Sennett (2010), the gratification crisis is linked to a narcissistic disorder and the lack of relationship with others, which brings pain and suffering to oneself.

The narcissist is not used to experiences, they want to experience everything they find themselves with. In experience, we find the other. They are transformative encounters, they change us. The experiences, on the contrary, prolong the self and the other, in the world. In self-love, the limit to the other is clearly overcome. In narcissism, on the contrary, it merges. (HAN, 2015, p.84)

Therefore, the current context has suppressed the riches of profound experiences and, consequently, the way of relating to others. People and organizations are becoming saturated with information, weakened by experiences, and lacking in meaning and affection. For Larrosa-Bondía (2002), an experience is what happens to us, what happens to us, and what touches us. However, in the context of excessive information, speeds, and shallow thoughts about ourselves, a lot happens to us, little happens in us, and almost nothing touches us or affects us deeply:

experience, the possibility that something may happen or touch us, requires a gesture of interruption, a gesture that is almost impossible in the present times; it requires stopping to think, stopping to look, stopping to listen, thinking more slowly, looking more slowly, and listening more slowly; stopping to feel, feel more slowly, dwell on the details, suspend the opinion, suspend the judgment, suspend the will, suspend the automatic action, cultivate attention and delicacy, open our eyes and ears, talk about what it happens to us, to learn slowness, to listen to others, to develop the art of meeting, to be very quiet, to have patience and to give ourselves time and space. (LARROSA-BONDÍA, 2002, p. 24)

Therefore, when reflecting on the impoverishment of experiences in a dynamic and uninterrupted world, there is also talk, above all, of the relational weakening; that is, the lack of time and space for affections between people. For the Epicurean philosopher Espinosa (1979), relating is the natural logic of life. To live is to be part of the world and to be subject to constant encounters with other parts of this world. To meet these different parts is to relate to them, to affect and be affected by them.

However, if there are countless possibilities for superficial encounters in these new contexts, little can affect them profoundly. What happens in the context of the selfie, the abundance of information, the speed, and the ephemerality is a continuous movement of disenchantment since the magic that touches the being has faded in new stimuli that quickly replace and are replaced.

For Bauman (2004) and Sennett (2010), we experience today a disintegration of impersonal bonds and ties. It is as if we were wearing a mask that simultaneously allows us to enjoy the other's company, but also that protects us. Thus, the "friction and stroking of shoulders, contiguity, intimacy, sincerity, entering into the other, without keeping secrets, confessing compulsively and compulsorily" (BAUMAN, 2004, p.49) – which used to be human defenses against loneliness – are now replaced by frenetic and frivolous interactions, such as likes, words in chat boxes, virtual comments, so that:

when we look more closely and remove the mask, we discover unfulfilled longings, frayed nerves, frustrated loves, sufferings, fears, loneliness, hypocrisy, selfishness, and compulsion to repeat... performances replace ecstasy, the physical is inside, metaphysics, outside... (SIGUSCH apud BAUMAN, 2004, p.65)

All this complexity and fluidity of the 21st century, with its weaknesses and flexibilities, mainly affect the organizational environment, the professional relationships, and their affectivity. A life full of frustrations and pain, therefore, condemns the organizational culture. How can communication contribute to the construction of new narratives, adapted to these new realities?

*New Narratives and Rituals for a More Humanized Organizational Culture*

New organizational patterns of coping with the countless challenging scenarios presented in this study continually emerge. They range from remodeling the physical work environment to actions that can alleviate everyday tensions, seeking to create a kind of oasis, naturalizing the work environment as a unique environment, endowed with a completeness that will suffice the professional's life, leaving out other personal needs. Ultimately, looking for the creation of "homo corporativus".

As much as internal communication has its recognized importance in communication planning in organizations, good, assertive vehicles are not enough if there is not a full adherence to the human and to the organizational culture, which can be defined as

a set of fundamental values and assumptions expressed in symbolic elements, which, in their ability to order, assign meanings, build organizational identity, both act as an element of communication and consensus, as well as hide and instrumentalize relationships of domination. (FLEURY and FISCHER apud MARCHIORI, 2006, p. 80)

These confrontations, when strategically planned and aligned with the principles and characteristics of the organizational culture, tend to be more efficient. In this sense, the organizational culture arises from the essence of the organization and, even though it exists from power relations, culture – somehow imposed by the organization – is transformed and transmuted from the relationship with the other. Culture is organizational, but the everyday experience is individual and human, and the combination of these factors brings up three fundamental aspects: artifacts, shared values, and underlying assumptions. Nevertheless, none of these elements can affect if there is no affection on the individual's part on some level so that they can be impacted – negatively or positively.

The mentioned aspects work as levels of the organizational culture and its interaction, according to Schein (1997). Thus, the first level – artifacts – encompasses visible and / or audible behavior patterns, the visibility of the physical space, and the rules of conduct and dress of people, language, technology, and products.

At the second level – values -, they are tested in the physical environment and practiced by social consensus. Values contribute to the analysis of how members behave in the face of an organizational situation.

The third level refers to underlying assumptions, which include relationships with the environment, nature of reality, time and space, nature of the human activity, and nature of human relationships. These are indisputable values given their character of “truth” and their repetition. The organization’s rituals are found in this third level of culture, characterized by an ‘eternal return’ of what is said, well said, wrongly said, or not said (NASSAR, FARIAS, and POMARICO, 2019). The levels of the organizational culture and its level of communicative “tangibility” can be better seen in the table below:

<b>ARTIFACTS, TECHNOLOGY, AND ART</b>	Visible, but often not decipherable
<b>VALUES</b>	Excellent level of knowledge
<b>BASIC ASSUMPTIONS</b>	Considered to be true. Invisible. Unconscious.

Source: adaptation of MARCHIORI, 2006, p. 95

The understanding of organizational culture and its rituals already includes a large number of paradoxical elements. At the same time that the constant transformation present in individuals and organizations is seen as natural and belongs to an expected evolutionary process, change processes are often sources of conflict and resistance; that is, a desire for stability that is opposed to discomfort, the new, the unexpected.

Understandings about the nature and significance of organizations lead to this intrinsic relationship with organizational culture and the importance of narrative rituals in the context of continuous changes and living organisms, even if procedural.

With a broader focus and taking into account the aspect of social interaction, the influence of the environment, and a constant movement of mutation, Morgan (1996) points out that organizations are true living systems, with different levels of adaptability to varying types of environments. Oliveira (2002) highlights the resilience experienced in organizations in an overflowing perspective beyond the walls of the workplace, because

as organizations grow and expand in all areas of social life, on the other hand, they describe the options of extra-organizational life for individuals, causing them to create psychological, social, and technological accommodation mechanisms so that they can adequately coexist and survive. (OLIVEIRA, 2002, p. 79)

In the work environment, the trend is the change that will continue to transform the social system, requiring an adjustment of behaviors by professionals and a constant awareness by organizations to create a permanent recognition of flexibility, even if they always encounter obstacles (SOTO, 2008). The author also says that

people who carry out the changes are people, which leads us to the conclusion that the traditional emphasis on the best strategic management technologies will hardly achieve the best results expected if it does not focus on the reality and development of the staff. (SOTO, 2008, P. 270)

The organizational culture must permeate and function as a supporting pillar for any ritual narratives built in the work environment. As an example, we can cite the transformation of corporate

office environments, in which hierarchies are demystified through the absence of walls and the emergence of workstations devoid of symbolic power, greater physical and visual proximity to other people in the workplace, loss of individual reference, and possession of a workstation for more fluid and interactive use of physical space.

However, the change in physical space cannot be limited only to what is understood as a visible artifact, as exposed by Schein (1997). Paradoxically, such a process of change can generate a series of organizational tensions, namely: loss of the feeling of belonging and territory in the face of a shared, changeable and impersonal workspace; disorders caused by collective physical proximity, such as excessive noise and minimal privacy – even though the work environment does not retain individuality characteristics a priori.

Such changes are complex and require new narratives that are coordinated and expressed in rites and rituals, shared values, played by the organization continuously, and echoed in the organizational environment. Shared values based on strategies with humanized narratives must take into account the individuals' adaptability time and the maintenance of a healthy organizational climate. The absence of these components can lead to dissonant shared values, such as resistance to shared and changing physical environments, social isolation, conflicts in interpersonal relationships, among others.

From studies by Pettigrew & Whipp about change in organizations and the direct relationship with communication, Reis (2004) highlights three dimensions: communicational pattern, communicative practice, and communicational initiatives. For each of the dimensions, the content of the relationship and the aspects of change can be related. Thus, for the first dimension "context of change," there is the creation and reproduction of expectations and the creation of the communicational pattern of response. For the second dimension, "process of change", there is a search for characterization, particularization, and differentiation in the dynamics of the relationship, which generates communicative practice. Finally, in the third dimension, "content of change," actions are implemented – fostering reactions – through communicational initiatives.

There is no way to experience organizational transformations – often triggered by the external environment – without a robust communicational presence. It increasingly requires much more than efficient vehicles for the flow of information, but instead transforming agents of change that can strategically work communication in the face of humanization aspects.

Studies that involve quality of working life (QWL) – an essential aspect of humanization in organizations – date from the 1950s, and are revisited from time to time, given the complexities of modern life that strongly impact the world of work. According to Forno and Finger (2015, p. 109), "it has been shown that job satisfaction is reflected in profitability for the organization, whether through increases in production or improved commitment."

Job satisfaction is the translation of assertive, ritualistic organizational narratives, which place humanization as the protagonist and make it possible to reduce the levels of tension so prevalent in the corporate environment.

### **Final Considerations**

The reflections made here – based on the perspective of a digital, fluid, random, abundant, changeable, ephemeral, chaotic, complex, exposed, and uncertain context – demonstrate that, in many cases, organizational cultures may be created that highlight the so-called pains of the 21st century.

Formed by interpretations, understandings, and constructions of meanings, the organizational culture is based on transcendent and subjective values – such as the feelings and affections (positive and negative) of the subjects who live and interrelate in a given time and workspace. Controversies, a multiplicity of opinions, beliefs, and affections that change with each new challenge float in the work

environments. Hence, the organizational culture is linked to the human, to each individual who is part of that environment.

Therefore, it is not possible to generalize or create unique, rational, and protocol models of communications in organizations. The reflections brought here point not to conditions or rules to be followed for a communication that will vehemently deliver affections and positive results. On the contrary, due to the complex context studied, the discussions are precisely opposed to ideas of ready models and imposed on all.

Even if they are not trained in STEM disciplines, communication professionals would very much like to believe in a magic formula of communication that they could rationally control and measure. For this reason, they are often seduced by these models, rules, and metrics, which bring them certain credibility in showing a result, however abstract or intangible it may be. Nevertheless, the reality reminds us that perfection is always relative, that the possibilities are infinite, that the same message can affect different individuals positively or negatively, that error is always possible in the human world, and that conflicts are inherent in relationships because everyone has their incompatibilities.

Overall, when the goal is more related to humanization and less to institutionalization, one stops merely submitting oneself to representative roles, labels, and positions that prioritize and privilege control, the rational, the paradoxical, the meaningless, and the lack of recognition, freedom, and opportunities for innovation. Then, they give rise to respect, without crises of affective artificialism, moving from the fast of indifference to a regime of urgent transformation, focusing on new, more humanized narratives that privilege care and compassion.

### References

- BAUMAN, Z. (2004). *Amor líquido*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
- CHANLAT, J. (2007). Por uma antropologia da condição humana nas organizações. In.: TÔRRES, Ofélia de Lanna Sette (Org.). *O indivíduo na organização: dimensões esquecidas*. Tradução e adaptação de Arakey Martins Rodrigues – 3ª ed – 10 reimpr. São Paulo, Atlas.
- DAVENPORT, T. H. & BECK, J. C (2001). *A Economia da Atenção: Compreendendo o novo diferencial de valor dos negócios*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
- ESPINOSA, B. (1979). *Pensamentos Metafísicos*. In: Chauí, M. (org). *Espinosa. Os Pensadores*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural.
- FARRAH, B (2016). Da depressão ao assédio organizacional: efeitos humanos do poder paradoxal nas empresas pós-disciplinares. In: FARRAH, Bruno Leal (Org). *Assédio moral e organizacional: novas modulações do sofrimento psíquico nas empresas contemporâneas*. São Paulo: LTr.
- FORNO, C. D. & FINGER, I. R (2015). Qualidade de vida no trabalho: conceitos, histórico e relevância para a gestão de pessoas. In: *REVISTA BRASILEIRA DE QUALIDADE DE VIDA*. v. 7, n. 2.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2010). *Vigiar e Punir*. 38ª ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- GARDE-HANSEN, J. (2011). *Media and Memory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- GAULEJAC, V. (2007). *Gestão como doença social. Ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social*. Tradução Ivo Storniolo. Aparecida – SP: Ideias & Letras.
- GOLEMAN, D. (2013). *Foco: a atenção e seu papel fundamental para o sucesso*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva.
- HAN, B. (2015). *Psicopolítica: neoliberalismo e novas técnicas de poder*. Tradução de Miguel Serras Pereira. Lisboa, PT: Relógio D'Água.
- HARARI, Y. N. (2016). *Homo Deus- uma breve história do amanhã*. Tradução Paulo Geiger – 1ª edição – São Paulo. Companhia das Letras.
- HOLMES, D. S. (1997). *Psicologia dos Transtornos Mentais*. 2ª ed. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.
- LARROSA-BONDIA, J. (2002). Notas sobre experiência e o saber da experiência. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*. Rio de Janeiro: Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Educação, n.19, p.20-28, jan./abr. Disponível em: [http://www.anped.org.br/rbe/rbedigital/RBDE19/RBDE19\\_o4\\_JORGE\\_LARROSA\\_BONDIA.pdf](http://www.anped.org.br/rbe/rbedigital/RBDE19/RBDE19_o4_JORGE_LARROSA_BONDIA.pdf). Acesso em: 15 de out. 2019.
- LIPP, M. (2000). *Laboratório de Estudos Psicofisiológicos do Stress*. Laboratório de Stress. Disponível em: <http://WWW.estresse.com.br/leps.html>. Acesso em 18 out. 2019.
- MARCHIORI, M. (2006). *Cultura e comunicação organizacional: um olhar estratégico sobre a organização*. São Caetano do Sul, SP: Difusão.
- MORGAN, G. (1996). *Imagens da organização*. Trad. Cecília Whitaker Bergamini, Roberto Coda. São Paulo: Atlas.
- NASSAR, P., FARIAS, L. A. & POMARICO, E (2019). *Narrativas rituais: uma aproximação entre comunicação e antropologia*. Santa Maria.
- OLIVEIRA, S. L. (2002). *Sociologia das organizações*. São Paulo: Pioneira Thomson Learning.
- REIS, M. C.(2004). Comunicação e mudança organizacional: uma interlocução instrumental e constitutiva. In: *Revista ORGANICOM. Comunicação e mudança cultural nas organizações*, Ano 1, Número 1.
- SCHEIN, R. H. (1997). *Organizational culture and leadership*. 2. ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- SEMPRINI, A. (2010). *A marca pós-moderna: poder e fragilidade da marca na sociedade contemporânea*. 2ª ed. São Paulo: Estação das Letras.

- SENADOR, A. (2018) Nomofobia 2.0 e outros excessos na era dos relacionamentos digitais. São Paulo: Aberje.
- SENDIN, T. (2018). Precisamos falar sobre estresse. Revista Exame. Disponível em <<https://exame.abril.com.br/negocios/precisamos-falar-sobre-estresse/>> . Acesso em: 15 de out. de 2019.
- SENNETT, R. (2010) A corrosão do caráter: conseqüências pessoais do trabalho no novo capitalismo. Rio de Janeiro: Record.
- SILVA, J. (2016). A síndrome de burnout como consequência do assédio moral no ambiente de trabalho. In: FARRAH, Bruno Leal (Org). Assédio moral e organizacional: novas modulações do sofrimento psíquico nas empresas contemporâneas. São Paulo: LTr.
- SOTO, E. (2008). Comportamento organizacional: o impacto das emoções. São Paulo: Cengage Learning.
- TOFFLER, A. (1973). O Choque do Futuro. 2ª Ed. São Paulo: Record.
- WURMAN, R. S. (1999). Ansiedade de Informação: como transformar informação em conhecimento. 2ª Ed. São Paulo: Cultura.
- YOUNG, K.S. e ABREU, C.N. (2011). Dependência de internet: manual e guia de avaliação e tratamento. Porto Alegre: Artmed.