Constructing Attention to Engage Social Presence:

Choosing Wisely and Managing Expectations

The portability of communication devices that enable voice and data services via cellular connectivity is prompting a new paradigm of communication media. Distinctive from other media in that they can be used anywhere, mobile technologies "are often worn on the body, highly individualized, and regarded as extensions of the self" (Campbell & Park, 2008, p. 372). Devices such as smartphones, smartwatches, and iPads provide users with access to the Internet, social media such as Facebook and Twitter, email, instant messaging, games, television, movies, and voice calls. Many models also are used as music players, digital cameras, planners, phone/address books, and alarm clocks. Augmented with apps, they are further transformed into tools for myriad activities such as shopping, banking, and language learning.

The drastic changes in communication brought about by mobile technologies are occurring not only because of the many options for communicating and accessing content but because of their ubiquity. Mobile subscriptions number in the billions worldwide and continue to grow at a startling rate. While landline telephones took "about 45 years to get from 5 percent to 50 percent penetration among US households," mobile phones took only seven years to reach a similar proportion of customers (DeGusta, 2018). As of 2019, 96% of Americans own a cellphone, and 81% of adults in the US own a smartphone ("Mobile Fact Sheet"). Many users feel they must carry their mobile devices with them at all times in a state of "perpetual contact" (Katz & Aakus, 2002), a condition that is particularly true for young adults, who typically are on their smart phones between eight and ten hours a day (Roberts, Yaya, & Manolis, 2014).

The new mobile communication technologies are affecting many aspects of communication, including civility (Cameron & Webster, 2011); lying behavior (Hancock, Thom-Santelli, & Ritchie, 2004); engagement in public settings (Campbell & Kawk, 2011); personal and public space (Höflich,

2006); the quality of face-to-face conversation (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012); interpersonal relationships (Ishi, 2006); and family communication (Wajcman, Bittman, & Brown, 2008). Because of the ubiquitous access to mobile devices, people are often engaged in multicommunicative behavior—participating in more than one conversation at a time (Reinsch, Turner & Tinsley, 2008). A communicator, for example, could be texting a friend during a face-to-face conversation with someone else. This behavior has escalated and become normalized as the use of mobile devices has increased (Reinsch & Turner, 2019).

One communication construct that requires reconsideration as a result of mobile technologies is social presence. Initially defined as "the degree of salience of the other person in the interaction" (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976, p. 65), social presence is transformed in a multicommunicative environment into the requirement that communicators create salience for themselves in the communicative space of another. They must make themselves present to others in a way that secures audience involvement in an interaction. The notion of the attention economy provides insights into the challenge that communicators face as they attempt to initiate interactions with others in the digitally enhanced multicommunciative environment. Simon (1971) first identified the attention economy when he observed that, "in an information-rich world, the wealth of information means a dearth of something else: a scarcity of whatever it is that information consumes. What information consumes is rather obvious: it consumes the attention of its recipients" (pp. 40-41). The resource that is scarce in the attention economy, of course, is precisely what communicators require to construct the social presence that initiates an interaction. To have even minimal capacity to influence another requires communicators to construct their own social presence in such a way as to capture the attention of the potential audience—to make the communicator's message more salient than any other messages available to the audience.

The construct of social presence is linked to communication technologies in various ways in the literature, and as communication technologies have evolved, so has the conception of social presence. One way in which social presence is conceptualized is as a property of a communicative medium. Social presence, from this perspective, is the "degree to which the medium permits users to experience others as being psychologically present" (Fulk, Steinfield, Schmitz, & Power, 1987, p. 531), with the degree of presence manifest in a medium determined by the number of channels or codes available within that medium. As Walther (1992) explains, the "fewer channels or codes available within a medium, the less attention that is paid by the user to the presence of other social participants" (p. 54). Media richness theorists conceptualize social presence as a property of a medium when they suggest that the more a particular channel emulates the face-to-face environment, the more media richness or social presence the channel carries (Daft & Lengel, 1986).

As communication technologies continued to develop, the extent to which individuals experience the illusion that a mediated experience is not mediated became a focus, creating a substantially different conception of social presence (Lombard & Ditton, 1997). Lee's (2004) definition of social presence as "a psychological state in which virtual (para-authentic or artificial) objects are experienced as actual objects in either sensory or nonsensory ways" (p. 37) is representative of this perspective on social presence. In this type of research, social presence is explored in the use of avatars (Biocca, Harms, & Burgoon, 2003); the design of video games (McGloin, Farrar, & Fishlock, 2015); videoconferencing (Park, Rhoads, Hou, & Lee, 2014); and computer-mediated environments in general (Sung & Mayer, 2012).

The availability of the Internet as a venue for identity construction triggered another evolution of the construct of social presence, this time with social presence conceived as the development and management of self-representation online to produce a particular "degree of feeling, perception, and reaction" in response (Tu & McIsaac, 2002, p. 146). The construction of this form of social presence is

seen as "an ongoing project" that is "both an art and a craft, something one works at persistently" (Xinaris, 2016, p. 66). It is the product of a number of elements, including the information that individuals include in profiles, the photographs they upload, the preferences they indicate, the products they endorse, and the timeliness and frequency of their postings and replies (Ke, Chávez, Causarano, & Causarano, 2011; Xinaris, 2016). Studies of this version of social presence explore the construction of online presence in, for example, online education and link levels of perception of social presence to variables such as perceived learning, perceived satisfaction with an instructor, and student engagement (Ke et al., 2011).

The emergence of the digitally enhanced multicommunicative environment requires a shift yet again in the conception of social presence. Individuals not only must make strategic choices about how to construct and manage their own online social presence in an effort to be perceived in particular ways, but they must interact with others in the multicommunicative environment—they must attempt to project themselves into the communicative worlds of others. If they are able to construct such a social presence successfully, securing some degree of attention to and engagement with themselves and their message by the audience, they have the potential to experience a sense of "being with another" (Biocca et al., 2003, p. 46); psychological and behavioral engagement (Biocca & Harms, 2002;); some level of mutual understanding (Savicki & Kelley, 2000); and a perception of affiliation with their audience (Dyson, Vickers, Turtle, Cowan, & Tassone, 2015). This is the type of social presence with which we are concerned here.

Attentional Social Presence

Turner and Foss (2018; in press) have theorized a form of social presence labeled *attentional social presence* that allows communicators to insert themselves into the communicative space of others and secure their attention. Attentional social presence is defined as a state achieved when a communicator's actions shift attention from the audience's current objects of attention to the

communicator. Attentional social presence can be constructed through the choice of four options—budgeted, entitled, competitive, and invitational social presence.

Budgeted social presence describes a communicative state in which communicators are participating in or have access to multiple conversations. Communicators enact budgeted social presence when their focus is on their own availability through the efficient management of multiple messages at once. Their key strategy is to juggle and manage all of these messages by multicommunicating, allocating social presence across a number of interactions. The relationship that characterizes budgeted social presence is marked by a conversion of the audience member—at least temporarily—into an availability expenditure. Budgeted social presence exists across a wide continuum, ranging from a state of alertness, in which communicators keep a digital device turned on in case specific communicators try to reach them, to a state of active initiation, in which communicators begin conversations with others while they are involved in other conversations. The norm or expectation within many organizations that individuals carry a digital device with them at all times (Turkle, 2015), providing employees with ubiquitous access to one another, suggests that budgeted social presence is the default state for many. In this budgeted state, communicators always face the choice of when to step out of budgeted into another type of social presence.

A second type of presence that communicators may choose for dealing with the issue of probable audience inattention is *entitled social presence*, in which they focus their communicative efforts on the environment. The key strategy in this kind of social presence is for communicators to limit the number of messages in the environment by telling or asking their audience members to silence their mobile devices or to limit other conversations so that few or no messages compete with the ones they are offering. The relationship envisioned with the audience is one of inequality, with the communicator assuming a superior position to the audience.

To respond to the probable lack of attention of the audience in the multicommunicative environment, some communicators focus on the nature of the message they are constructing, striving to make it as appealing as possible. The result is *competitive social presence*, in which communicators allow audience members to use their mobile devices but choose to compete with other messages by using strategies of persuasion. Competitive communicators adopt low-power or weaker positions than their audience members, who have a high degree of control of the interaction and at least momentarily greater dominance because they have a choice about whether to invest their attention in the communicator's message.

In a fourth type of social presence, communicators choose to focus specifically on the audience. Here, communicators commit to conversing only with the potential audience members but do not dictate to audience members how they should handle their mobile devices; they are free to accept the communicator's invitation to participate in a single conversation or not. If the invitation is accepted, an equal relationship is generated between the communicator and audience. The result is *invitational social presence,* rooted in the theory of invitational rhetoric, in which the communicator's goal is not to persuade others but to try to understand their perspectives (Foss & Foss, 2019; Foss & Griffin, 1995; Foss & Griffin, 2020). Individuals who enact invitational social presence are not confined to any particular type of communication mode or to synchronous technology; they may use face-to-face interaction or some form of communication technology. Interactants who choose to engage in invitational social presence, however, restrict their communication to one interaction or conversation rather than multicommunicating (Foss & Turner, 2020; Turner, in press; Turner & Foss, 2018; Turner & Foss, in press).

The goal of this essay is to extend earlier theorizing of attentional social presence in two ways. First, we seek to explicate the factors involved when communicators and audience members make the choices they do concerning the type of social presence to enact—we explore the conditions around

context, message, and audience that motivate a communicator to choose one type of presence rather than another. This essay thus constitutes a prequel to earlier theorizing of attentional social presence in that it outlines the factors that influence a communicator's selection of a particular type of social presence to bring to an interaction.

A second way in which we extend earlier work on attentional social presence is that we explore the mismatches that can occur when different types of social presence are brought to an interaction by a communicator and an audience. In earlier theorizing, the focus was largely on the communicator and the choices the communicator makes about social presence. But communicators are interacting with audiences, and their choices concerning social presence sometimes collide with the expectations and preferences of audience members for particular types of social presence. This essay expands on this earlier focus on the individual communicator to explore the processes involved when the choices about desirable social presence differ between communicator and audience.

Factors that Affect the Selection of Social Presence

Whenever they want to communicate in the multicommunicative environment, communicators must select a type of social presence—they must decide how to respond to the strong likelihood that their audience members are engaged in or have the potential to engage in other interactions. In this section, we suggest some of the key factors related to context, message, and audience that affect the decision to construct one type of presence rather than another (for an overview of these factors, see Figure 1).

Contextual Factors

Communication contexts are more or less conducive to different types of social presence. Norms, response expectations, visibility, and size are among the contextual characteristics that communicators take into account when they select the type of social presence they believe is appropriate in an interaction.

Norms. The norms of a particular context suggest whether certain types of presence are considered appropriate or not. Two long-distance friends, for example, may have a norm of Zooming weekly just to catch up and spend time with one another. Their norm would exclude the construction of budgeted, entitled, or competitive social presence and would privilege the adoption of invitational social presence. In some settings or on some occasions—a wedding, for example—those individuals who are supposedly at the center of attention are likely to feel disrespected if someone engages in budgeted social presence at the event; that person is likely to be judged socially inappropriate or impolite (Cameron & Webster, 2011). In other contexts, norms might be explicit about whether and when budgeted social presence is allowed. Under such conditions, when mobile devices are expected to be turned off, communicators are unable to engage in budgeted social presence and must enact another form instead.

The norms surrounding communication use are changing rapidly as access to technology and wireless signals continues to expand (Reinsch et al., 2008). When adolescents average nine hours per day on their phones (Tsukayama, 2015), fewer and fewer contexts exist in which communicative norms suggest that multicommunicating is unacceptable. Instead, in a growing number of contexts, the norm is that the practice of multicommunicating is seen as appropriate and is even expected. In organizations that stress the importance of responding quickly to messages, for example, communicators are expected to engage in budgeted presence, and the act of forbidding technology use—requiring that employees "go dark"—is unacceptable. Similarly, when individuals are out with friends, engaging in social conversation, they all might find that enactment of budgeted or competitive presence is appropriate for them.

Response expectations. Response expectations constitute a second contextual factor that affects communicators' decisions about social presence. Communicators often enter into social presence with specific expectations for the type of response they want from their audience. For example, in a

classroom, when a professor lectures on a complicated theory, fully expecting the students to pay

attention to the lecture and focus on the content she is sharing, she chooses entitled presence with an

expectation that the students will want to learn the information and thus will accept and respect that

choice. In contrast, an executive may develop questions to guide a brainstorming meeting, expecting

the members of the team to come to the meeting ready to share ideas and learn from one another. Here,

the executive is choosing invitational presence and is expecting the team members to accept that

invitation and engage in dialogue with one another.

Visibility. The extent to which a context is visible (either physically or electronically) to

someone else has an impact on the type of social presence a communicator selects. Visibility is

particularly important in making the decision to engage in budgeted social presence. The term

compartmentalization describes the cross-conversational availability of cues in a context, suggesting to

communicators whether they will be able to hide activity in one conversation from a partner in a

second conversation (Reinsch et al., 2008; Turner & Reinsch, 2007; Turner & Reinsch, 2009). If the

typing of a communicator on a keyboard can be heard in a telephone conversation,

compartmentalization is diminished, and communicators are less likely in that situation to choose

budgeted social presence. Similarly, if individuals are in a meeting with a small number of people, they

are less able to hide their texting than if they are in a large group, decreasing the likelihood that they

will engage in budgeted social presence. A higher degree of visibility or compartmentalization, then, is

more likely to facilitate communicators' participation in budgeted social presence.

Communicators who cannot view an audience may be less likely to choose entitled social

presence because their control over the audience's use of other digital devices is limited.

Communicators can ask for attention during a web conference or an audio call, but their lack of

surveillance capacity limits the likelihood that they can enforce that request. When they are able to see

their audience members, they are more likely to choose entitled social presence because they have

information as to which individuals seem to be attending to their message and which do not.

　　　　Size. Closely related to the contextual factors of visibility and response expectations is size of

the audience. The larger the audience, the less visible any one audience member is to the

communicator and, consequently, the more difficulty the communicator is likely to have imposing a

specific type of social presence. A similar argument can be made with respect to the intersection of

size and response expectations. The larger the audience, the less responsibility any one audience

member has to respond to the message of the communicator.

　　　　Time. Time is another contextual factor that affects the nature of the presence a communicator

chooses to create. If time is short and a decision needs to be made quickly or a problem solved

efficiently, all participants in an interaction may see budgeted or entitled social presence as perfectly

appropriate, even in situations in which they normally would not be considered fitting. In such cases,

budgeted or entitled social presence may be used to gather required data and to secure the opinions and

advice of many stakeholders. A shortage of time also may be the prompt for invitational rather than

budgeted social presence. Members of a work team may decide that, because they have very little time

for solving a problem, they need everyone's perspective and invite everyone to set their mobile devices

aside and focus on the problem at hand as they enact invitational social presence.

Message Factors

　　　　Some features of messages impact the decisions that communicators make as to the kind of

social presence they will construct or see as appropriate in a particular interaction. These include the

features of goal, sensitivity, complexity, and ambiguity.

　　　　Goal. The goal or objective that is motivating a communicator to create and send a message is a

factor that affects the choice of social presence. Communicators who wish to persuade audience

members of a plan or a proposal, for example, are more likely to choose entitled or competitive social

presence as the types of presence that will create a conducive environment for the achievement of the goal. If someone has decided that a romantic relationship is over, that communicator is likely to enact entitled social presence to convey the message. In contrast, if that person is trying to better understand the needs of the other person to improve the relationship, that goal will affect the selection of social presence, and the invitational mode is likely to be the type chosen.

Sensitivity. When a message is about an especially intimate or difficult topic that involves a high degree of sensitivity or emotional load, the pressure to enact entitled, competitive, or invitational social presence is likely to be high. For example, when doctors tell patients that they have a serious illness, the doctors' access to important information that the patients need will encourage the doctors to choose entitled social presence so that they can impart that information to their patients effectively and efficiently. Similarly, when a family member is concerned about communicating difficult financial problems to the rest of the family, the seriousness of the topic and the impact of the message on the lives of those involved are likely to engender either entitled or invitational social presence.

Complexity. Messages with a high cognitive load—messages that are particularly complicated or complex—typically require more mental processing and thus suggest that communicators will choose entitled social presence to convey them. In studies of multicommunicating, researchers have found that individuals have more difficulty engaging in multicommunicating or budgeted social presence when a message is complex (Reinsch & Turner, 2009). If they must explain a mathematical process or the stages of the process of a complex logistical operation, for example, communicators may believe that their audience members must focus on their message to understand the information, so they are more likely to choose entitled social presence. When communicators need to solve a complex problem in collaboration with the audience, however, they are more likely to choose invitational social presence.

Ambiguity. Messages that are highly ambiguous and involve multiple meanings typically prompt communicators to choose entitled or competitive social presence so that the participants involved can process the cues available to manage the meaning of the interaction. For example, when a manager is discussing a new compensation plan, the meanings of terms such as *performance*, *effectiveness*, and *successful* in relation to compensation expectations could be highly ambiguous. Communicators in this situation who assume that the audience wants to learn the information are likely to engage in entitled or competitive social presence.

Audience Factors

Audience factors describe those situational characteristics that recognize the relationship between the communicator and the audience and how they feel about each other—factors that play a role in the selection of type of social presence enacted by communicators. Audience factors include the value of a relationship, the status of the interactants relative to one another, and the degree of interdependence of the interactants.

Value. How important a relationship with an audience is to communicators or the value of the relationship to them may affect the decision about the kind of social presence to enact. Social exchange theory suggests that individuals make decisions about relationships by comparing a current relationship with other options that are available; the same comparison is likely to occur as individuals decide on the type of social presence to enact (Burgess & Huston, 1979; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Each person has a different weighting of relationships, so the hierarchy of value for relationships differs substantially among communicators. Some individuals may privilege conversations with a partner or spouse over any other conversations, choosing to enact invitational social presence because they truly value the perspective of that person. For other communicators, their children, parents, or close friends might be the recipients of budgeted social presence because communicators assume that those individuals know they have a close relationship with them and value them highly—they may believe

that taking care of a message quickly is not an affront to them but an affirmation of the strength of that relationship. Similarly, they might choose entitled social presence with such intimate others because they are responsible for their well-being—parents communicating with a child might adopt entitled social presence in an effort to fulfill their perceived parental responsibilities, a high priority for them.

Status. The status of the interactants in relation to one another also is important to decision making about the nature of the social presence to be constructed. Individuals of higher status are more likely to be allowed to make decisions about their own social presence as well as that of others when involved in interactions with people of lower status. Specifically, status provides more power to communicators to choose entitled social presence as well as potentially more success when choosing competitive social presence. Turner and Reinsch (2007) found that many individuals believe that multicommunicating is inappropriate with their bosses or superiors, so those who hold higher status positions may choose entitled or competitive social presence because they know they have the attention of their subordinates.

Interdependence. The interdependence of the communicators also affects decisions regarding social presence. The more dependent a communicator is on an audience member for specific resources, the more likely the communicator is to choose invitational social presence so that the interactants understand one another more fully. Communicators are not likely to invest the time and energy required for invitational social presence into superficial relationships with casual acquaintances. When individuals must acquire important information from someone who is the only available source of that information, they are likely to want the communicator to engage in entitled social presence.

All four types of social presence should remain a part of the repertoires of all communicators. There are times when communicators want and even need to create budgeted social presence simply to handle all of the conversational traffic in a particular context and to be as efficient as possible in their allocation of availability. At other times, those same communicators want to apply the resources

available to them to create entitled social presence to ensure that an audience has access to a particular message. Communicators also may decide to engage in competitive social presence, where they focus on crafting a compelling message but do not want to coerce audience members into attending to it. At other times, communicators may choose to engage in invitational social presence, opening themselves up to newness, variety, and unexpected developments in their communicative relationships. Such choices are dependent on the constellation of factors in any interaction concerning the context, the message, and the audience.

Mismatches in Social Presence

The decision as to which kind of social presence to enact is complicated not only because of the myriad factors that go into the decision but because communication is not a process in which individuals engage by themselves. A communicative environment is co-created by all of those involved, and choices to engage in various forms of social presence influence all parties in an interaction (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Just as communicators are constructing social presence in certain ways, audiences have expectations about the type of social presence that will be constructed by communicators. They also are bringing their own preferences for types of social presence to an interaction.

When individuals find social presence to be satisfactory (Hecht, 1978), the satisfaction is likely to be the result of similar decisions the interactants have made about the nature of the social presence they believe will be appropriate or effective in a situation. Their expectations for the type of social presence they desire or expect in a particular instance are confirmed and match (Tong & Walther, 2015), and both interactants choose as their focus of attention the same component of the communicative situation. If a communicator is engaged in budgeted social presence and the audience expects the interaction to be quick and superficial and to convey basic information, the social presence constructed by the communicator is likely to be satisfactory for both. In this case, a focus on the

availability of the communicator is seen by both communicator and audience as appropriate. If a communicator enacts entitled social presence and audience members are supportive of that form of social presence and happy to have their technology removed to help them focus their attention on a topic they want to learn more about, then entitled social presence also is satisfactory for those involved.

The types of social presence selected by communicators and audience members, however, do not always match or align. In such instances, the communicator chooses to approach an interaction by enacting one type of social presence, but the audience is expecting another. The concepts of symmetry and asymmetry related to relational control are relevant to the matching process that occurs in attentional social presence, although they must be modified to fit the exigency of the multicommunicative environment. (Rogers, 2001). Symmetry is not usually achieved when a communicator and an audience both are employing the same kind of presence—entitled social presence, for example. Instead, what constitutes symmetry in attentional social presence is when the communicator employs competitive social presence, for example, and the audience believes that it is an appropriate type of social presence for the communicator to use in that situation and adopts the role it requires of the audience. Similarly, a communicator may employ invitational social presence, and if the audience accepts the invitation offered to engage in a particular kind of interaction, the pattern is one of symmetry. Asymmetry, in contrast, is when the communicator adopts one type of social presence and the audience does not believe it is appropriate for that situation. There is thus a mismatch between the interactants' ideas of what constitutes appropriate or desirable social presence.

Much still needs to be discovered concerning the outcomes of mismatched selections of attentional social presence, but existing theories point to largely negative outcomes from mismatching in general in the communication process. Dissatisfaction (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) is likely to be the result of a mismatch between the communicator's decision and the audience's expectation concerning

social presence. Contingency theory, for example, points to the importance of fit between an entity and its environment (Donaldson, 2001). Similarly, the social support literature, including the theory of optimal matching, suggests that individuals find support from another person to the extent that both communicators feel a match between the type of support they desire and the type they receive (Cutrona & Russell, 1990).

A few examples illustrate the kinds of mismatches that can occur in the selection of social presence and the dissatisfaction that is likely to result. A mismatch can occur, for example, when one interactant chooses budgeted social presence and another chooses entitled. Communicators who choose entitled social presence view their audiences as containers to be filled (Turner & Foss, 2018)—they see the information they want to share as critical to the audience and expect audience attention. One context that illustrates this type of mismatch is a university classroom where a professor has chosen entitled social presence while lecturing, but the students have chosen budgeted social presence. The visible cues that the students are not committing their full attention to the professor create a highly dissatisfactory interaction for the professor. If the professor demands that they put their smartphones away, the students are likely to be dissatisfied with the interaction because they believe they are being inefficient.

A mismatch between interactants who have selected competitive and budgeted social presence respectively is also common. When communicators choose competitive social presence, they view the audience as an investor, and they employ a variety of rhetorical strategies to win the audience's attention away from mobile devices (Foss & Turner, 2020; Turner, in press; Turner & Foss, 2018; Turner & Foss, in press). During a sales presentation, for example, a communicator may hope to win the attention of the audience because of the high-quality, engaging nature of the presentation (enacting competitive social presence). Audience members, however, may not see the presentation as compelling, useful, or salient and might prefer to be multicommunicating with others (enacting

budgeted social presence). Again, such a mismatch between the preferences of the interacting parties can cause dissatisfaction for both.

A clash between expectations for invitational and entitled social presence is also common in interactions. A mother and her daughter might sit down together to talk about the bullying the girl is experiencing at school. The daughter brings an expectation that the conversation will be a dialogue, with both of them focused on the interaction and both contributing equally to exploring solutions; she is expecting invitational social presence. Her mother, in contrast, brings with her an expectation that she will be employing entitled social presence—she has limited time for the conversation because of an impending conference call. She enters the interaction expecting that she will present her ideas quickly, and her daughter will listen and accept them as the best solutions to the problem. Neither will be very satisfied as a result of the clash between the two types of social presence.

Each of the factors identified at the beginning of this essay affecting why communicators choose one type of social presence rather than another—factors relating to context, message, and audience—also affect the likelihood of a mismatch between expectations for social presence. The more the parties involved agree on their perceptions of these factors, the more likely they are to expect the same type of social presence in an interaction. For example, if both interactants perceive the same norm in operation or both perceive that time is short (contextual factors), they are more likely to share expectations for the form of social presence that should prevail. In this case, they both might agree that entitled social presence on the part of the communicator is appropriate and that the audience members should pay close attention to that message or that all communicators can choose budgeted presence. Likewise, if they both perceive that a message being communicated is highly sensitive and salient (message factors), they are likely to use the same type of social presence to define an interaction. They might decide, in such an instance, that they both want to engage in invitational social presence.

In contrast, when the parties involved in an interaction differ in their perceptions of the factors that affect choice of social presence, they are likely to experience a mismatch in their selection of types of social presence. For example, if one individual perceives the operative norm at a wedding to be one of respecting the occasion and focusing on the couple being married, that person is likely to see entitled social presence as appropriate. This norm would dictate a cessation of all multicommunicating with others—turning off the smartphone and focusing on the ceremony and the couple. Another person might see the operative norm as one of efficient communicating and the wedding as "just one more message" to check off a list of many items required to be completed to be productive; that person is likely to see budgeted social presence on that occasion as quite appropriate. If these two individuals are trying to interact at the wedding, the mismatch between their different conceptions of the preferred social presence is going to cause dissatisfaction for them. Similarly, if some individuals in an interaction perceive themselves as highly interdependent with a communicator, they might envision that the type of social presence that will be used in an interaction will be invitational, in which the communicator desires their input and pays exclusive attention to them. If the communicator does not see herself as having any particular connection to the audience, however, she might want to conclude the interaction as quickly as possible, thus seeing entitled or budgeted social presence as perfectly appropriate in that situation. Again, these different perceptions of the factors that affect the selection of social presence are likely to lead to mismatches and feelings of dissatisfaction with the interaction.

Although the focus in this section has been on the negative results of mismatches in expectations for social presence, we acknowledge that, in some instances, such mismatches may have positive outcomes. As expectancy violations theory explains, unanticipated violations of social norms and expectations may produce arousal value; when individuals' expectations are violated, their interests or attentions are aroused (Burgoon & Jones, 1976). Such arousal may increase interest in or attention to a message or an interaction. Language expectancy theory (Burgoon & Miller, 1985)

provides further evidence that an intentional or accidental deviation from an expected type of social presence by a communicator can produce a positive reaction on the part of the audience. Mismatches in social presence between a communicator and an audience, however, are more likely to result in dissatisfaction with an interaction than satisfaction. Although mismatches may produce momentary interest or arousal, they are likely to result in attention to something other than the message—the violation itself, the individual who is violating expectations, or the meaning of the violation (Burgoon & Jones, 1976; Burgoon & Hale, 1988). Just as communication accommodation theory suggests that conversational partners evaluate an interaction as less positive when nonaccommodation occurs, a lack of accommodation by one party to the social presence constructed by another is likely to lead to a more negative evaluation of an interaction (Gasiorek & Giles, 2012).

Negotiation of Mismatches in Social Presence

When communicators and audiences bring different expectations to an interaction concerning social presence, they must negotiate—either implicitly or explicitly—how the interaction will proceed given those different expectations. Although research has not been conducted on how communicators and audiences negotiate mismatches in expectations for social presence, we posit that such mismatches generate three possible results—acquiescing to eliminate mismatch, overlooking mismatch, and co-creating to resolve mismatch. All three of the options are viable and legitimate and able to be used effectively in some contexts—they all serve to mitigate or diminish the dissatisfaction that typically results from mismatches in social presence.

Acquiescing to Eliminate Mismatch

One option that may result from negotiations over a mismatch in expectations about the choice of social presence is acquiescence, in which one party capitulates to the other and allows the other to dictate the kind of social presence that will be employed. For any number of reasons, one party may decide to allow the other's definition of social presence to be the operative one at that moment. The

individual(s) doing the acquiescing may have less status or may be more apathetic, for example, and so they decide not to challenge the conception of social presence chosen by the other. A student might decide, for example, that risking a bad grade is not worth antagonizing a professor by arguing that he should be allowed to be on his smartphone during class and puts it away, allowing the professor's expectations for entitled social presence to stand. Similarly, if an executive explains that she needs the input of group members to solve a problem and thus invites them to refrain from using their mobile devices, her request that the group use invitational social presence is likely to be accepted.

Overlooking Mismatch

Communicators and audiences may not be able to reach agreement about the appropriate kind of social presence to enact in a given situation. A second option that may result from mismatched social presence is that individuals continue interacting even though their conceptions of what the appropriate social presence is do not align. Each party brings its definition of social presence to the interaction, and neither acquiesces to the other, so the interaction continues with the two different types of social presence tangling throughout the interaction with the differences overlooked. A manager might not want her employee to be texting while she is trying to talk to him about a performance issue, for example, but she might say nothing because she does not want to be seen as unsupportive. She continues to expect and to enact entitled social presence, while her employee continues to expect and to enact budgeted social presence.

On some occasions, a mismatch is known only to one of the parties, so the mismatch is overlooked by that one party. If a communicator is talking by phone to another person, for example, and cannot see the other person texting others (and thus engaging in budgeted social presence), the communicator may believe that her choice of entitled social presence is operative in the interaction. In this example, there is no discussion about the mismatch; the two parties simply "agree" in various ways to ignore the mismatch, so neither is dissatisfied.

At other times, mismatches are openly discussed by interactants, and they verbally agree to disagree; they continue interacting with the mismatch in place. One person at a wedding, for example, might explain the norm she is following to another, and he, in response, might explain the different norm he is following. They might choose to disagree but to continue interacting—somewhat unhappily—without a resolution of the mismatch.

In other situations, the decision to overlook a mismatch is more amicable and supported. Friends who are out for an evening might bring expectations with them that they will be engaged in invitational social presence while they are together—they will focus on learning more about each other using only one channel of communication. If someone in the group pulls out her smartphone and says that she must keep it in sight and available during the evening, that constitutes a mismatch in expectations between her and the other group members—they are planning on invitational social presence, and she is using budgeted social presence. If she explains that she has a babysitter for her children and wants to be available if necessary to the babysitter, her imposition of budgeted social presence into the gathering is likely to be allowed and supported. She has explained her goals for the interaction (she wants to have fun with the group and to focus on it) as well as the rationale for her choice of a different kind of social presence (she is concerned about her children).

Co-creating to Resolve Mismatch

A third outcome that may result from a mismatch in expectations for social presence is that the parties involved actively negotiate the type of social presence that will prevail in an interaction and come to an agreement about what it will be. Together, they co-create the type of social presence that will characterize the interaction, so both interactants have input. The negotiation process typically involves metacommunicating about social presence—the parties involved discuss the options available and why they prefer a particular choice. They then come to a decision that is satisfactory to everyone involved. Perhaps they all agree that, for this particular situation, entitled social presence is

appropriate, and they will assume the roles concomitant with that decision. In other cases, interactants may decide that they will engage in invitational social presence during the course of a meeting but will stop halfway through for a break, at which time they can all be involved for a few minutes in budgeted social presence. Or perhaps they designate the first part of the meeting, where someone is presenting information, as defined by competitive social presence, during which time audience members are free to multicommunicate in budgeted social presence if they desire, but they all commit to engaging in invitational social presence following the formal presentation.

In this essay, we have proposed factors that affect the initial selection of social presence by communicators, the ways in which disagreement around these factors prompts mismatches, and the means interactants use to address mismatches. Because our theorizing here is largely derived from anecdotal evidence, this essay provides only a starting point for exploring the reasons behind various choices for social presence and interactions that involve mismatches in the types of social presence enacted. What we have proposed here now needs to be explicated more thoroughly, tested, and developed into a more robust theory about how communicators select the type of social presence appropriate for an interaction and how they address mismatches in conceptions of social presence. The result of additional research into decisions about and mismatches in social presence should be greater satisfaction for all of us in our interactions in the digitally enhanced multicommunicative environment.

References

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: Everything that passes for knowledge in society*. London: Allen Lane.

Biocca, F., Harms, C., & Burgoon, J. K. (2003). Toward a more robust theory and measure of social presence: Review and suggested criteria. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, *12*, 456–480. doi: 10.1162/105474603322761270

Burgess, R. L., & Huston, T. L. (Eds.). (1979). *Social exchange in developing relationships*. New York: Academic Press/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs, 55*(1), 58-79. doi: 10.1080/03637758809376158

Burgoon, J. K., & Jones, S. B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations. *Human Communication Research, 2*(2), 130-146. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1976.tb00706.x

Burgoon, M., & Miller, G. R. (1985). An expectancy interpretation of language and persuasion. In H. Giles & R. N. St. Clair (Eds.). *Recent advances in language, communication, & social psychology* (pp. 199-229). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cameron, A., & Webster, J. (2011). Relational outcomes of multicommunicating: Integrating incivility and social exchange perspectives. *Organization Science, 22*(3), 754-771. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0540

Campbell, S. W., & Kwak, N. (2011). Mobile communication and civil society: Linking patterns and places of use to engagement with others in public. *Human Communication Research, 37*(2), 207-222. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2010.01399.x

Campbell, S. W., & Park, Y. J. (2008). Social implications of mobile telephony: The rise

of personal communication society. *Sociology Compass, 2*(6), 371-387. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00080.x

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279602

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: Toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), *Social support: An interactional view* (pp. 319-366). New York: Wiley.

Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science, 32*, 554–571. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554

DeGusta, M. (2018, January 3). Are smart phones spreading faster than any technology in human history? *MIT Technology Review.* Retrieved from https://www.technologyreview.com/s/427787/are-smart-phones-spreading-faster-than-any-technology-in-human-history/

Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dyson, B., Vickers, K., Turtle, J., Cowan, S., & Tassone, A. (2015). Evaluating the use of Facebook to increase student engagement and understanding in lecture-based classes. *Higher Education*, *69*(2), 303-313. doi: 10.1007/s10734-014-9776-3

Foss, S. K., & Foss, K. A. (2019). *Inviting transformation: Presentational speaking for a changing world* (4th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, *62*(1), 2–18. doi: 10.1080/03637759509376345

Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (Eds.). (2020). *Inviting Understanding: A Portrait of Invitational Rhetoric*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Foss, S. K., & Turner, J. W. (2020). Challenges to the enactment of invitational rhetoric

in the age of mobile communication technologies. In S. K. Foss & C. L. Griffin (Eds.), *Inviting understanding: A portrait of invitational rhetoric* (pp. 157-170). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fulk, J., Steinfield, C. W., Schmitz, J., & Power, J. G. (1987). A social information processing model of media use in organizations. *Communication Research*, *14*, 529-552.

Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2012). Effects of inferred motive on evaluations of nonaccommodative communication. *Human Communication Research*, *38*(3), 309–331. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958-2012.01426.x

Hancock, J., Thom-Santelli, J., & Ritchie, T. (2004). Deception and design: The impact of communication technology on lying behavior (pp. 129-134). *SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New York: ACM. doi: 10.1145/985692.985709

Hecht, M. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research, 4*(3), 253-264. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00614.x

Höflich, J. R. (2006). The mobile phone and the dynamic between private and public communication: Results of an international exploratory study. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy, 19*(2), 58-68. doi: 10.1007/s12130-006-1024-4

Katz, J. E., & Aakus, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ke, F., Chávez, A. F., Causarano, P-N. L., & Causarano, A. (2011). Identity presence and knowledge building: Joint emergency in online learning environments? *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, *6*, 349-370.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence.* New York: Wiley.

Lee, K. M. (2004). Why presence occurs: Evolutionary psychology, media equation, and presence. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, *13*, 494–505. doi: 10.1162/1054746041944830

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *3*. doi: 10.1111/j.10836101.1997.tb00072.x

McGloin, R., Farrar, K. M., & Fishlock, J. (2015). Triple whammy! Violent games and violent controllers: Investigating the use of realistic gun controllers on perceptions of realism, immersion, and outcome aggression. *Journal of Communication*, *65*, 280–299. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12148

"Mobile Fact Sheet" (2019, June 12). Pew Research Center: Internet and Technology. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/

Park, N., Rhoads, M., Hou, J., & Lee, K. M. (2014). Understanding the acceptance of teleconferencing systems among employees: An extension of the technology acceptance model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *39*, 118–127. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.048

Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2013). Can you connect with me now? How the presence of mobile communication technology influences face-to-face conversation quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*(3), 237-246. doi: 10.1177/0265407512453827

Reinsch, N. L., Turner, J. W., & Tinsley, C. H. (2008). Multicommunicating: A practice whose time has come? *The Academy of Management Review, 33*(2), 391-403. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2008.31193450

Roberts, J.A., Yaya, L. H. C., & Manolis, C. (2014). The invisible addiction: Cell-phone activities and addiction among male and female college students. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions 3*(4), 254-265. doi: 10.1556/JBA.3.2014.015

Rogers, L. E. (2001). Relational communication in the context of family. *Journal of Family*

        Communication, 1(1), 25-35. doi: 10.1207/S15327698jFC0101-05

Savicki, V., & Kelley, M. (2000). Computer mediated communication: Gender and group

        composition. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, *3*, 817-826. doi: 10.1089/10949310050191791

Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. New

        York: Wiley.

Simon, H. (1971). Designing organizations for an information-rich world. In M. Greenberger (Ed.),

        Computers, communications, and the public interest (pp. 37-52). Baltimore, MD: Johns

        Hopkins University Press.

Sung, E., & Mayer, R. E. (2012). Five facets of social presence in online distance education.

        Computers in Human Behavior, *28*, 1738–1747. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.04.014

Tong, S. T., & Walther, J. B. (2015). The confirmation and disconfirmation of expectancies in

        computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research, 42*(2), 186-212. doi:

        10.1177/0093650212466257

Tsukayama, H. (2015, November 3). Teens spend nearly nine hours every day consuming media.

        Washington Post. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-

        switch/wp/2015/11/03/teens-spend-nearly-nine-hours-every-day-consuming-

        media/?utm_term=.65c4b9b3bfc6

Tu, C-H, & McIsaac, M. (2002). The relationship of social presence and interaction in online classes.

        American Journal of Distance Education, 16, 131-150. doi: 10.1207/S15389286AjDE1603_2

Reinsch, N.L. and Turner, JW. (2019). Multicommunicator aspirational stress, Suggestions for

        teaching and research, and other insights after 10 years of multicommunication research, 33(2),

        Journal of Business and Technical Communication 141-171.

Turkle, S. (2015). *Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age*. New

York: Penguin.

Turner, J.W. (in press). *Being present: Strategies for commanding attention in the digital workplace*.

Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Turner, J. W., & Foss, S. K. (in press). Best practices in the construction of attentional social presence:

Securing the attention of multicommunicating audiences in the business world. In S. Allen, K.

Gower, & D. K. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching with technology in management,*

leadership, and business. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Turner, J. W., & Foss, S. K. (2018). Options for the construction of attentional social

presence in a digitally enhanced multicommunicative environment. *Communication*

Theory, *28*(1), 22-45. doi: 10.1093/ct/qty002

Turner, J. W., & Reinsch, N. L. (2007). The business communicator as presence

allocator: Multicommunicating, equivocality, and status at work. *Journal of Business*

Communication, 44(1), 36-58. doi: 10.1177/0021943606295779

Turner, J. W., & Reinsch, N. L. (2009). Successful and unsuccessful multicommunication episodes:

Engaging in dialogue or juggling messages? *Information Systems Frontiers*, *12*(3), 277–285.

doi: 10.1007/s10796-009-9175-y

Walther, J. B. (1992). Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relational perspective.

Communication Research, 19, 52-90.

Wajcman, J., Bittman, M., & Brown, J. (2008). Families without borders: Mobile phones,

connectedness and work-home divisions. *British Sociological Association*, *42*(4), 635-652. doi:

10.1177/00380385008091620

Xinaris, C. (2016). The individual in an ICT world. *European Journal of Communication, 31*, 58-68.

Figure 1: Factors influencing social presence choice as they affect expectation and outcome