

Understanding the sociology of social relations

في فهم سوسيولوجيا العلاقات الاجتماعية

* موساوي عبدالحفيظ

Moussaoui Abdelhafid

abdelhafid.moussaoui@univ-sba.dz

University of Sidi Bel Abbas,

Sociology of

(Algeria), The Laboratory of

communication

Social Studies and Research in

Algeria

لباير بلعباس Labair Belabbas

belabbas.labair@univ-sba.dz

University of Sidi Bel Abbas, (Algeria),

The Laboratory of Social Studies and Research in

Algeria

Received: 07/10/2024

Accepted: 28/12/2024

Published : 31/12/2024

Abstract: To understand social relations, we must research and trace many of the secretions contained in this complex concept and look at it from all angles, secrets, and intellectual problems, this is in light of the emergence of a number of variables affecting aspects of social life, which make them influence and be affected directly and indirectly in determining and drawing the pattern and nature of the map of social relations, so contribute to reshaping the societal reality, especially since the societal need for cohesion and intensification has become urgent, rather, it has become an inevitable circumstance and a strategic necessity at the same time after all these challenges and changes, Which added and gave this concept a special dimension and character in terms of formulation and intellectual rooting leading to the act of practice, accordingly, we sought in this study to try to understand and deconstruct the mechanisms of social relations within their sociological and psychological framework, In order to achieve the desired goals, we adopted the analytical approach to analyze and interpret our topic.

Keywords: social relations, social network, Sociology of interaction, levels of social relations.

* Corresponding author: abdelhafid.moussaoui@univ-sba.dz

ملخص: لفهم العلاقات الاجتماعية وجب علينا البحث والتعقب في كثير من الإفرازات التي يحتويها هذا المفهوم المتشعب والنظر إليه من كل الزوايا والخبايا والإشكالات الفكرية، وهذا في ظل بزوغ جملة من المتغيرات الملامسة لمناحي الحياة الاجتماعية، مما يجعلها تؤثر وتتأثر بشكل مباشر وغير مباشر في تحديد نمط وطبيعة خريطة العلاقات الاجتماعية، ومن ثم المساهمة في رسم الواقع المجتمعي من جديد خصوصا وأن الحاجة المجتمعية للتلاحم والتكاثف أضحت ملحة، بل عادت ظرفية حتمية وضرورة إستراتيجية في آن واحد بعد كل هذه التحديات والتغيرات، الأمر الذي أضفى وأعطى لهذا للمفهوم بعدا وطابعا خاص من حيث الصياغة والتأصيل الفكري وصولا لفعل الممارسة، وعليه سعيينا في هذه الدراسة إلى محاولة فهم وتفكيك آليات العلاقات الاجتماعية ضمن إطارها سوسيولوجي والسيكولوجي، وللوصول للأهداف المرجوة اعتمدنا المنهج التحليلي لتحليل وتفسير موضوعنا.

كلمات مفتاحية: العلاقات الاجتماعية؛ شبكة العلاقات الاجتماعية؛ سوسيولوجيا التفاعل؛ مستويات العلاقات الاجتماعية

1. Introduction:

Social relationships arise as a result of continuous interaction and communication among human beings, aiming to meet their needs and satisfy their desires. These relationships considered as the link that connects individuals in human communication and form the complex network of relationships between the individual and others. As these connections between humans grow and develop, continuous interaction and communication lead to bonding and cohesion, based on a set of relatively stable expectations that are fundamentally built upon the expectations of the interacting parties.

On the other hand, due to the importance of human social relationships as the basic unit of sociological analysis for sociologists, based on certain aspects and criteria, the first criterion is the continuity of these relationships – are they ongoing or intermittent? The second is the intensity of the relationship, i.e., the strength of the relationship between its parties and its nature (cooperative, competitive, or conflicting). Lastly, the type of relationships – whether political, economic, professional, kinship-based, etc. Moreover, social relationships can also be distinguished based on the targeted group (Luciana, 2022, p.01).

However, there are those who study social relationships from the perspective of the factors that lead to the emergence of specific relationships and the results that stem from them (Al-Khashab, 1996, p.200). Despite the differences in views among theorists, researchers, and thinkers regarding the theoretical frameworks that enable us to study and understand social relationships, some believe that it is necessary to study them within their sociological context

due to the nature of the essential components and characteristics that distinguish human societies. They argue that without understanding the network of social relationships, there would be no value in studying these human societies. On the other hand, another group argues that social relationships should be studied from a psychological and ethical perspective, given the psychological needs and motives that distinguish human beings from other creatures.

Since social relationships are a result of the interactions between individuals aimed at meeting needs and fulfilling desires, specialists regard these relationships as a vital source in the process of societal construction, particularly as they depend on social network systems. In reality, social relationships specifically form through the establishment of social networks due to their distinct attributes and characteristics (Pierpaolo, 2013, p.20). Regardless of the varying approaches to understanding and explaining the reasons for the formation and emergence of social relationships, they all stem from the social nature of humans, who strive to form groups that complete the network of social relationships (Ben Issa, 2011, p.167). Based on this, we chose this theoretical approach, which aims to address the key foundations and model frameworks followed by scholars in clarifying, understanding, and interpreting the sociology of social relationships. Social relationships are, after all, the foundation of communal life and the central concept of sociology.

Additionally, we found that "sociologists, regardless of their different schools of thought, have focused on studying society through the composition of individuals and relationships as a fundamental system for the emergence of social phenomena, regardless of their type" (Rahouma, 2005, p.276).

This compels us to explore a framework that seeks to answer the following question: What are the implications of interpreting and deconstructing the mechanisms of social relationships within their sociological and psychological context?

2. Understanding the Concept of Social Relationship Formation:

Individuals in society are connected by various relationships and bonds that arise from their social nature and interactions. Life places us in a complex network of relationships with others (Aljabli, 1984, p.204). Regardless of the type of relational field created by the actors,

social relationships can be defined as exchanges that take place between the actors. These exchanges lead to an understanding of culturally specific expectations, where individuals (pursue goals and hope to receive rewards) within social constraints, meaning (they have limited resources, and each strives to control and dominate the other while simultaneously defending themselves).

A social relationship is a form of cooperation where (they put their resources and skills in the service of all objectives), and it tends to create inequality because (the rewards depend on the position they occupy in that relationship and their influence within it, enabling them to exert effort over others). It is important to clarify that even in relationships that seem "equal," such as "love or friendship relationships," they are inherently unequal unless the actors prevent themselves from succumbing to this or from yielding to temptation and submission to the other. Therefore, most human relationships are either actually or potentially unequal. Each actor tends to prioritize control over their own goals, resources, and rewards, even at the expense of the other. This results in a pattern of social dominance unless the other party defends themselves or possesses the means to do so (Guy, Bajoit, 2009, pp.55-65).

To further clarify and navigate these two concepts or dimensions (constraints and expectations on the one hand, and cooperation and inequality on the other), this conception can be summarized into four essential dimensions of social relationships, as illustrated in the table below. Every relational system includes several social relationships and several pairs of actors.

To examine each form of these social relationships, we must analyze each of these four dimensions one by one, in sequence, as follows:

(Intentions): Defining the goals pursued and the contributions (resources and skills) that actors aim to acquire and achieve.

(Contributions): These define the nature of dominance, as it relates to the position occupied in the relationship, allowing each actor to control, in one way or another, the outcomes, resources, and skills of the other party.

(Rewards): Rewards are a condition of dominance, as each individual has their goals and contributions, taking into account the control (power and persuasion) that others exert over them.

(Dominance): This refers to rewards, including social recognition, moral reassurance, material well-being, self-awareness, and the ability to exert social influence.

Table 2: shows the shape and four basic dimensions of the concept of social relations according to Guy Bajoit's conception.

		Any social relationship generates expectaions among the actors and takes place under certain constraints	
		Cultural expectations	social restrictions
Any social relationship is a form of cooperation that tends towards inequality.	cooperation	01- Purposes Every actor is concerned with the following purposes: (relations issues partially and not completely, participants, conscious, legitimate and voluntary).	02- Contributions To achieve these goals, everyone acquires skills and resources that they contribute to relationships.
	inequality	03- Dominance It is that each actor has a limited ability to impose his dominance over the other or to defend himself, as each one controls the purposes, interests, resources and rewards.	04- Rewards Each person gets according to his contribution and unequal rewards to achieve his goals in one way or another, and to defend himself from the dominance of others.

Table 1 (Guy, Bajoit, 2009, p.53)

3. Theoretical Approaches to Social Relationships:

Social relationships arise through mutual interaction that lasts for a certain period of time, leading to the emergence of stable social expectations, such as the reciprocal role between husband and wife or the relationship between the psychoanalyst and the patient (Gaith, 2002, p. 437). Social relationships also form as a result of continuous interaction between individuals whether two persons or more, face-to-face, within a communication process.

Consequently, human and social relationships emerge. However, we can differentiate between human and social relationships: social relationships refer to a situation in which both parties engage in specific behavior, taking into account the behavior of the other (Sayed Ahmed, 2022, p. 212), whereas human relationships refer to the various methods agreed upon by people to achieve a desired way of life, ensuring continuity (Salma, 2003, p. 139).

The researcher studying "social relationships" finds themselves dealing with an overlap between two sciences—psychology and sociology—making it necessary to be knowledgeable in both. As a result, social relationships have received considerable attention from scholars, with different opinions and concepts being presented. Some have explored the topic in terms of positive aspects like experiences and discord, while others divided it into secondary social relationships prevalent in large societies.

However, there has been a disagreement among scholars and theorists on how to study social relationships. Some argue for studying them within the sociological framework, considering social relationships as a core component of human societies, and without them, it is impossible to understand society. On the other hand, others believe it is essential to study them within the psychological framework, given the unique psychological needs and motives of human beings.

- **The Interpretive (Individual) Approach:** This approach considers the individual as responsible for determining their own destiny and contributions, as the individual preceded society in existence. Society is not a figment of the imagination, meaning these thinkers emphasize how individuals and groups establish society and give it meaning. This approach, therefore, seeks to understand how individuals and groups build society rather than focusing on how society affects them. This implies living life rather than being concerned with how communities influence individuals and groups. Thus, the individual's life becomes the focal point of social life (Abdulaziz, 2017, p. 494). Accordingly, they view social relationships as emerging from the lived experiences of the individual. The problems that arise are primarily individual issues; social problems stem from the cumulative personal issues of individuals (Fayyad, 2022, pp. 14-15).

- **The Realist Social Structural Approach:** This approach argues that society imposes itself on individuals and constrains them with a set of established norms and standards, primarily reflected in traditions, customs, and various laws and regulations that inhibit social

relationships. These norms and values impose themselves on individuals, making them obligated to adhere to them without deviation. These standards, values, and forms become the predominant framework shaping the social relationship system, even though they may vary from one society to another, depending on the specific nature of each society. This especially includes all the means that society uses to ensure individuals comply with its values, attitudes, and goals, which involves regulating individual and social behavior (Othman, 2002, p. 70).

• **The Reconciliation Approach:** Proponents of the reconciliation approach argue that both structure and human action are interdependent and mutually influential. Neither can impose itself on the other due to their vital need for each other. Societal action, as a whole, requires the participation and contributions of all individuals to achieve its goals. Society, in particular, needs individuals to engage in any activity, whether within its institutions or otherwise. On the other hand, individuals cannot form and establish social relationships without the need for that social structure, which itself serves as a tool for regulation and communication among them, based on a set of values, means, and available resources. Furthermore, individuals cannot form social relationships without this social structure, which in turn regulates and supports the continuation of these relationships with material and cultural means. The absence or loss of part of this structure would affect human action, leading to the potential breakdown of social relationships. Thus, human action originates from the individual, while social structure originates from society, and neither can exist independently of the other.

4. Classification of Social Relationships:

There are several classifications of social relationships (Hamed, 2015, p. 35), including:

4.1. Charles Cooley's (C.H. Cooley) Classification:

Cooley distinguished between two types of relationships:

Primary Social Relationships (Les Relations Primaires): This type of relationship is characterized by strong bonds, cohesion, and cooperation. It is prevalent in small groups, referred to as primary groups, where "we" prevails over "I." This indicates a strong sense of belonging and connection to the group.

Secondary Social Relationships (Les Relations Secondaires): These relationships are found in secondary groups, which are larger and have more members. They are characterized by weaker personal relationships and rely on formal structures and contractual principles, as seen in institutions, associations, and similar entities.

4.2. Ferdinand Tönnies' (F. Tönnies) Classification:

Tönnies differentiated between social relationships in small, local communities and those in larger, more general societies (Al-Khashab, 1996, p. 137). There is also another classification in this category (Khalid Hamed, 2015, p. 35), such as the one proposed by Durkheim, which distinguishes between mechanical solidarity in simple societies and organic solidarity in more complex societies.

There are also two other aspects in describing and studying social relations, which are:

- **Qualitative or Descriptive Aspect (Aspect Qualitatif ou Descriptif):** This dimension focuses on the strength, cohesion, or weakness of social ties, analyzing whether relationships are strong, weak, cohesive, or lacking in unity.
- **Quantitative Aspect (Aspect Quantitatif):** This dimension assesses social relationships from a quantitative perspective, measuring the number of members involved, the degree of participation of each member, and the stability or cohesion of the relationship. This is based on quantitative standards and is often taken as a given.

4.3. K. Davis' Classification of Social Relationships:

K. Davis provided a set of criteria and foundations for classifying social relationships, as detailed in Table 2 below:

Table 02 : specifies the criteria identified by Davis.

	Primary Relationships	Secondary Relationships
Natural conditions	Spatial proximity Small number Long duration of interaction	Spatial dimension Large number Short duration of interaction
Social characteristics	Setting goals Self-assessment of the relationship Self-assessment of the other person Complete knowledge of the other person Availability of informal control	Lack of goal setting Impersonal evaluation of the relationship Impersonal evaluation of group members Limited knowledge of the other person

		Feeling of external constraints and pressures Dominance of formal control
Sample relationships	Friendship Husband-wife relationship Parent-child relationship Student-teacher relationship	The relationship between the seller and the customer The relationship between the broadcaster and the listener The relationship between the actor and the viewer The relationship between the boss and the subordinate The relationship between the author and the reader
Sample groups	Playgroup Family group Neighborhood or village group Work team	Companies Major Government Departments State

Table 02 (Al-Salmuti, 2008, p. 139)

4.4. Parsons' Classification of Social Relationships:

Parsons provided a detailed classification of social relationships, as follows:

- **Emotionality versus emotional neutrality:**

A social pattern (relationships) is considered emotional or affective because it allows the actor or role-player to directly satisfy all their needs and desires. In contrast, the relationship here is of an affectively neutral type if the actor or role-player is required to adhere to a specific system while pursuing the interests of others. The emotional form dominates certain types of relationships, such as family and friendship relationships. However, it takes on a more neutral character in certain relationships, such as those within formal organizations (Hamed, 2015, p. 37).

- **Self-Orientation versus Collectivity Orientation:**

Self-orientation seeks to achieve everything that benefits the members of the system, group, or society individually, while collectivity orientation aims to achieve the public good. However, several differences have been recorded in terms of orientation, mainly due to various standards related to the group, its goals, and its size.

- **Vertical relationships versus private relationships :**

vertical relationships characterized by judging individuals or things based on objective criteria, which are often determined by formal, regulated rules and procedures. In contrast, private relationships refers to evaluating individuals or things in light of subjective criteria (Hamed, 2015, p. 37).

- **Performance an achievement versus gender and heritage::**

Social systems differ in the methods used to determine the social status of their members. In some systems, social status is determined based on the work and achievements of individuals, as well as their qualifications and specializations, such as determining positions through the division of labor in formal institutions. On the other hand, in other systems, social status is determined based on hereditary factors, as in traditional and tribal societies (Abdulaziz, 2015, p. 500).

- **Specialization versus functional diffusion:**

It is known that systems and societies vary in terms of functional specialization and the precise definition of roles. Conversely, there are other systems characterized by functional diffuseness.

According to the classification model presented by Parsons, we can classify relationships within families as diffuse, emotional, and particularistic, driven by collective orientation. On the other hand, relationships within industrial and administrative organizations are characterized by specialization, affective neutrality, universalism, and a focus on principles of achievement.

- **Classification by Situation:**

In this classification, factors and standards are influenced by what often occurs in groups characterized by enforced loyalty, belonging, intensity, and a strong connection to the collective. It also includes formal contractual relationships, governed by a set of laws regulating the nature of social relationships.

4.5. Additional Classifications of Social Relationships:

- **Vertical Social Relationships (Relations Sociales Verticales):**

These relationships involve interactions between individuals occupying different social or functional roles, such as the relationship between managers and department heads in factories, where hierarchy governs the interaction, either from the top down or bottom up.

Where we find it done through the means of communication available between them (Fawzi, 2017, p. 55).

- **Horizontal Social Relationships (Relations Sociales Horizontales):** Horizontal relationships occur between individuals with similar or equal positions, such as the interaction between production managers and research directors, in order to conduct studies related to the reasons for low productivity in an institution. These social relationships are considered horizontal and this is for those who occupy similar or identical positions, or we can say equal ones. (Fawzi, 2017, p. 55).

- **Formal Social Relationships (Les Relations Sociales Formelles):** Formal relationships are those defined by the organizational structure of an institution or official body, and are regulated by legal frameworks and internal policies (Abdulaziz, 2015, p. 502) to ensure the achievement of the organization's objectives and sustainability specified by legal texts.

- **Informal Social Relationships (Les Relations Sociales Informelles):** it includes all the interactions that occur between the members of the organization or institution (Fawzi, 2017, p. 55). However, these interactions are not subject to regulations or organizational decrees, but rather arise as a result of events that occur within the organizations, leading to informal or non-institutional situations, such as incidental meetings or the aligned tendencies between each member and the group they belong to, or within social movements. In most cases, these interactions aim to either expand or undermine the organization, based on the interests of each group.

5. The Importance of Studying Social Relations:

Social relations hold great importance, as they often involve a set of rules and principles, which include all the driving and motivating factors. Among these motives and reasons are the following:

5.1. Psychological Motives (les Motifs psychologiques):

Social relations satisfy all psychological needs, which serve as the internal driving forces for humans (such as the need for security, food, love, shelter, belonging, etc.). Without these needs, it is impossible for any individual to achieve comfort, prosperity, and advancement with their fellow humans.

5.2. Public Interests (les Intérêts publics):

Social relations between individuals and groups generate a type of shared public interests and goals. Thus, the group strives to achieve these according to the common good, through cooperation and solidarity (Fayyad, 2022, p. 4).

5.3. Interdependence (Interdépendance):

It refers to mutual appreciation and respect for others and oneself, recognizing differences and disparities. Self-sufficiency cannot be achieved solely based on personal capabilities. Interdependence is an essential condition, whether within the same group or with other groups, in order to achieve the common good and thus maintain the system or common interest on which each group is founded.

5.4. Religious Beliefs (Croyances religieuses):

These reflect the diversity and plurality of religions, especially as each religion encourages and calls its followers to cooperate, harmonize, unite, support, and take pride in their community (Abdulaziz, 2017, p. 504). Therefore, each religion serves as a regulator, promoting solidarity, unity, and cooperation among its followers to protect the public interest.

5.5. Power (la force):

Power is the ability to influence others, control them, or change them in a specific way. Most social relations require power, as it acts as the social mechanism that regulates the behavior of individuals and groups to ensure balanced relations.

06 - Levels of Social Relations:

These are analytical levels that reflect the extent of adherence, diversity, and interaction between different social elements, subject to a set of standards and principles such as the processes of exchange in influencing and being influenced by two parties. The highest level of social exchange is the one that involves the most interaction. The most well-known levels of social relations are as follows:

6.1. First Level - Non-reciprocal or Circumstantial Relations (Relations circonstancielles):

These are superficial and temporary relationships, defined by certain circumstances, and may occur incidentally. An example of this type of social relationship is when individual "A" does not coincide with individual "B" and is not affected by individual "B". This means that there is no real communication or social interaction between them. Alternatively, individual "A" may

be asked to judge individual "B" based solely on available data, meaning individual "A"'s responses are influenced by information about individual "B".

6.2. Second Level - One-way Relationships (Relations avec les médias ou la publicité):

This is a form of social relationship, such as media or advertising relationships, which are fundamentally indirect and non-reciprocal. They arise between individuals and various media or advertising sources, such as television, radio, the internet, and other means. In this level, individual "A" does not coincide with individual "B", and while individual "A" is influenced by the behavior of individual "B", individual "B" is not influenced by individual "A". There is no real interaction between them. Individual "B" exerts significant influence on others, but they cannot influence individual "B" because the social relationship here is neither direct nor reciprocal.

6.3. Third Level - Semi-reciprocal Relations (Niveau dramaturgique ou théâtral):

This is the dramatic or theatrical level, based on the dramaturgy theory introduced by American sociologist Erving Goffman in his book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* in 1959. It compares social relations to theatrical performances where actors play specific roles and follow pre-written or planned scripts. In this type of relationship, individual "A" and individual "B" interact according to a predetermined plan or a scripted dialogue, where individual "A" encounters individual "B" and responds in a specific manner within a precise system. Although there appears to be interaction, it is simply a role they follow based on given directions.

6.4. Fourth Level - Non-interactive Relations (Niveau non interactif ou non synchrone):

This level is characterized by the lack of balance or harmony between individual "A" and individual "B" in the social relationship. When they speak, neither listens to or responds to the other. There is no interaction, communication, or mutual interest between them, as they compete and conflict. An example of this is the situation between a defendant and a plaintiff or between a witness and a judge.

6.5. Fifth Level - Reciprocal but Unbalanced Relations (Niveau interactif ou synchrone):

This is also known as the interactive or synchronous level, characterized by balance, harmony, and synchronization between individual "A" and individual "B". When one speaks, the other responds, indicating mutual agreement and complementarity in terms of cognitive closeness. There is real interaction and communication between them, and they cooperate, understand, and agree with each other, particularly in terms of mutual respect and appreciation. An example of this would be the relationship between colleagues, between husband and wife, or between a teacher and a student during open, direct dialogue.

6.6. Sixth Level - Mutual Relations (Relations mutuelles):

This is considered the most accurate and true form of social relations, as it involves mutual interaction during the social exchange process. It reflects complementarity, reality, and interaction between individuals and groups. At this level, individual "A" and individual "B" are in a synchronized and balanced relationship, each influencing the other in terms of attitudes and behaviors in a harmonious and balanced way. They exhibit cognitive closeness, mutual understanding, and cooperation. An example of this is the relationship between friends or between a husband and wife.

7. Factors Affecting Social Relations:

There are several traits and characteristics that govern and influence social relations, including the following:

7.1. Work Conditions:

In this context, individuals communicate and interact with various groups that possess different cultures, allowing them to acquire and develop new skills through social interaction.

7.2. Media in General:

Media influences individuals through the process of socialization and interaction, utilizing magazines, music, television programs, as well as social media platforms and other means.

7.3. Individual Experiences:

These contribute to shaping one's thoughts, inclinations, and interests, all of which reflect on their social behavior and relationships with others.

7.4. Personal Traits:

These are the various characteristics that affect an individual's behavior regarding their self-perception and how others perceive them. Such traits differ among individuals, including

(introversion, irritability, pessimism, calmness, optimism, responsibility, recklessness, logic, etc). Consequently, all these traits influence the nature of an individual's relationships with others. It's also noted that the relationship between people with disabilities and those without differs significantly from their relationships with each other (Fayyad, 2022, p. 6).

7.5. Scientific and Technological Advancement:

The significant changes brought about by this advancement across various aspects of society clearly and obviously impact the social relations among community members and groups. This impact can be either positive or negative, depending on how this technology is utilized in relation to real life.

8. Conclusion:

The emergence of social relations among individuals is influenced by a set of specific regulations, as it arises from different considerations and criteria. An individual's social status and the role of social life are sufficient to determine the type of relationship to be established, while individuals' perceptions of others dictate the nature of their relationships. This is not just based on an individual's own perspective but also on how others perceive them, especially since opinions vary and multiply according to each individual's status and the nature and interests of each person. For example, the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims is entirely different from their relationships with each other, as each community has its unique characteristics.

Social relations are affected by various foundations, regulations, and criteria, such as biological factors, which include physical, genetic, and health characteristics of individuals; psychological regulations, such as mental, behavioral, and emotional aspects, which influence their inclinations, attitudes, and choices regarding the type of social relationship; and social regulations that relate to cultural, economic, religious, legal, and political characteristics of communities through the standards of values and practices of relationships. Additionally, individual regulations pertain to personal characteristics, talents, interests, skills, and the specific goals of each individual or group.

An individual who establishes a social relationship typically has preconceived notions and various interests that determine which social relationships to pursue, based on the nature of their experiences. Furthermore, the environment in which they grow and live influences their

behavior and governs their relationships with others. This is particularly true as societies have evolved from simple traditional communities to complex and multifaceted ones, thanks to scientific and technological advancements that have entered these societies. Such culture may be seen as foreign and might not align with the customs and traditions of the targeted community. Therefore, social relationships vary according to the nature of each society.

It can be stated that what governs social relations is the individual's personality and the set of experiences and cultures they have acquired from social life, depending on its nature. This includes the level of scientific advancement encompassing these societies and its positive or negative repercussions, as well as the various influences that the latter impose on the community. Additionally, it reflects how different cultural standards are established in each society and how each individual utilizes this based on their cultural nature, experiences, opinions, and ideas, optimizing them for the formation of social relations if they are positive, and conversely if they are negative.

References:

1. Othman Omar bin Amer, (2002), Basic Concepts in Sociology, Publications of Qaryus University, (1st Edition), Benghazi, Libya.
2. Mustafa Al-Khashab, (1996), Sociology and Its Schools, Anglo-Egyptian Library, Cairo, Egypt.
3. Hamad Ali Rahouma, (2005), The Internet and the Techno-Social System: An Analytical Study of the Technological Millennium of the Internet and the Modeling of Its Social System, (1st Edition), Arab Unity Center, Beirut, Lebanon.
4. Ben Aissa Rabah, The Impacts of Literacy on Family Functions and Social Relations: A Field Study of Literacy Classes in Zerbia El-Ouadj, Master's Thesis, Sociology of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Biskra, Algeria.
5. Ali Abdulrazzaq AlJabli, (1984), Issues in Contemporary Sociology, Al-Nahda Publishing House, Beirut, Lebanon.
6. Mohamed Atef Ghaith, (2002), Sociology, Dar Al-Maaref, Alexandria, Egypt.
7. Ghareeb Sayed Ahmed, (2022), Introduction to Sociology, Dar Al-Maaref Al-Jami'iya, Egypt.

-
8. Salma Mahmoud Jumaa, (2003), The Dynamics of Group Work Methods, Modern University Office, Egypt.
 9. Fikra Abdulaziz, (2017), Social Relations from a Sociological Perspective, Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, (10th Edition), Issue 1, University of Tebessa, Algeria.
 10. Hossam Al-Din Fayad, (2017, 07, 04), Social Relations, link: <https://tobe.blogspot.com> (22:08, 03, 11, 2022).
 11. Khaled Hamid, (2015), Introduction to Sociology, Jisour for Publishing and Distribution, Algeria.
 12. Nabil Al-Silmouti, (2008), Theoretical Framework of Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Key Concepts and Issues, Egyptian Book House (5th Edition), Egypt.
 13. Boudraa Fawzi, (2021), Corporate Culture and the Nature of Social Relations: A Field Study at the Sonelgaz GPIZ Branch, Master's Thesis, Sociology of Organization and Work, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oran, Algeria.
 14. Pierpaolo, Donati. (2013). The Added Value of Social Relations. Italian Journal of Sociology of Education, 5(1).
 15. Guy, Bajoit. "The Concept of Social Relation" 5 (2009): 51-65. doi: 10.7202/038621AR.
 16. André, Petitat. Diffuse Education and Social Relation. (2005); 16(2): 155-166. doi: 10.3917/ES.016.0155.
 17. Luciana, Galliano. (2022). Social Capital, Identification, and Support: The Leeway of Integration. PLOS ONE, 17(4): e0266499-e0266499. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0266499.