

UNWRAPPING PRESENCE: THE IMPACT OF CELL-PHONES ON FACE-TO-FACE
CONVERSATIONS

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Masters of Arts
in Communication, Culture and Technology

By

Amanda M. Morris, B.A.

Washington, DC
April 16, 2018

Copyright 2018 by Amanda M. Morris
All Rights Reserved

UNWRAPPING PRESENCE: THE IMPACT OF CELL-PHONES ON FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATIONS

Amanda M. Morris, B.A.

Thesis Advisor: Jeanine W. Turner, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Ubiquitous digital devices such as cell-phones have made it easier for people to multicomunicate, or participate in multiple conversations at once. While these devices have enhanced the multicomunicative environment, they have also threatened to take away from some of the key interpersonal elements of face-to-face (FtF) conversation, such as the ability to listen and pay attention. While un-interrupted FtF conversation provides the opportunity for individuals to form closer bonds of intimacy with their conversation partner, the presence of cell-phones within such interactions now creates a challenge where individuals must compete for the attention and presence of their partner. The theory of attentional social presence proposes that communicators attempt to secure the attention of their conversation partner through four types of presence: budgeted, entitled, competitive, and invitational social presence. Each type of social presence contains a different focus on cell-phone use and a specific set of motivations based off of a desired personal and relational outcome. Grounded in the theory of attentional social presence, this thesis aims to better understand how the Millennial generation navigates the four types of presence within FtF conversations, paying close attention to the relational outcomes that each presence type provides. The data collected from 23 semi-structured interviews with participants aged 18-36 suggests that one's decision to use a

certain type of attentional social presence is highly dependent on contextual factors such as relational closeness, number of conversational partners, and the topic of the conversation.

This thesis is dedicated to three people:

To my parents, whose presence in my life is constant and unfailing. Thank you for giving me three precious gifts that I will always cherish: my life, your love, and my education.

To my grandmother, Frances, whose presence in my life helped me to discover the joy of conversation, the power of learning, and the thrill of independence.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the sum of many years of learning and research, and it wouldn't exist without the help and support from many people.

Thank you to Drs. Read Mercer Schuchardt, Rebecca Sietman, and Sween Noh Kelsey for teaching me the foundations of communication and research at Wheaton College. You gave me confidence, and without your support, I wouldn't have made it to graduate school.

There are many members of the Georgetown community that I am forever grateful for. Jennifer Boettcher, thank you for helping me to navigate library databases and find some of my most important sources. Sarah Twose, thank you for being our CCT advocate and making sure we always had the proper materials in order to succeed. Drs. Martin Irvine and Leticia Bode, thank you for teaching me alternative ways to gather literature and conduct research; the lessons learned in your classes gave me an important perspective in this research.

This thesis wouldn't have happened without my participants. I thank each and every one of you for taking the time to tell me your stories and experiences. It was a highlight of this project.

To my CCT friends, thank you for your constant support through this journey. From movie nights to encouraging texts to helping me set up the video camera at my presentation. I'm deeply grateful for your friendship and support. Madhavi and MC, thank you for all of the laughs and for making this thesis experience significantly less isolating. #turnersthesistrio for life! We did it!

To Dr. Diana Owen, thank you for serving as my second reader. Your dedication to your students and your passion for your research is something I hope I can someday achieve. It was an honor and a pleasure to work with you.

To Dr. Jeanine Turner. Thank you for making this thesis possible. Thank you for introducing me to the theory of attentional social presence, for working with me through two independent studies, and for being my thesis advisor. Your enthusiasm and kindness can make any day better. Working with you has been such an honor, and a highlight of my time at CCT.

Finally, to my parents and my brother. Words will never properly express my love for you and gratitude for all that you've done for me. Thank you for always being there to remind me that I am capable and worthy. All that I have ever accomplished is grounded in the support and love you give to me each and every day.

WITH GRATITUDE,

Amanda

Wherever you are, be all there!

- Jim Elliot

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale.....	5
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
Introduction.....	8
The Cell Phone and Its Affordances.....	9
Intimacy and Attention.....	12
Multicommunication.....	19
Attentional Social Presence.....	21
Politeness Theory Within Attentional Social Presence.....	28
Expectancy Violations Theory Within Attentional Social Presence.....	31
Moving Forward.....	34
III. METHOD.....	36
Participants and Procedures.....	36
Millennial Generation.....	36
Interviews.....	37
Data Analysis.....	40
IV. RESULTS.....	44
V. DISCUSSION.....	55
Budgeted Social Presence.....	55
Entitled Social Presence.....	58

Competitive Social Presence	59
Invitational Social Presence	59
Limitations and Future Research.....	60
Conculsion.....	61
APPENDIX A: Interview Questions	63
APPENDIX B: Tables	65
REFERENCES	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participant Demographics.....	65
Table 2: Table of Codes	66
Table 3: Exemplars: Phone Checking Behavior (Budgeted Social Presence).....	69
Table 4: Exemplars of Reciprocation of Phone Use (Budgeted Social Presence).....	74
Table 5: Exemplars of Phone as Conversation Enhancement (Budgeted Social Presence).....	77
Table 6: Exemplars of Phone Use in Awkward Situations and Avoidance (Budgeted Social Presence)	79
Table 7: Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence - Context	81
Table 8: Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence – Confronting Others	84
Table 9: Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence – Being Confronted	86
Table 10: Exemplars of Competitive Social Presence Strategies	87
Table 11: Exemplars of Invitational Social Presence	90

I. INTRODUCTION

It's Friday night and you're out to dinner to catch up with a friend that you haven't seen for two months. You're sitting across from him as you tell him about a conflict at work when suddenly the cell-phone resting on the table in front of him lights up. His eyes glance down to the screen and the feeling hits you - you've lost his attention. "Hold on," he says as he picks up his phone. "Let me just reply to this text."

This is one of many examples of the ways in which multicomunication - the act of participating in multiple conversations at once (Turner & Reinsch, in press) - can occur. Cell-phones have become ubiquitous objects in everyday life, and many people have experienced at least one example of this process at some point in their life. Whether someone text messages during a face-to-face (FtF) conversation, instant messages during a conference call, looks something up on their phone during a group conversation, or sends an email while talking on the phone, all of these situations involve multiple conversations at once, which serve as examples of multicomunication.

When multicomunicating, a person divides his or her attention between two or more speech events, thus making it more difficult for him or her to coordinate responses. The process of multicomunication not only causes gaps of silence within a situation (Reinsch, Turner & Tinsley, 2008), but it has the potential to end a conversation altogether by taking away the attention of a conversation partner. As multicomunication has become more commonplace, it is important to understand what this act is doing to traditional FtF conversation, and how people decide to budget their presence within a given FtF interaction when they are competing against a mobile digital device (Turner & Foss, 2018) such as a cell-phone, tablet, laptop, or smart watch.

Catching the attention of another person is beginning to involve more strategy now that speakers often have digital devices to compete with (Turner & Foss, 2018). This serves as a threat to human communication, as maintaining a person's attention is a vital step in holding a conversation and keeping it going between two or more individuals (Turner & Foss, 2018). While rhetoric, or persuasion, has often played a significant role in first capturing an audience's attention (Lanham, 2006), one must now question whether rhetoric alone is a powerful enough tool to capture another's attention when competing against mobile digital devices.

As digital devices have enhanced the multicomunicative environment, the concept of social presence has continued to evolve (Turner & Foss, 2018). Individuals must make choices regarding how to manage their presence within a conversation, and balance that social presence with the presence they maintain online. Thus, Turner and Foss (2018) have developed the theory of attentional social presence, a model that focuses on the efforts that communicators make to insert themselves into a communicative environment and secure the attention of their conversation partner. Under the umbrella of attentional social presence, four types occur: budgeted, entitled, competitive, and invitational social presence. Different motivations exist behind each type of social presence, and each social presence has a different focus and strategy based off of a desired personal and relational outcome (Turner & Foss, 2018).

FtF conversation is an important human activity because it is within a conversation, when individuals are fully present to one another, where one learns to listen to the other while experiencing the sensations of being heard and understood (Turkle, 2015). From a young age, FtF conversation assists in developing empathy and also serves as a method

of advancing one's capacity to self-reflect (Turkle, 2015). The sensations of being heard and understood within a conversation often lead to outcomes of satisfaction, an important feeling that benefits overall psychological health (Hecht, 1978).

Yet, in the face of evolving digital technologies, individuals often find themselves competing for the attention and presence of their FtF conversation partner(s). According to a recent Pew Research study (2017), 95% of Americans from a variety of geographic, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds and ages reported that they own some kind of cell-phone. The cell-phone and other digital devices have come to provide users with a sense of belonging by offering them the affordance of talking to friends and family over messaging platforms or connecting with others on social media sites (Srivastava, 2005), and many users consider their cell-phones to be a basic accessory to their daily lives, claiming that they "can't imagine living without" the essential utility that is their smartphone (Smith, 2012).

While cell-phones and other mobile digital devices can serve as a source of entertainment and sociability, bringing individuals who are geographically distant closer together (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012), the constant connectivity that they allow can also disrupt human attachment and the value that is put on FtF human connection (Turkle, 2012). The use of cell-phones can reduce the amount and quality of attention given to real-world events, from driving a car (Strayer, Drews, & Johnston, 2003) to communicating in a FtF conversation (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016; Przybylski & Weinstein 2012; Turner & Foss, 2018). The cognitive overload that can result from excessive use of information and communication technologies can negatively affect individuals' working memory, increase levels of distractedness, and make it harder for

people to determine whether information is relevant or irrelevant (Misra, Cheng, Genevie, & Yuan, 2014).

As human dependence on mobile digital devices continues to increase (Smith, 2012; Srivastava, 2005), researchers have begun to study how these devices affect FtF interactions and levels of attention, presence, and empathy. From leisure time spent together and simple conversations, to date nights, serious discussions, and work and classroom environments (Duran, Kelly, & Rotaru, 2011; Kraushaar & Novak, 2010; McDaniel & Coyne, 2016; Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012), consistent patterns have begun to illuminate the fact that the use of cell-phones or digital devices will have different effects on a FtF interaction or situation depending on the context. Results from two particular studies showed that while the presence of mobile technology will negatively affect interpersonal closeness and trust, these effects are more pronounced if individuals are discussing a personally meaningful conversation or in a meaningful situation (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012).

Previous research has proven that the presence and interruption of the cell-phone within a FtF conversation has the power to affect the conversation's flow and outcome. Furthermore, scholars have begun to study how these interruptions are affecting presence, politeness, and the relationship between conversation partners (Aagaard, 2016; Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012). Research claims that many approaches to politeness rely upon social norms (Bousfield, 2008), yet there remains room to study how technology - specifically cell-phones - affect the ways in which people navigate social presence and expect certain norms of politeness.

As cell-phones become more and more common, it is important to understand how they are affecting natural human activities such as conversation. Because conversation is a uniquely human act (Turkle, 2015), it is important to understand how technology is breaking into that routine, and thus, changing an activity that has the power to shape the human personality and psyche. In better understanding how the interruption from a cell phone is affecting FtF communication, perceptions of politeness, and expectations of an interaction, individuals may begin to have a better idea of how to treat their conversation partner with respect and acknowledge that they care. The act of caring, or being present, has a significant impact on how individuals perceive the other, affecting the future of friendship, family, and business interactions (Turkle, 2015).

Rationale

As cell-phones have become more ubiquitous, the individuals who use them continue to feel the desire to become more and more accessible to the people and communities on the other end of the digital device. Thus, the act of multicommuting has become more commonplace within conversations. However, the act of multicommuting is not always received as positive, and research has begun to uncover that this action takes away from traditional FtF conversational norms such as undivided attention and eye contact (Reinsch, Jr., Turner, & Tinsley, 2008).

Previous research has studied the process of multicommuting (Reinsch Jr., Turner, and Tinsley, 2008) and how attentional social presence is acted upon within FtF conversational interactions (Turner & Foss, 2018). However, no research to date has focused on a specific generation's use of attentional social presence within a FtF interaction. Furthermore, while research has focused on how the presence of cell-phones

impacts perceptions of politeness and relational expectations between conversation partners (Kelly, Miller-Ott, and Duran, 2017; Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017), no research exists regarding on what types of politeness strategies emerge within the contexts of attentional social presence.

Thus, this study sets out to explore one primary research question:

RQ1: How do Millennials navigate the four types of attentional social presence within a FtF conversation?

Drawing upon politeness theory and expectancy violations theory, this study hypothesizes that the use of each of the four types of attentional social presence will depend on what conversation partners perceive to be polite or expected behavior within a given situation.

Without conversation, humans become less empathic, less creative, less connected, and less fulfilled (Turkle, 2015). Thus, it is important to understand how mobile digital devices - particularly cell-phones - are breaking into human conversation, and how individuals can continue this natural act while embracing technological advancement. As cell-phones are changing conversational norms, it is important to understand how social presence and expectations are changing within FtF conversations. By understanding what people perceive to be normal or expected states of presence within a conversation, individuals can better understand how to listen to their partner and be present within a given context. By knowing the rules and being conscious of what a conversation partner needs in order to feel heard and understood, FtF relationships and connections will continue to prosper despite the new technologies that threaten to break them down.

This study is grounded in the theory of attentional social presence while drawing upon concepts from politeness theory and expectancy violations theory (EVT). This research aims to build off of the key findings from three particular studies: a 2018 study by Turner and Foss introducing the theory of attentional social presence, a 2008 study conducted by Reinsch Jr., Turner, and Tinsley, which focused on the definition of and concepts related to multicomunication, and a 2017 study conducted by Miller-Ott and Kelly which applied politeness theory to cell-phone usage in the presence of friends.

II. Literature Review

Introduction

From the moment they are born, humans desire intimacy and long to be valued by others (Forgas & Fitness, 2008). One of the ways such desires can be met is through interpersonal communication, or the exchange of information between two or more people (Berger, 2008). Interpersonal communication can be found in a variety of contexts, but perhaps one of the most natural and humanizing forms of interaction is face-to-face (FtF) communication (Turkle, 2015). Within these conversations, people learn how to develop empathy and listen; it's through these exchanges that people experience the human desire to be understood, valued, and heard (Turkle, 2015). Interpersonal communication is built on a set of skills including listening, feedback, questioning, and awareness of style (Baney, 2004), and the more someone practices these skills within a FtF conversation, the more rewarding the experience will be.

Interpersonal abilities and skills, such as listening, have long been vulnerable to evolving technology, and the 21st century serves as no exception to such a threat. Open-ended and spontaneous conversation in which humans can be fully present and vulnerable is lost when someone interrupts a conversation to check a text message, open a laptop, or swipe across the screen of a tablet (Turkle, 2015). The use of digital devices amidst a conversation can lead people to focus on something other than their conversation partner, resulting in lower levels of trust, empathy, and understanding amongst conversation partners. Not only does the presence of a cell-phone take away from cues such as eye contact and body movement, but conversation partners may perceive such actions as an intentional act of impoliteness, thus lowering the recipient's level of conversation

satisfaction (Allred & Crowley, 2017; Andersen, Guerrero, Buller & Jorgensen, 1998). Even when they're not being used (Misra et. al, 2014; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012), cell-phones have the power to divide human attention by distracting the thought process and allowing an individual to wonder what he or she could be doing on the cell-phone (Hyman, 2014).

The Cell-Phone and Its Affordances

While the cell-phone was once a new, unique, and uncommon object in people's lives, it has now become a mundane device that nearly blends in (Ling, 2012) to everyday life. Cell-phones now hold a symbolic meaning within advanced technological societies, so that even when they are not audible, their presence alone represents a window into a network of connections and information (Misra et. al, 2014). The second decade of the 21st century has welcomed an increase in smartphone use around the world, with individuals from a vast array of geographic, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds and ages claiming these mobile digital devices as their own (Pew Research, 2017).

The cell-phone provides basic communication affordances and it brings a sense of belonging to its user. Through various apps and messaging platforms available on the smartphone, users can feel a sense of belonging by finding a community in which they share a common goal or interest (Srivastava, 2005). The cell-phone serves as a link to the people within one's intimate sphere, and many users consider their cell phones to be a basic accessory to their daily lives. Some users have described their phone as an essential utility that they "can't imagine living without," (Smith, 2012) and if someone finds him or herself without a phone, they may feel like they have betrayed their social sphere that exists through the mobile phone (Ling, 2012). While cell-phone owners claim that their

phone has made it significantly easier to do things such as stay in touch with the people they care about or stay organized with scheduling, users have also admitted that the presence of their phone makes it significantly harder to disconnect, thus jeopardizing the undivided attention that is often expected, and necessary, in face-to-face (FtF) situations (Smith, 2012).

A person's decision to interact with a digital device is influenced by personal choice, perceived expectations, and work norms (Mazmanian, Orlikowski, & Yates, 2005). Furthermore, the use of mobile technology has also been proven to be contagious - if one conversation partner begins to use his or her digital device, the other will typically follow suit (Finkel & Kruger, 2012). Researchers have found that by following the actions of others, people are guided in how to understand and position themselves at each point of an interaction (Bayer, Campbell, & Ling, 2016). In other words, if conversation partner A pulls out his or her cell-phone to check the time, conversation partner B will take that as a cue to pull his or her phone out, too.

Through social media apps and messaging services, today's ever-present digital devices have proven that FtF interaction is not the only way to achieve intimacy. However, this affordance has put the traditional establishment of FtF intimacy at risk (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016). Because they are mobile, cell-phones and other digital devices such as tablets or laptops can sound off alerts at any time and in any location, often taking precedence over the social interactions they disrupt. The need or desire to answer a call often outweighs the importance of maintaining a FtF conversation, thus affecting perceptions of politeness (Plant, 2000) and one's ability to listen. The simple act of checking a phone to check the time or seeing someone else's phone light up from

receiving a notification can distract people enough to ruin a conversation (Finkel & Kruger, 2012).

As cell phones have become ubiquitous, research has begun to discover the strategies that individuals use in order to maintain an uninterrupted conversation. Because of the distraction that cell-phones encourage, many conversation partners choose to put the device away or turn it to silent to eliminate the possibility of a digital disruption during situations such as a date or serious conversation (Kerner, 2013). Research has found that interacting in a neutral environment without a cell phone nearby may help foster closeness, connectedness, and trust because the attention of each individual is focused on his or her conversation partner instead of their phone (Lin, 2012).

However, embracing a cell-phone-free environment has proven to be a challenge. Because cell phones have enabled around-the-clock contact, they likely play a role in the dialectical tension between autonomy versus connection (Duran, Kelly, & Rotaru, 2011). In other words, people experience tension between wanting to be free from their phone, but also wanting to remain connected to the opportunities it provides. Research has shown that the use of cell-phones can serve as a source of conflict and a means for rule-making. For example, lower levels of satisfaction with the use of cell-phones and higher availability expectations within a romantic relationship were associated with less satisfaction with the amount of time spent with a partner, feelings of being restricted from the phone, and a higher desire to control the other (partner) (Duran, Kelly, & Rotaru, 2011).

Because cell-phones serve as a means to bring people closer together, they also serve as an extension of one's social connections beyond the FtF conversation at hand (Drago,

2015; Ling, 2012; McDaniel & Coyne, 2016; Turner & Reinsch, in press). Mobile digital devices serve as an extension of the workplace, which can lead to negative reactions from spouses and family members (Dieter Czechowsky, 2008). In the classroom, research has proven that the use of laptops and other digital devices to take notes is often detrimental to the student because of the distractions they allow; multitasking and opening more windows to other communication channels such as email or Facebook takes away time spent listening to a lecture or interacting with other students (Kraushaar & Novak, 2010). Whether one is multicommuting in the classroom or at work, research indicates that open screens degrade the performance of both their owners and everyone in close proximity to them (Turkle, 2015).

In order to understand the ways in which cell-phones are impacting FtF interactions (specifically conversations), it is important to have a basic understanding of the concepts that surround interpersonal communication, which serves as a foundation upon which FtF conversations are built. Furthermore, in order to continue to understand how cell-phones are affecting FtF conversations, the concepts of multicommuting and attentional social presence, along with politeness theory and expectancy violations theory, will be explained.

Intimacy and Attention

Intimacy is an interpersonal and transactional process that rests upon two primary components: self-disclosure and partner responsiveness (Reis & Shaver, 1988). The process of intimacy begins when an individual verbally or nonverbally communicates personal, relevant and revealing information to another person. In order for the process to continue, the conversation partner, also known as the listener, must somehow

communicate responsiveness, typically through the use of emotions, expressions, and behavior that aligns with the content of the disclosure while also conveying validation and understanding toward the other and his or her disclosed information. However, the interaction will only be registered as intimate by the speaker if he or she feels understood and cared for by his or her partner (Laurenceau, Rivera, Schaffer & Pietromonaco, 2004).

When connecting with a partner in a social interaction, an individual typically expects his or her partner to be responsive and attentive because it provides a sense of mattering to the speaker (Jones, Moore, Schratler & Negel, 2001). Mattering to another person is a basic human need and desire, and it is not necessarily about the quality of the relationship, but instead, more about the self-perceived relevance to a specific other (e.g. friend, partner, family member). The concept of mattering equates to feelings of belonging and relatedness, which highlights the purpose that individuals have to feel important and relevant to their significant others (Demir, Ozen, Dogan, Bilyk, & Tyrell, 2011). People determine how much they matter to the other by comparing perceptions of attention; a person will look at the attention he or she is getting and compare it to the attention the specific other directs on to other objects in the environment (Marshall, 2011). Thus, if someone sees his or her conversation partner checking a phone more than listening to the conversation, the individual will likely feel as if he or she doesn't matter.

Within an interaction, one cannot *not* communicate (Watzlawick, Bavelas & Jackson, 2011). Thus, when people converse with one another face-to-face, any behavior that they exude within that interaction contains communicative value (Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 2011). Conversation partner A might be sitting still and silent while looking at conversation partner B who is talking and making hand gestures. In that situation, each

individual is communicating something with the other, whether its a silent message that signifies “I am listening” or a verbal message that contains a set of stories or feelings. Regardless of what one’s role is within the conversation or whether or not someone is speaking, gestures are always present in the interaction (Schlain, 1998). From verbal behavior such as speaking to nonverbal behavior such as nodding a head or turning one’s body toward a conversation partner, these actions contain message value that an interaction partner picks up on and responds to (Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 2011). Thus, the process of communication not only transmits messages, but it also establishes behavior (Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 2011). While talking, the speaker is constantly watching the listener for nonverbal feedback which will give him or her confirmation that the message he or she is communicating results in a desired, or undesired, effect (Schlain, 1998).

Key to maintaining a conversation is the ability to pay attention. One’s attention span is typically driven by what his or her goal is at the time (Forgas & Fitness, 2008). If someone’s goal is to be present in the moment and listen to his or her conversation partner, his or her attention will most likely be on that conversation partner. In fact, scholars have proposed that people believe that goals should serve as a characteristic of relationships - each member of the conversation should have a goal of supporting his or her partner in whatever form they express a need (Forgas & Fitness, 2008). This goal is often accompanied by the act of paying attention so that a conversation partner understands and acknowledges the need. However, as cell-phones become more ubiquitous, the goal of being present in the FtF conversation now competes with the goal to be accessible to the communities that are present via a cell phone (Ling, 2012). This

sense of competition, or tension between the two connections, comes from the uniquely human desire to control the ways in which one allocates his or her attention (Turkle, 2015).

Research has found that even if it's not being used, the mere presence of a cell-phone can have a negative effect on closeness, connection, and conversation. In their 2012 study, Przybylski and Weinstein conducted two experiments where they evaluated the extent to which the presence of a cell phone shaped relationship quality between two participants. In the first experiment, the researchers tested for relationship quality, partner closeness, and positive affect by randomly assigning pairs of participants to one of two conditions: phone absent or phone present. When the phone was present, a cell-phone rested on a book which was placed on a nearby desk outside of the participants' direct visual field. The first experiment found that the partners who got to know one another, sharing a "moderately meaningful" discussion in the presence of a cell-phone, felt less close with their partners and reported lower quality of relationship than those who got to know each other without the presence of a cell phone. The second experiment explored which relational contexts were more affected by cell-phones by manipulating the content of the discussions to be either casual or meaningful by applying conversation types to the framework of experiment 1. This experiment found that when the conversation was casual, the presence of a cell-phone did not affect the partners' levels of trust. However, when attempting to have a more meaningful conversation in the presence of a phone, participants reported less trust than those who had had the same type of conversation without the presence of the cell-phone.

The resulting evidence from both experiments shows that the presence of the cell-phone restrains the development of interpersonal closeness and trust, thus lessening the extent to which people feel empathy and understanding toward their conversation partners. The results from the second experiment, in particular, indicate that these effects are particularly apparent when conversation partners are involved in a more serious or personally meaningful discussion.

Building upon the experiments conducted by Przybylski and Weinstein (2012), Misra, Cheng, Genevie and Yuan (2014) conducted a naturalistic field experiment where 100 pairs of people were randomly assigned to discuss either a casual or meaningful topic together. Research assistants observed whether, during the course of a 10-minute conversation, the participants placed a mobile device on the table or held it in their hands. The researchers found that conversations which were had without a mobile communication technology were rated significantly better than those in which a mobile device was present. For the conversations that happened in the presence of a mobile device, participants reported the conversation to be less fulfilling while also experiencing lower levels of empathetic concern compared to participants who conversed without the presence of a mobile device.

Furthermore, outside of FtF conversation, studies have begun to uncover that technologies - books, Walkmans, iPods, and cell-phones, among others - may assist in avoidance strategies (Baron & Campbell, 2012; de Souza e Silva and Frith, 2012). Looking down at a phone and checking emails or scrolling through Spotify gives individuals the opportunity to appear busy and thus avoid conversation with anyone. This

gives users an opportunity to “hide” (Nakamura, 2015) within a mobile world, despite the individual’s physical presence in reality.

Goffman (1980) posits that humans have the ability to divide their attention into “main” and “side” involvements. Within a main involvement, the primary part of a person’s attention and interest is aimed at the primary target of his or her actions. For example, if Jack and Jane are in conversation with one another and Jane is solely focused on Jack and the story he is telling, Jane’s attention is mainly involved on Jack’s story. On the other hand, if Jane takes out her phone to check a notification while Jack is talking, her attention on both Jack and her phone become side involvements. The main involvement that is upheld by an individual within a social situation serves as a potential expression of his or her intention on being present (Goffman, 1980). Goffman proposes that within any social gathering, individuals may feel compelled to practice minimal main involvement to avoid the possibility of appearing disengaged. While Goffman (1980) uses the example of waiting rooms and airplanes being supplied with magazines or other reading materials that serve as minimal involvements, one could argue that now, in the 21st century, the object of the cell-phone has now taken on the role of being a minimal involvement for individuals looking to pass time or appear involved in something.

Furthermore, Goffman (1980) goes on to propose that in public restaurants, eating can be defined as the main involvement. Yet, on the other hand, it can be seen as something that may not engage an individual’s entire attention, as people often eat out together. In Goffman’s examples, if someone is alone, he or she might bring a newspaper or a magazine as a substitute for human companionship, or sit in a location where the individual may appear to be rushing through a meal so that he or she alludes to having

other business to attend to. However, in the 21st century, mobile digital devices have replaced the old newspaper technology. Cell-phones often serve as a companion when an individual finds him or herself alone in a public space, and the act of looking at the phone while in public has the potential to signal that someone is busy and less approachable (Nakamura, 2015), regardless of where he or she is standing. Cell-phones now substitute for human companionship in nearly every social setting, but one must inquire what it means when this action is taken one step further and, even in the face of human companionship, cell-phones serve as subordinate involvements to both human conversation and the social setting in which it takes place.

Goffman (1980) goes on to explain that the failure to maintain a degree of main involvement is not simply caused by a lack of understanding of what is going on or due to an unstimulating environment. Rather, a person might find that his or her concerns and interests lie outside of the environment that he or she is currently in, or because he or she is feeling too much anxiety to participate in the situation. In the 21st century, this type of situation can play out in many ways. One conversation partner may fail to maintain a degree of main involvement with the other partner not because he or she isn't interested in what the other has to say, but rather because he or she has become distracted by the vibration or sound from a phone located on the table, in a purse, or in a pocket. The anxiety of knowing that there's an unanswered notification has the potential to take away from the main involvement, which has been socially expected to be the conversation itself.

Research indicates that the presence and use of a cell phone within a FtF conversation has the potential to lower feelings of intimacy, attention, and understanding amongst

conversation partners (Misra et. al, 2014; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012). However, in order to better understand why this is a problem, it's important to understand the ways in which individuals attempt to be involved in multiple conversations at once.

Multicommunication

The behavior of multicommunicating can be described as an act of participating in multiple conversations at once (Turner & Reinsch, in press). When multicommunicating, a person divides his or her attention between two or more speech events, thus decreasing his or her ability to coordinate responses, and subsequently causing gaps of silence (Reinsch, Turner, & Tinsley, 2008). For example, a person might be text messaging a friend and Facebook messaging a classmate all while getting lunch and having a conversation with his or her significant other - this act would serve as an example of multicommunication in action. Multicommunication can vary in intensity depending on the number of open conversations, the pace of each conversation, the number of topics being discussed, and the placement of social roles (Reinsch, Turner, & Tinsley, 2008).

The introduction of a multicommunicative environment has caused another shift in the concept of social presence (Turner & Foss, 2018). As mobile digital devices - and more specifically, cell-phones - have become ever-present, the idea of having an individual's undivided attention and presence has become less and less familiar (Turner & Foss, 2018). Absent presence - the situation where a partner is physically present but distracted by their digital technology (Gergen, 2002) - has become a frequent result of multicommunication in the instance of FtF interactions, resulting in delayed responses, abnormal and mechanical vocal intonation, and unanimated, motionless, and unresponsive body language (Aagaard, 2016).

Cell-phones serve as a tool to connect with individuals who, for various geographic and social reasons, cannot be present in a FtF interaction. However, no set guidelines have been established to determine in what kind of social setting it is appropriate to multicomunicate (Nakamura, 2015). Thus far, research has found that the acceptability of using a cell-phone to connect with others within a FtF context - or multicomunicate - is highly dependent on the goals and expectations of each partner, which are often shaped by the type of conversation that is being had. For example, a formal date or intimate conversation has been found to come with expectations of undivided attention, thus lowering the acceptability of a cell-phone being used or present within that type of interaction (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015).

However, in more informal situations, expectations for cell-phone use differs and tends to be more acceptable (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015). Research has shown that casual conversations within larger group settings, or while two partners are casually watching television together, may be a more appropriate context for multicomunication. In their 2015 Pew Research Center report, Rainie and Zickuhr found that while 77% of adults believe that it is generally acceptable to use a cell-phone while walking down a street and 75% believed it was acceptable to employ a phone while using public transit. However, both of these situations serve as contexts where an individual may not necessarily be conversing with a partner. On the other hand, only 38% of people believed it was generally acceptable to use cell-phones while out at a restaurant, and a mere 5% found it generally acceptable to use a cell-phone at a meeting. When asked whether mobile phone use impacted group interactions, 82% of adults reported that when phones were used in these social settings, they frequently or occasionally harmed the conversation, while 38%

reported that cell-phone use in this type of situation benefited the conversation and contributed to the atmosphere of the group (Rainie & Zickuhr, 2015). Thus, there remains room to explore in which social contexts multicomcommunication may benefit a conversation.

As cell-phones become a normal part of everyday life, it is plausible that the act of multicomcommunication will follow suit. However, referring back to the idea of context, one's ability to multicomcommunicate may be dependent on the type of conversation one finds him or herself in. In order to better understand this idea, Turner and Foss (2018) have developed the theory of attentional social presence.

Attentional Social Presence

As the digital environment becomes more enhanced, the ability to multicomcommunicate continues to strengthen. People are not only socially present in FtF interactions, but they are also present in various online channels, forcing them to make strategic choices on how to manage their social presence both on and offline, according to the ways in which they hope to be perceived. In order to influence anyone or project one's own identity, one must construct his or her social presence in a manner that catches their audience's attention (Turner & Foss, 2018). In other words, people are now torn between maintaining a certain social presence in the online world of social media and messaging, while also balancing the social presence required within a FtF situation.

If individuals within FtF conversations are becoming more distracted by the process of multicomcommunicating, it is important to explore how these behaviors have begun to shape the ways in which conversation partners try to hold the attention of the other, and subsequently, keep the conversation going without the distraction of the cell-phone.

Turner and Foss (2018) developed a theory, attentional social presence, which is established upon the concepts of social presence and relational control, and contain four options which can be used by conversation partners in order to maintain attentional social presence.

The model for attentional social presence focuses on the actions of communicators within FtF interactions and applies to the efforts that communicators make to insert themselves into a communicative space (Turner & Foss, 2018). The model includes four options available for constructing attentional social presence: budgeted social presence, entitled social presence, competitive social presence, and invitational social presence.

A. Budgeted Social Presence

Within this state of presence, individuals are actively participating in or have access to multiple conversations (Turner & Foss, 2018). In other words, when two individuals are sitting together for lunch and one or both of them have their cell-phone out on the table, they are participating in budgeted social presence by opening up the interaction for the potential for communication on the cell phone while also continuing the FtF conversation. Furthermore, if a group of individuals are together at a party and many of them are messaging others, they are also participating in budgeted social presence. Thus, budgeted social presence serves as the default state for many individuals, regardless of whether they find themselves at work, at school, with family, or with friends (Turner & Foss, 2018).

Within the process or budgeted social presence, a communicator's goal is to efficiently manage multiple messages at once - in other words, to effectively multicomunicate and allocate their presence across a variety of communication

channels that can be either FtF or digital. There is a significant amount of control involved within budgeted social presence, as an individual always has the choice as to when he or she can step out of budgeted social presence and into another type of social presence (Turner & Foss, 2018). Thus, within budgeted social presence, the communicator focuses on his or her own availability, attention, and time; his or her goal is to control the interactions he or she has with others depending on his or her own needs. The communicator is aware that he or she will most likely not have the attention of his or her audience, but instead, the focus is on how he or she can manage communication messages and achieve the highest level of productivity (Turner & Foss, 2018).

There are many reasons that motivate people to check their cell phone, or practice budgeted social presence, while interacting with a FtF partner. Nakamura (2015) found two specific contexts in which individuals practice budgeted social presence: when someone checks his or her phone while alone in public, and when someone checks his or her phone in the company of familiar people. In the context of being alone in a public place, individuals will use their phone as a source of entertainment, such as to play a game or text a friend. But users will also use their phone as a tool to nonverbally communicate a message of being occupied, and therefore, less approachable (de Souza e Silva & Frith, 2012; Goffman, 1980; Nakamura, 2015). On the other hand, individuals are also motivated to check their phone while spending time with others. For example, Nakamura (2015) points out the fact that people will glance at their phones to check the time or see if they have received any new notifications within the course of an interaction. People will also pull out their phone while in the company of others in order to enhance the conversation (Nakamura, 2015). For example, if two individuals are trying

to decide where to go for lunch one day, one may take out his or her phone and use the phone as a tool for discovering a restaurant nearby. Nakamura (2015) also points out that individuals may use their phones as a way to express negative feelings toward an ongoing FtF interaction, or use the phone as a tool to escape entirely. This might occur when one conversation partner brings up a topic that the recipient of the message finds uncomfortable.

Under the umbrella of budgeted social presence, the concept of “phubbing” - a blending of the words “phone” and “snubbing,” has also emerged. Phubbing refers to the act of one conversation partner snubbing the other by taking out and using his or her cell-phone while in a FtF interaction (Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas, 2016; Roberts & David, 2016). Thus, the act of phubbing sometimes serves as a process of multicommuting if the interruption involves a separate conversation on the phone. While the research on what motivates individuals to phub their conversation partner is still developing, scholars have found that factors such as internet addiction, fear of missing out, and self-control have the potential to contribute to the act of phubbing (Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas, 2016).

As Chotpitayasunondh and Douglas state in their study (2016), there is room to explore how the action of phubbing has become acceptable within a given society, and part of understanding the process of normalizing this action can be traced to the concept of reciprocity. Reciprocity can be seen as a behavioral response to what one perceives as kindness or unkindness (Falk & Fischbacher, 2006). According to the theory proposed by Falk and Fischbacher (2006), two factors remain vital in understanding how people evaluate the kindness of an action: the consequences that result from an action, and the

intentions held by the actor. The consequences of an action will be perceived and reciprocated differently, depending on the root of the intention (Falk & Fischbacher, 2006). While Falk and Fischbacher's concept of reciprocity differs from other models and approaches, their model has the potential to be applied to the concept of phubbing. Chotpitayasunondh and Douglas (2016) allude to the idea that the concept of reciprocity may be a motivating factor behind why phubbing has become commonplace. For example, if a FtF conversation partner pulls out his or her cell phone during a conversation, the other partner might reciprocate by pulling his or her phone out, too. As this behavior is acted upon and observed more and more, it becomes more widely accepted (Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas, 2016) within the context, culture, and/or society in which it occurs. Referring back to Falk and Fischbacher's theory (2006), this may serve as a consequence of the action. However, there is still much to be discovered regarding the motivations behind the intentions of the actor, and how the recipient's perceptions of the actor's intention may affect the recipient's perception of whether or not the act of phubbing is kind or unkind, polite or impolite.

Budgeted social presence can be found in many of today's FtF and online interactions. However, it has the potential to leave conversation partners feeling hurt. Because attention is allocated to multiple channels, conversational partners may perceive the communicator's interruption of the FtF conversation, and lack of attention, as impersonal (Turner & Foss, 2018). If a conversation partner suspects that the communicator is attempting to hide a separate conversation that he or she is involved in, that partner is more likely to experience feelings of incivility, mistrust, tension, and lower levels of empathy between his or her conversation partner (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016;

Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015; Misra et al, 2014). However, research has found that if the communicator admits and acknowledges the separate conversation happening on his or her mobile device (Cameron & Webster, 2011), conversation partners are more willing to pause the conversation and wait for the interruption to pass. Scholars have begun to study how these feelings of incivility and mistrust might be ameliorated within such a context. For example, individuals sometimes use forewarnings to announce that they're expecting a text message ("I need to keep my phone out because I'm expecting a call from my boss in ten minutes and I need to answer it"), or use a disclaimer to explain who they are communicating with and why ("Please excuse me, my sister has texted me. I need to answer her real quick") (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017). However, there remains room to continue to explore people's perceptions of when they find budgeted social presence to be acceptable and unacceptable.

B. Entitled Social Presence

This state of presence occurs when a communicator chooses to deal with an inattentive audience by focusing his or her communication efforts on the environment and limiting the number of messages in that environment so that fewer acts of multicomunication may compete with the communicator (Turner & Foss, 2018). For example, before a lecture, a speaker may ask his or her audience to put their electronic devices away. Or, when out on a date together, one partner might tell the other to put his or her phone away. These efforts are made because the communicator believes that his or her message should be prioritized over other messages that the audience might be involved in, and thus, the communicator essentially demands that the audience - whether

it be one person or an entire auditorium - listen to the his or her message (Gikas & Grant, 2013; Turner & Foss, 2018).

Like budgeted social presence, entitled social presence involves a communicator who seeks to control communication in the moment. However, in this scenario, the communicator is no longer trying to manage multiple conversations at once, but instead, trying to ward off competing messages sent and received by others in the situation (Turner & Foss, 2018). This happens through the act of the communicator telling the audience, in some way or another, to put their phones and/or digital devices away. This action has the tendency to create a superior-inferior relationship (Rogers, 2001), giving the communicator more power in the relationship because of the demand for attention that he or she has made (Turner & Foss, 2018). With this power dynamic in mind, there remains room to better understand how an audience member or individual may react to such a request.

C. Competitive Social Presence

This type of presence is similar to entitled social presence in the way that the communicator aims to get his or her audience's attention, however, one main difference is the fact that instead of directly asking an individual or audience to put their devices away, the communicator attempts to compete with the mobile digital device by attempting to make his or her message as compelling and appealing as possible (Turner & Foss, 2018). Instead of being in the higher power position that entitled social presence puts the speaker in, competitive social presence puts the speaker in a lower-power position. As the communicator receives feedback from the audience, he or she may adjust his or her message in an attempt to retain and increase the attention of the audience -

essentially, communicators practicing competitive social presence are attempting to win the attention of their audience (Turner & Foss, 2018). For example, conversation partner A might notice that conversation partner B is distracted by his or her phone. Conversation partner A will then use some type of strategy to try to distract conversation partner B's attention away from his or her phone and back to conversation partner A. Little to no research has been conducted regarding how successful this strategy is, or how it compares to the strategies used in entitled social presence.

D. Invitational Social Presence

This state of presence stems from the theory of invitational rhetoric, where the communicator's only goal is to try to understand the perspectives of his or her audience, as opposed to attempting to persuade and or change the audience's behaviors and/or actions (Foss & Griffin, 1995; Turner & Foss, 2018). Invitational social presence can only happen with smaller audiences of one or a few people, as the larger the audience grows, the less the situation will be about learning about one another and the more the situation will be about competing for the audience's attention (Turner & Foss, 2018). Examples of invitational social presence can be found frequently in everyday life, such as when two friends get together to catch up and talk about each others' lives while leaving their cell phones on silent and out of sight, or when a family gets together for a meal and no one pulls out a cell phone or other mobile digital device.

Politeness Theory Within Attentional Social Presence

The expectations that guide conversations between communication partners are often shaped around perceptions of politeness, and the concept of politeness serves as a building block which leads to social order and a "precondition of human cooperation"

(Brown & Levinson, 1987). Politeness equates to acting in a way that allows others to experience both independence and acceptance; respecting and honoring the needs and boundaries of the others, just as one would want others to provide that freedom to him or herself (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006). However, as new technologies enter daily life, they disturb society's pre-existing ideas of politeness (Ling, 2012). The public use of the cell-phone has evolved from being impolite to now being relatively accepted; however, the "correct" behavior when using a cell-phone remains an area of conversation and research that society is still working to understand (Ling, 2012).

Central to the idea of politeness theory is Erving Goffman's (1967) concept of face, which can be defined as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 61). In order to support the face of the other person, politeness is necessary (Miczo, 2012). The concepts of negative and positive politeness can be re-worded as positive face and negative face. Individuals have both positive and negative face needs; positive face is the positive self-image that a person desires to have approval of from others, while negative face equates to a sense of freedom from control of others (Goldsmith & Lamb Normand, 2015). Behaviors that have been found to threaten positive face include interruptions and lack of attention, both of which can be found in today's cell phone-infused environment (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017; Tedeschi & Harris Bond, 2001), and both of which occur during budgeted social presence. However, entitled social presence also has the potential to threaten positive face, as well. When someone is told to put his or her phone away, that person may feel as though their conversation partner disapproves of their behavior. It could also be proposed, however, that the person

practicing entitled social presence is also threatening his or her positive face, as the recipient of this request might view him or her as controlling or assertive.

If someone says or does something to take away the other's sense of independence or acceptance, they engage in a face-threatening act. When someone engages in politeness, they are making an attempt to be careful about what ways in which they can reduce impact of a face-threatening act (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006). Thus, there is room to explore whether entitled social presence is perceived as a face-threatening act, and if so, whether there are any ways of going about this type of presence so that an individual can reduce the impact of the perceived face-threat. Furthermore, someone may engage in "negative politeness" as an attempt to protect the other from feelings of intrusion or restriction, and "positive politeness" when attempting to help the other achieve acceptance (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006).

In their 2017 study, Miller-Ott and Kelly applied the framework of politeness theory to transcripts derived from focus groups in which college students discussed their experiences and perceptions of cell-phone use in the presence of friends. The findings highlighted budgeted social presence in action, and indicated that friends experience a tension between positive and negative face needs that relate to cell-phone usage, and individuals rely on a variety of responses to face threatening acts. Particularly noteworthy findings included the fact that cell-phone usage conveys many face-threatening messages within a relationship, such as the idea that a speaker is not important enough to maintain their partner's full attention, that a speaker may be "boring" compared to the community that is available via cell-phone, or that the listener doesn't take the speaker, and subsequently, the relationship, seriously. These findings indicate that speakers expect

their conversation partners to be fully present during a conversation with a friend because the act of being attentive serves as a cue that the conversation partner is important. Thus, the use of a cell-phone during such a conversation violates the expectation of presence and “devalues” the conversation partner (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017).

Much like the experiments on the presence of a cell-phone within a FtF interaction (Misra et. al, 2014; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012), Miller-Ott and Kelly’s study (2017) found that context was also a factor when evaluating whether or not it is polite to use a cell-phone within a FtF conversation. While cell-phone usage signals a lack of interest and concern within the conversation, the potential for negative-face is heightened when conversing in one-on-one interactions, but less threatening when partners are involved in quick and/or informal conversations.

Furthermore, Miller-Ott and Kelly (2017) found that the use of forewarnings and disclaimers served as an effective strategy in acknowledging and reducing the face-threatening act of cell-phone use while with a friend. For example, if one partner informed the other that they’d be receiving an important text in 15 minutes, or excused the immediate interruption of a text by explaining that they needed to answer the message quickly, the threat to the positive face of a friend was lessened while giving the conversation partner the freedom to be able to use the phone.

Expectancy Violations Theory Within Attentional Social Presence

Expectations are important components in everyday life: they affect how people approach things, perceive situations, interact with others (White, 2015), and shape our perceptions of what is right and wrong. Our expectations play a significant role in influencing what we believe to be polite and impolite, abnormal and normal. For

example, before starting a conversation with a friend, an individual might have certain expectations of how his or her friend will respond and act in the situation. Furthermore, before hopping on a Metro train during rush hour, an individual might have expectations of how crowded the train will be.

Expectancy violations theory (EVT) is a theory that was developed in order to explain how human communicators identify, translate, and react to situations based on the pre-existing expectations they have for the interaction (Burgoon, 2016; White, 2015). EVT posits that our expectations are influenced by three important factors: the communicator, the relationship, and the context of the interaction (White, 2015). Expectations of the communicator may include demographic information such as age, gender, appearance, and/or personality. Expectations of the relationship may include how familiar partners are with each other, or their perceptions of the other's status. Contextual expectations may include the type of environment in which the interaction occurs (White, 2015). For example, meeting in a quiet library will come with different contextual expectations than meeting in a bustling coffee shop.

EVT proposes that when an expectation is violated, an individual's arousal is heightened as he or she is forced to make sense of what happened while attempting to make sense of what the behavior might mean. In evaluating the meaning of the violation, a person will evaluate whether or not the violation has positive or negative value, which can be termed as "violation valence." For example, within the context of a FtF conversation, regardless of whether two people know each other or not, there are social norms that will shape one's expectations of the interaction; eye contact, alertness, and turning the body toward the speaker can all be evaluated as positive, at least in Western

cultures. However, when eye contact is avoided, a person leans away, or a conversation partner disregards what is being said, the scene will most likely be evaluated as negative (Burgoon, 2016). While positive violations can produce more desirable communication patterns and outcomes, negative violations provide less desirable outcomes.

Kelly, Miller-Ott, and Duran (2017) applied EVT to the usage of cell-phones within romantic relationships by surveying 225 adults between the ages of 23-35. This study found that among the particular age group of participants, using one's cell-phone while spending time with a romantic partner was not unexpected behavior, and thus, not considered an expectancy violation. Despite considering cell phone usage as expected behavior, many participants viewed the behavior as valenced, with more reporting negative valence than positive. Following the pattern of previous research (Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2017; Misra et. al, 2014; Przybylski & Weinstein, 2012), the findings indicated that the nature of the cell-phone usage and the context of which it occurred played a significant role in whether or not the action determined valence and perceived expectations. Excessive usage of the cell-phone, or using it for certain activities such as games or checking sports scores, was less expected and perceived as more negative. This was particularly the case when participants expected greater attention from their partners, such as during a date at a restaurant or when involved in a joint activity such as watching a movie together (Kelly, Miller-Ott, & Duran, 2017).

The findings from Kelly, Miller-Ott, and Duran's 2017 study indicate that each type of presence may come with a different set of expectations. For example, previous research shows that while budgeted social presence may not always be perceived as polite, it is considered relatively normal behavior, and thus, it is expected, at least in certain contexts.

On the other hand, invitational social presence demands for a conversation partner to be fully immersed and present in a situation. Thus, pulling one's phone out while involved in invitational social presence could be seen as a significant violation of one's expectations, and subsequently, politeness. When looking at expectations through the lens of entitled social presence, there is room to explore whether there is a disconnect between the sender's expectations and the receiver's expectations. For example, the sender may hope that the act of asking the receiver to put his or her phone away as a positive violation, but the receiver may see the request as a negative violation because it serves as a threat to his or her positive face.

Moving Forward

The goal of this study is to explore how conversational partners navigate issues of politeness and expectations through the lens of attentional social presence. While research has found ways that both politeness and expectations are affected within FtF interactions, no research has yet studied the patterns of politeness and expectations that emerge within each of the four types of attentional social presence. Understanding the expectations of politeness and social norms involved within each type of attentional social presence has the potential to highlight how and why people navigate toward choosing a specific type of presence within a conversation. Furthermore, knowing how people choose each type of presence, and what they expect out of it, will begin the process of better understanding why some conversations between partners are more successful than others. This study aims to better understand how politeness strategies and expectations within attentional social presence work together to foster stronger understanding between conversation partners, and what situations or factors play a role in

weakening the connection between conversation partners. Focusing on one specific generation, one primary research question emerges:

RQ1: How do Millennials navigate the four types of presence within a FtF conversation?

Stemming from this research question, this study aims to explore the main hypothesis that the decision to choose any of the four types of attentional social presence will depend on what conversation partners perceive to be polite or expected behavior within a given situation.

III. Method

Participants and Procedures

This study was restricted to participants aged 18-36 living in the Washington, D.C. metro area in order to narrow in on a specific Millennial population living in a confined geographic space. After receiving approval from Georgetown's institutional review board, a call for participants was physically and electronically distributed to local university campuses and departments. Using convenience sampling, participants living in the Washington, D.C. metro region were encouraged to participate via distribution of the flyers on the researcher's social media channels, the social media channels of friends of the researcher, and two Georgetown graduate student Facebook pages. A total of 23 individuals (17 = F, 6 = M) ranging in age from 18 to 36 offered to participate in the study. 23 interviews ranging in length from 13 minutes to one hour and 27 minutes were conducted in the month of February 2018 (see appendix A).

Millennial Generation

Millennials were chosen for this study because of the defining fact that these individuals are considered the first generation in history to have been connected to digital technology for most of their lives (Taylor & Keeter, 2010). Although the exact years of birth that define the Millennial generation have not been specifically defined, a Millennial is oftentimes referred to as anyone approximately born between the years of 1980 and 2000 (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). This generation of individuals has been praised for their ability to multitask while being criticized for their lack of communication skills (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Despite the generation's shortcomings, a 2010 Pew Research Center report claimed that Millennials are on the

path to becoming the most educated generation in American history, an achievement that has mostly been driven by the fact that these individuals are entering a more knowledge-based economy, but also enrolling in higher education because they can't find a job in the post-recession market (Taylor & Keeter, 2010).

Interviews

Interview methodology was chosen for this study due to its capability to extract experiences and first-hand stories through conversation with participants (Tracy, 2013). While quantitative research could have been applied to this study's research questions, the aim of this study was not to extract a series of statistics, but rather to converse with participants, hear their stories, and take meaning from the topics presented from within their stories. As Tracy (2013) explains, qualitative interviews allow the chance for mutual discovery through an experience that is flexible and oftentimes unpredictable. As Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) note, the research interview is a professional conversation which is built upon the conversation of daily life. It is within an interview where knowledge is shared as two people interact and exchange viewpoints and ideas. And while the interview allows for flexibility in regards to conversation and mood, it does contain a specific structure and purpose (Tracy, 2013). Although the interviewer and interviewee are conversational partners, it is important to note that the interviewer nearly always has more control in regards to dialogue direction and chosen topic than the respondent does (Tracy, 2013).

The present study contained semi-structured, narrative interviews. Each interview was audio recorded for transcription purposes, and at the start of each interview, each participant completed an informed consent form and was reminded of his/her rights as a

participant. The interviewer entered the conversation with an ordered list of questions, however, as the conversation between interviewer and interviewee began to flow, the sequence of the questions and the questions themselves sometimes varied. This was a purposeful decision in order to stimulate the discussion as opposed to dictating it, with the hopes of allowing room for adaptability and unexpected findings (Tracy, 2013).

Interview questions were created based on this study's research question and hypothesis which aimed to further understand how Millennials navigate the four different types of attentional social presence, and whether their decisions influenced, or were influenced by, politeness strategies or preconceived expectations. In preparing the interview questions, careful attention was directed toward how each question was worded. Each question was created with the hopes of being simple, clear, and open-ended (Tracy, 2013). Careful attention was devoted to ensuring that the questions were non-leading and avoided any threat to the interviewee's identity (Tracy, 2013). Considering these factors, the final draft of interview questions included 15 questions (see appendix B).

The initial questions were used to build rapport, helping the participant to feel comfortable and allowing him or her to get in the mindset of talking about his or her own cell-phone use. The initial questions also focused on factual issues, such as asking participants how much time per day they spent on their cell-phones, and how long it took them to check their cell phone when they knew they had a notification waiting for them. Following the initial questions, participants were then asked a series of generative questions which aimed to generate frameworks for conversation which would allow the

pace and direction of the answers and conversation to flow according to the participant's response (Tracy, 2013).

A majority of each interview was built upon behavior and action questions (Tracy, 2013), many of which focused on how cell phones were used in their FtF conversations. For example, participants were asked, “Can you think of a time when you were in a FtF conversation, and the conversation was interrupted because you checked your cell-phone?” These types of behavioral questions were asked in order to get a better sense of whether or not people think it’s acceptable to use their phone within a FtF conversation, and if so, their motives behind these actions. Furthermore, these questions were used to explore attentional social presence without actually mentioning the term. This was done to ensure that clear, simple questions were asked. Within this stage of questioning, participants were frequently asked follow-up questions in order to better understand their motives behind their decisions. Although hypothetical questions were generally avoided due to the nature of the research questions and the goals of this study, they were asked on occasion, particularly in instances when participants had never experienced a situation, such as “Has anyone ever told you to put your phone away?”

As the interview progressed, one question in particular served to pose the ideal (Tracy, 2013), meaning it aimed to generate a response where the interviewee could easily blend reality with his or her own wishes. Participants were asked, “What would you consider a ‘good relationship rule’ regarding the presence and use of a cell-phone within a conversation,” with the hopes that this question would elicit the participant’s ideal conversational environment, and potentially, his or her opinions of the role of a cell-phone within this context. Following this question, the final part of the interview

contained directive questions (Tracy, 2013) which aimed to wrap up the interview and direct the interview back from wherever the follow-up questions and prompts had led the conversation. The final questions focused on the act of listening and were posed as typology questions (Tracy, 2013) in order to better understand how people listen and know when they're being listened to, while also hoping to gain more insight into the actions that lead people to believe they're not being listened to. The final question aimed to get a better understanding of why people believe or don't believe it's important to listen to a conversation, with the hopes of applying their answers to the ideas revolving around attentional social presence.

Data Analysis

Upon transcribing the interviews, the data immersion phase began (Tracy, 2013). Within this phase, each transcript was read through its entirety once in order to get to know the words that came out of the mouth of each participant, understand the content of each interview, and recall the unique aspects of the data that emerged from each piece (Tracy, 2013). During the process, general notes were made when something in particular stood out or related to the theories in which this research is based upon.

Upon the initial read-through of each transcript, the primary-cycle of coding began. All transcripts were uploaded to a password-protected project that was created on Dedoose (version 8.0.35), a qualitative software which provides organized solutions to coding and examining data. Each transcript was read through again in its entirety, except this time, initial codes were assigned to the data. Initial codes were separated into four different categories: budgeted presence, entitled presence, competitive presence, and invitational presence. Thus, if a participant talked about using his or her cell phone while

at the dinner table, that excerpt was clearly an example of budgeted presence, and was coded as “budgeted presence.”

Upon finishing this phase of the read-through, each transcript contained presence codes. After assigning presence codes to each transcript, the primary-cycle continued as each transcript was read-through again. This time around, other codes were assigned to the data that did not clearly indicate any presence type, but still contained certain themes, such as context, forewarning, politeness, rude behavior, and so on. Each of these themes was made into a code. For example, any time a participant talked about context, the code “context” was assigned to that excerpt. Themes began to emerge from the codes within each individual transcript. For example, if a participant mentioned any significant theme that related to content mentioned in the literature review, even if it was just mentioned once, a code was created. It should be noted that during the primary-cycle, excerpts were only assigned one code at a time - thus, an excerpt that had previously been coded as “invitational presence” was not assigned any other codes. This was done for organizational purposes. The codes created in the primary cycle of coding were considered “first-level codes,” which Tracy (2013) refers to as descriptive words that describe present themes within the data, such as actions, emotions, reactions, locations, and so on. The goal of this phase of coding was not to answer why or how something happened or occurred, but to simply outline what was going on within the participant’s story (Tracy, 2013).

Upon assigning first-level codes to each transcript during the primary-cycle of coding, the secondary-cycle of coding began, in which the codes which had been identified during the primary-cycle were then organized and categorized into broader

concepts, also known as second-level codes (Tracy, 2013). According to Tracy (2013), “Second-level coding includes interpretation and identifying patterns, rules, or cause-effect progressions” (Tracy, 193). During the secondary-cycle of coding, hierarchical codes (Tracy, 2013) also emerged. These codes served as umbrella terms under which secondary-codes were placed. For example, “politeness strategy” was categorized under the hierarchical code of “forewarning/excuse/apology,” a code that housed all secondary-cycle codes which were assigned to quotes and excerpts that addressed the ways in which participants tried to buffer cell-phone interruptions. Thus, the hierarchical code “forewarning/excuse/apology” was placed under the even larger umbrella of the first-cycle code, “budgeted presence.”

Upon going through each transcript and organizing secondary-cycle codes, 23 second-level codes emerged. Using Dedoose software, word documents containing quotes and excerpts were compiled based on each code. For example, the “phone as prompt” code provided 10 pages worth of examples that had been coded as such. Documents containing each of the 23 secondary-cycle codes and each of the four primary-cycle codes was then printed into hard copy, which the researcher termed “code packets.” Each of the code packets was then read through in entirety, looking for exemplars, which Tracy (2013) describes as examples and/or stories that stand out as significant and provide more insight into the essence of the code. As the exemplars were marked as important, typologies (Tracy, 2013) - words that assisted in classifying the exemplars - were also assigned to certain exemplars.

Upon going through the list of 27 total code packets, a matrix (Tracy, 2013) sheet was created using Microsoft Excel, compiling 214 of the most relevant exemplars with their

assigned primary and secondary-cycle codes and typology. From the 23 original secondary-codes, 19 were included in the matrix and four (“time per day spent on phone,” “generational references,” “cultural references,” and “phone sounds/notifications”) were omitted because they contained no exemplars that assisted in highlighting part of the research topic or question. The matrix was organized in order of primary-cycle code, secondary-cycle code, and typology. Next, the exemplars were listed and organized according to each code and typology, and the transcript number of each quote was included for organizational purposes. Within this spreadsheet, analytic memos (Tracy, 2013) were included alongside many of the exemplars in order to highlight why the quote was relevant, interesting ways that it differed from popular themes, interesting insights that it provided, and so on; these memos served as a way for the researcher to bookmark the data and remember specific details (Tracy, 2013). Memos were also included within the code packets. Along with the spreadsheet, a codebook was also created in the event that an outsider to the research would be able to understand the terminology.

Upon creating the matrix, the process of compiling the findings and writing the findings chapter began. Based off of the data within the matrix, the data from the code pamphlets, the data from the transcripts, and all of the memos created within these sections, the researcher created an outline for the results chapter based off of the combination of the strongest themes within the data and the research question at hand.

IV. Results

The aim of this research is to better understand the ways in which Millennials navigate the four different types of attentional social presence, paying close attention to the types of politeness strategies that emerge from each presence type while asking whether expectations play a role in choosing the type of presence. This study began with one primary research question:

RQ1: How do Millennials navigate the four types of attentional social presence within a FtF conversation?

Furthermore, the researcher hypothesized that the decision to choose any of the four types of attentional social presence will depend on what conversation partners perceive to be polite or expected behavior within a given situation.

Through the interview process, various themes emerged regarding the use and impact of cell phones within FtF conversations. The most prevalent themes include:

- **Presence choice is dependent on context.**

A highly prevalent theme that was discussed among participants was the fact that one's choice to use a cell-phone within a FtF context is highly dependent on contextual factors such as one's relationship with his or her conversation partner, the physical location of the conversation, the number of people involved in the conversation, the topic of the conversation, and the intention behind the conversation. Many participants mentioned settings such as the classroom, a work meeting, a doctor or hair appointment, a family dinner, or a theater performances to physical spaces that request one's attention, and therefore, make phone use less acceptable. This alludes to the idea that Millennials may recognize that the phone serves an interruption to presence and attention:

When I see someone else check their phone, depending on the situation, I would say that I'm not upset by it, like if it's with a friend. I think that might be different with -- like in class, if I see people consciously look at their phone, I don't agree with that. In class, or if I'm at a movie, or listening to a speaker, or something like that, in a setting where your phone is supposed to be away, and it's out, I have a little bit more trouble with that. (F, 26)

Furthermore, participants discussed how they feel more comfortable checking their phones when conversing with individuals whom they're comfortable and who they see often, such as a friend, family member, romantic partner, and so on. Participants mentioned that they're less likely to interrupt a conversation by checking their phone when they're interacting with a new acquaintance or a friend who is visiting from out of town:

I had a friend recently visit from a European country so I'm like, 'It took you a long time to get here.' So I would feel kind of weird taking out my phone and just chilling while she's right there because we never get to see each other. However, with someone that I see in the office every day or sometimes our partners will just -- I'll just do that with one of my boyfriends and be just chilling. Because we're just having this quiet sitting together time. And you don't have to be focused on the other person. But if it's a friend who's visiting from very far away, I want to focus on them because you don't have much time together. (F, 25)

Another contextual factor that influences whether or not Millennials check their phone during a FtF conversation is the number of individuals involved in the conversation.

Participants tended to agree that more caution must be used when deciding whether or not

to use their cell-phone when they are in a one-on-one conversation because the conversation outcome is highly dependent on their own contributions. However, when they find themselves in a group setting, participants find it more acceptable to take out their phones because the direction and flow of the conversation is not as dependent on their own contributions:

I think, for a one-to-one conversation, um, I would prefer to have cell phones off the table because it's just you and the other person, and there's no point in bringing in the phone. But in a larger group, I think it's everyone's free will, it's ok, it's a huge group and there are more people. If someone doesn't listen to you, you can turn to the one on the right. Or shout across, like 'hey, both left and right are occupied with their phones, what are you doing.' So in a bigger group, maybe. In an informal setting it's also ok. In a formal setting, as usual, there should be some ground rules. (F, 28)

- **Millennials like to have access to their phone, regardless of context.**

Upon coding and analyzing the data from the interviews, it became apparent that Millennials like to have access to their phones. Participants tended to agree that they appreciate knowing that their phone is accessible in case an urgent notification pops up, such as a call from a parent stating there is an emergency, or an email from work that needs a rapid response. One participant indicated that the physical location of one's phone makes a difference - pulling it out of one's pocket to check it is perceived as less polite than moving one's eyes to glance at a phone on the table in front of him or her (see Table B). Furthermore, participants alluded to the idea that it is not always the action of checking the cell-phone that interrupts the conversation, but instead, the process of

responding to a notification (see Table B). Participants noted that when checking a notification during a FtF conversation, they recognize that they have a matter of seconds before deciding whether or not the need to respond outweighs the need to listen to a conversation partner:

When we get that (buzzing noise) or flash or the ding or whatever it is, we automatically go, 'oh, what's this new thing?' So that is the initial kind of reaction, I think. And then I usually just check, and if it's like something, like an email or whatever, something trivial, it doesn't need my attention immediately. I try to just avoid that. But something like mom saying, 'hey, there's an emergency, I need you to come home right now,' then I might be like, 'oh, hey, I've got to call her and see what's happening,' or something like that. So I try to gauge it to see the level of importance, and if I can do that within five to ten seconds, then I'll usually make a judgement call. (M, 25)

- **Millennials rarely tell others to put their phone away.**

While Millennials note that cell-phones should not be used in particular contexts, very few participants felt comfortable telling their conversation partner to put his or her phone away. For example, one participant noted that she believed the cell phone should not be used in the classroom setting. While she observed a violation to her own perceptions of polite social behavior, she acted on a different set of social norms which had to do with her role as student when a more authoritative figure, her teacher, was present:

If the professor didn't say anything and she is in a role of authority, then I didn't know if I should cross over into that role. In situations in the classroom, if the teacher doesn't say anything, than I guess I don't normally, either. And I don't

know why, I guess it's an authority thing, and maybe because I don't know their situation, like maybe there's an emergency happening or something like that, but I would say, whenever I do it (practice entitled presence), it's usually with someone I'm closer with. (F, 26)

Other participants noted themes of authority as they explained how they felt about telling someone to put his or her phone away. Participants seemed to believe that one can only practice such an act from a certain relational position. For example, if conversation partner A is in an inferior position, he or she does not have the authority to tell conversation partner B, who is “above” him or her, to put his or her phone away:

It depends on the situation, truly. And also how close the relationship is. For example, if you are my boss, or if you're someone who has a higher social status than me, even though you're using your phone, I wouldn't be able to say anything or set any rule because I'm in kind of an inferior status... but if we're in a more equal status, or even if I'm perhaps in the higher status if we are-- I don't know, I guess if we are close, I would be more likely to speak up, but if we just met for the first time, I would just not do so... and also because for people who don't know each other really well, it's hard to judge other people just because you don't know other people. So I guess I would rather wait to see what exactly the relationship is going to be. (F, 25)

One participant expanded upon the inferior/superior dynamics of this action by introducing the idea that age may play a role in whether someone feels comfortable telling the other to put his or her phone away. Multiple participants mentioned telling their younger siblings, or being told by older siblings, to put their phones away, thus

providing more evidence that whether one feels comfortable telling a conversation partner to put his or her phone away is dependent on his or her perceived role and placement within the relationship:

I would never tell an adult to put their phone away, like what? That's like telling them, 'don't put their drink down.' Like, get out of here. I don't think I would tell someone to not do anything. One, you're an adult. You should know what you're doing. Two, like who am I to tell you what to do, what's our relationship, probably not like that. And three, if you're going to do something stupid, it's your bad. (F, 24)

Looking at the role of authority from a different perspective, one participant discussed how she has studied topics related to communication, and thus feels comfortable telling people to put their phone away. Based off of the pattern of authoritative behavior, this example highlights the fact that her knowledge has elevated her perception of her own authority over these types of social interactions. The participant explained that she would feel comfortable telling someone to put their phone away, partly because she studied communication and has subsequently become more conscious of the interruptions that can occur, but also, almost in a way of educating the other, so that the other will also become conscious of his or her behavior. On a similar note, another participant explained that by telling a conversation partner, or being told by a partner, the expectation to keep phones out of the conversation, both parties are then aware, in future conversations, of what the other expects. Thus, if interpreted correctly by the recipient, the act of telling someone to put his or her phone away can serve as a way to foster stronger understanding among conversation partners:

They should know I know for a fact, I don't mind if someone tells me how they feel if I'm using the phone. I always feel it's better the other person knows how you feel, because it's always better to be honest with each other rather than, you know, having everything work in your head. Because they know that you don't like it, so next time they don't do it again. You can say it nicely, so I always put it politely, like 'if it's important, I can wait. (F, 35)

- **Phone interruptions are more acceptable if they are treated as a shared experience.**

Many participants shared stories of times when they've interrupted a conversation to check their cell phone, and times when they've been interrupted by a partner's switch in attention. While participants noted that either they or their conversation partner will use forewarnings, excuses, or apologies to buffer the interruption, many agreed that such strategies are most successful and meaningful when an individual explains who is on the other end of the notification, and why the interruption is occurring. Millennials appreciate when their conversation partner gives details on the interruption, as it makes them feel more included in the interruption and helps them to understand why the interruption is more important than the conversation at hand:

(At my work) I'm the youngest, so all of them have kids, and we are working together and they say, 'sorry, I have to answer every phone call because I don't know if it's from kindergarten and I have to answer it.' So I accept that because I understand there's a reason. They've explained a reason. It is something that they do which really provides some advice. Because maybe if they don't say anything, maybe it's important for them, but if they're not telling, I can't understand. 'This is

very impolite and I have to wait for ten minutes.' It significantly helps that you provide excuses or say 'I've been waiting for this call so please, can I just have five minutes to tell something. (F, 36)

- **Phone use within a conversation is often reciprocated.**

When discussing how they respond to a FtF partner's cell phone interruption, many participants noted that they reciprocate the action by pulling their own phone out. However, participants had different motivations behind this action. For example, when conversation partner A pulls out his or her phone and interrupts the FtF conversation, conversation partner B will see this action and be encouraged by the reminder that he or she may also have phone notifications waiting to be checked. However, many participants added that while they may be reminded of their own unchecked notifications, they also feel awkward just sitting there in the silence of the interrupted conversation:

I've definitely done that. Um, and I don't know if-- it could be for many reasons that I do that. A, it's a reminder that I haven't checked my phone in a while. Maybe something's going on, or it might just be a form of awkwardness if I'm not being talked to and I'm just sitting there just I want to do something. It's like I don't know what to do with my hands, like awkwardness. (F, 27)

Other participants noted that reciprocation of the action was dependent on situational contexts, such as how long it would take the conversation partner to respond to the interruption, or what type of agreement the conversation partners had before starting the conversation. For example, if the conversation came to a natural end, it would be acceptable for each partner to check his or her phone. However, if one partner had to

unexpectedly interrupt the conversation, then the other partner would wait for the interruption to pass without pulling out his or her phone:

Sometimes, yes. It also depends. So if at the moment we were just ending a period of conversation-- so we were both checking if there's anything going on, like on the internet or on social network, then probably, yeah. We'll do it simultaneously. But if, say, it's an ongoing conversation, but my friend has an incoming call, or he has to check a message, I will probably just wait because we both have a silent agreement that he will come back soon after he checks or finishes with the cellphone. (M, 24)

Some participants alluded to issues of facework that can sometimes arise in such situations. One participant stated this idea by explaining that she reciprocates the action partly because she doesn't want her conversation partner to feel bad about the interruption:

Yes, definitely, either because I've wanted to take out my phone and take that as a cue, or maybe because seeing them take out their phone, I don't want to appear like I'm staring at them using their phone. So maybe it's an attempt to not look weird... because if you're in a conversation with someone, if they're looking at their phone, it could either be I don't want them to see me looking at their phone and feel like I'm making a comment about them being on their phone. But also if they're on their phone because they're not paying attention to you, then I don't want that person to look up and see me not being paid attention to... it's like a passive-aggressive move to be like, 'well, I have a phone too.' But I think also it's to do with the activity. (F, 29)

- **Phones are capable of enhancing a communicative experience.**

While the cell-phone can serve as a negative interruption to a conversation, many participants pointed out that the phone can often be used to enhance a conversation by “Googling” a specific topic, looking up a location on a map application, looking up a video, or pulling up a picture that will assist in telling a story, advancing an argument, or directing conversation partners to a convenient place to eat. One participant explained that while the phone can sometimes be used as a tool to find an answer, there are some situations in which an answer cannot be searched for online, but instead, the conversation can simply be enhanced through the assistance of the cell-phone:

I think it helps. In fact recently-- what were we doing? So (a few of us), we were all just talking and one of them goes, 'I don't think we've won the Olympics in this sport for like 10 years.' That can't be right. And so that could've-- without phones, I would've been like, 'Well, I guess we'll have to look it up in the encyclopedia someday.' But then we were just like, 'Oh. No, we won that in 1920-something.' You know what I mean? Something random like that. So it kind of solves a question. And I guess some people argue that could kill conversations. We could've argued another 20 minutes on, 'Really? But I wonder if--' but I found that that's not something worth debating. First, you can't just Google, 'What's the meaning of life?' right? You can, but (laughter). That's a conversation that you can have that Google might help. Like, 'What's that one quote from Nietzsche,' or whatever. But I don't think that's a conversation killer. (F, 25)

While many participants were enthusiastic about the ways in which cell-phones can enhance FtF conversations, some acknowledged that there should be limits to this type of

use - that the phone should be used to find a specific answer, but once that answer is found, it should be put away again:

It depends. There are occasions, say, when I know the Chinese name of something, but I am not 100% sure of the corresponding English name of things. So I will probably resort to, say, Google on the right translation of the things I'm mentioning, but it has to stop there. After the cellphone or they even had to fulfill their task or responsibility in delivering the message, we resume to our previous conversation... but if somehow it became a distraction like, say, after you find out words, you continue to your other things. That would probably be a problem. So I think in the scenario that we described, the cell phone should be a tool to facilitate your conversation, but if it did the opposite thing, then I don't think it makes sense. (M, 24)

Based off of the interview exemplars, it is apparent that Millennials are aware of the ways in which cell-phones are affecting their daily FtF conversations. Moving forward, it is important to combine the findings from the interview data to the themes found in previously conducted research in order to determine the significance of these findings, and look forward at what future research on this topic can provide.

V. Discussion

Considering the themes that emerged from the interview data, it is important to understand where each one falls under the four types of attentional social presence, and to understand the meaning behind these feelings and behaviors.

Budgeted Social Presence

The data from the interview confirmed that budgeted social presence is the most common type of presence among Millennials; it essentially serves as the default state of presence (Turner & Foss, 2018), and based off of the stories told in the interviews, it is the most likely type of presence to fall under the category of unconscious behavior (see Table 3). While participants re-affirmed the idea that budgeted social presence allows an individual to have control over a situation based on their desire to be available to the network accessible by phone (Turner & Foss, 2018), participants also expressed the fact that the decision to multicomunicate does not always result from control, but often, results out of habit instead. While budgeted social presence results out of individual motivation and habit, the decision to check one's phone within a FtF conversation is also influenced by the actions of his or her conversation partner. Participants' decisions were often influenced by the behavior of their conversation partner (Bayer, Campbell, & Ling, 2016; Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas, 2016), such as when one conversation partner interrupts the conversation to check his or her phone and the other reciprocates this action, confirming that cell phone use can be contagious (Falk & Fischbacher, 2006; Finkel & Kruger, 2012). This action, in particular, served as a face-saving strategy within budgeted social presence. Not only did copying a partner's action serve as a personal face-saving strategy, but it was sometimes done in order to preserve the positive face the

conversation partner who had interrupted the conversation. Not only did the interrupted partner desire to look occupied, but the behavior served as an act of positive politeness on behalf of the interrupter so that he or she would not be caught in a face-threatening act (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006).

Participants admitted to practicing budgeted social presence by checking their phone while out by themselves in public places (Nakamura, 2015). Their motivation to do so sometimes came from boredom (Goffman, 1980), while other times it occurred because the individual was trying to avoid someone by looking busy (Baron & Campbell, 2012; de Souza e Silva & Frith, 2012; Nakamura, 2015). On the other hand, participants discussed the ways in which they use their phone to create shared experiences and bring others in to budgeted social presence by using their phone as a tool to enhance the conversation (Nakamura, 2015). Participants generally tended to be in favor of using their phone in this way, acknowledging that there was a limit to the answers which they could find using their phone as a tool, and thus alluding to the fact that it hasn't necessarily replaced conversation, but has simply enhanced it.

In the instances when budgeted social presence occurred through an unwanted or unexpected interruption, participants noted that they benefited from receiving forewarnings or excuses from conversation partners before or after an interruption occurred. However, the forewarnings and interruptions were most meaningful when the interrupter explained who was on the other end of the interruption, and why the interruption was more important than the FtF conversation at hand. Knowing who was on the other end of the interruption and why it was important seemed to lessen feelings of tension and mistrust (McDaniel & Coyne, 2016; Miller-Ott & Kelly, 2015; Misra et al,

2014), and therefore, the interrupted conversation partner was more willing to let the interruption pass (Cameron & Webster, 2011). Furthermore, knowing this information created a sort of shared experience among conversation partners, which appeared to benefit their overall conversational experience. Future research should continue to explore the ways in which budgeted social presence has the ability to both create and detract from shared experiences among FtF conversation partners.

Under the umbrella of budgeted social presence, the data also indicate a potential distinction between the ideas of distraction and interruption, alluding to the fact that the two are different, but can influence one another. For example, an alert from a cell phone can distract an individual's attention - their eyes might move from their conversation partner to the screen of their phone that sits on the table in front of them. However, this distraction may only affect the direction of the conversation if the individual responds to it and subsequently interrupts the conversation. On the other hand, using the cell phone as a tool may cause an interruption in the conversation - one conversation partner might interrupt the conversation to look up the hours of a restaurant a pair is planning to go to. However, a distraction will only occur if the conversation partner decides to get sidetracked from looking up the restaurant hours to checking a text message notification which might lead to checking his or her email. Future research should further explore whether individuals see a distinction between the phone serving as a distraction versus serving as an interruption, paying attention to which presence type each concept appears in most often.

Entitled Social Presence

The data indicate that entitled social presence is one of the more difficult types of presence for Millennials to navigate because of the inferior/superior complexities that exist within the interaction (Turner & Foss, 2018). The stories told in the interviews indicate that humans do indeed desire to have control over where they put their attention (Turkle, 2015), and they don't always react positively to being told otherwise.

Participants alluded to the fact that they don't believe that they are in such a position to demand that their message be prioritized over other competing messages (Turner & Foss, 2018), and some admitted that the times they have attempted entitled social presence have resulted in a ruined conversation because of the way that their conversation partner reacts to such a demand (see Table 8). The stories told by participants indicate that there is significant risk to positive face for all parties involved in a conversation, and that the act of entitled social presence serves as a face-threatening act. The request itself goes against the very concept of politeness, as it doesn't allow the other to experience both independence and acceptance (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006). However, the action that spurred the request also goes against expectations of polite behavior by interrupting a conversation, and thus, signaling to the speaker that his or her needs are not being respected (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006). Millennials' avoidance of this type of presence indicates that cell phone technology is changing FtF conversation (Ling, 2012) because the expectation to listen to another and respect his or her needs is being overridden by the fear of taking away the freedom of the interrupter (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006). There is significant opportunity for future research to explore the ways in which entitled social

presence can be acted upon so that the speaker can express his or her needs in a way that fosters a more positive and understanding reaction from the receiver.

Competitive Social Presence

The Millennials in this study were more likely to practice competitive social presence when trying to get a conversation partner to exit budgeted social presence and enter invitational social presence, and their strategies varied. Some participants attempted to change the topic of their conversation or the tone of their voice in order to catch their partner's attention, while others became silent and/or gave up on the conversation altogether. One's strategy seemed to depend on the closeness of the relationship with the partner - the closer conversation partners were, the more confident the participant was that he or she would have the partner's attention in the first place. However, some participants believed that individuals cannot compete with the cell phone because humans cannot provide the same notifications that a phone can. Future research should explore whether the act of giving up should still be categorized under competitive social presence, or whether the act itself serves as a switch back to budgeted social presence.

Invitational Social Presence

When discussing invitational social presence, participants confirmed that this type of presence only occurs in smaller groups of one or a few people (Turner & Foss, 2018). Furthermore, this type of presence appeared to be the type of presence that is expected when discussing serious and/or personal topics, or when engaged with a conversation partner whom one isn't as familiar with, such as a new friend or a person of authority. Participants noted that unlike budgeted social presence, it is a very conscious decision to enter invitational social presence, and that this type of presence sends a distinct message

to the conversation partner that they are valued and being attended to. Thus, traditional perceptions of politeness (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006) are acted upon and found most often within invitational social presence.

Limitations and Future Research

From its conception, this study was limited in scope as it only focused on Millennials living in Washington, D.C.. Future research should expand on this concept by incorporating Millennial participants representing a broader geographic scope. Furthermore, despite the fact that all participants were currently living in the Washington, D.C. metro area, they were raised in a variety of cultures from around the world. This study was limited by its research questions, and future research should explore the cultural differences that may affect one's ability to navigate attentional social presence.

Not only can future studies expand on geographic regions represented, but it can also expand on the generations that are represented. This study was limited in the fact that it only focused on the Millennial generation of individuals aged 18-36. Future studies may look at how other generations navigate attentional social presence and/or how multiple generations compare in the way that they navigate attentional social presence.

Furthermore, this study contained an unequal representation of women and men, which potentially caused bias. Future research should include a more equal representation of men and women, while also putting more of a focus on the differences in presence choices that men and women may make.

Finally, none of the participants in this study expressed any communication disorders or general disabilities. Future research should explore the ways in which individuals who

depend on mobile digital devices to effectively communicate navigate the four types of attentional social presence.

Conclusion

The data from the interviews indicate that while Millennials' ability to navigate through the four types of presence is dependent on contextual factors, it is also dependent on the conversation partner(s). Knowing that Millennials' responses to entitled and competitive social presence are not always positive and/or successful, conversation partner A may have a desire to transfer from budgeted social presence to invitational social presence, but if conversation partner B is not willing to take such cues and hints, conversation partner A will never achieve his or her conversational goals. Thus, attentional social presence is very much a collaborative effort that requires attention and the ability to listen in order to be navigated toward any direction besides budgeted social presence (Turner & Foss, 2018).

Key to any collaborative effort is the ability to listen and understand where the other is coming from (Turkle, 2015). Thus, this study found that in order for any one of the presence types to be successful, each conversation partner must be willing to listen to and look for the needs of his or her conversation partner, which will help that individual better understand the expectations of the conversation partner, and from there, understand what type of attentional social presence will be the most polite to use. In other words, attentional social presence is a collaborative effort (Turner & Foss, 2018), but in order for the collaboration to work, conversation partners must be able and willing to understand the needs of his or her partner.

Despite the frequent and normal presence of cell-phones, the art of FtF conversation is not lost - instead, humans must now participate using new strategies. With a willingness from each conversation partner to adjust his or her presence type depending on the needs of the other, FtF conversation will continue to help individuals to achieve intimacy and understanding.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

(Demographic Information)

Age
Hometown
Gender

(Introduction/Ice Breakers)

- 1) What kind of mobile devices do you use regularly to connect with people?
 - a) Which one do you use the most?
 - b) Approximately how much time do you think you spend on your phone each day?
 - c) What do you typically do on this device?
- 2) When you hear or feel an alert on your phone, how much time do you wait until you respond?
 - a) Does it ever depend on the context? What are your rules?

- 3) Can you think of a time that you were in a conversation and you checked your phone?
 - a) What motivated you to break from the conversation and check your phone?
 - b) Did you use any type of excuse to explain why you checked your phone?
- 4) Can you give me an example of a time when your conversation partner pulled out his or her phone?
 - a) What is your strategy when someone takes out their phone during a conversation? What is your response?
 - b) Has this distraction ever made you feel less connected to your conversation partner?
- 5) In what face-to-face conversational context would you consider it acceptable to take out your phone and use it?
 - a) In what context wouldn't this action be acceptable?
- 6) Can you think of a situation when your conversation partner asked you to put your phone away?
 - a) Can you think of a situation when you asked your conversation partner to put their phone away?
- 7) Can you give me an example of a time when your conversation partner warned you ahead of time that they'd be interrupted by their cell phone during your conversation?
 - a) If so, how did that affect your perception of your conversation partner and their levels of politeness?
- 8) What would you consider a "good relationship rule" regarding the presence and use of a cell phone within a conversation?
 - a) How would use it?
 - b) What would be hard about using it in a conversation or a meeting?

(Listening-based)

- 9) When you are having a face-to-face conversation, what are some things that you do to let your partner know that you're listening?
 - a) What are some things that your partner does to let you know that they're listening?
- 10) How do mobile devices that you have or your partner has impact listening?
- 11) Why is it important for you to show that you're listening, or to know that your conversation partner is listening?
- 12) Can you think of a time when your only goal was to listen to your partner?

(ask these questions at any point in interview)

- 13) Do you ever feel like you have to compete with a cell phone when you're having a face-to-face conversation? What is your strategy for keeping someone's attention?
- 14) Do you ever use your phone as a prompt when in a FtF conversation?
- 15) Can you think of a time when you couldn't connect with your conversation partner because you each were using a different type of approach?

Appendix B: Tables

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Transcript Number	Gender	Age	Interview Length
1	F	26	32:48
2	F	24	36:38
3	F	23	13:49
4	F	29	42:21
5	F	25	26:28
6	M	18	22:11
7	M	25	34:29
8	F	26	1:27:05
9	F	36	26:56
10	F	27	25:10
11	F	26	58:52
12	F	28	35:44
13	F	19	25:12
14	M	24	25:37
15	F	25	38:05
16	F	23	25:49
17	M	23	24:30
18	M	23	1:17:44
19	F	29	43:28
20	F	27	18:53
21	F	35	46:52
22	F	24	41:36
23	M	25	41:57

Table 2

Table of Codes

Primary Code	Hierarchical Code	Second-level Codes	Number of Examples
Budgeted Social Presence	Forewarning/excuse/apology	Inclusion, contextual, motivation, avoidance strategy, politeness strategy	9
	Motivation/priorities	Judging urgency, prioritizing	6
	Checking phone	Mirroring, dead end, inclusion vs. exclusion, prompt, habit, lack of listening, killing conversation, multiple people, avoidance tool	47
	Acceptable vs. unacceptable	Physical space, authority, social cues, phone as liaison, skepticism, Interpretations, context, social contract, inflated hype, phone as intrusion, removing from the present, Faustian bargain	14
	Context	Casual, formal/informal, relaxing/dinner, casual/prompt, class, family/loved ones, relationship type, level of seriousness, looking/leaving, purpose of conversation, dependent on	17

	participants, respecting the time, new friends/first dates, theater/performances, finding a balance, purpose of phone use, new friends/old friends	
Glancing/checking	Parents/emergency, insecurity, looking/leaving, phone in pocket/on table, phone on desk, multicommunicate, temptation, urgent, rules hurtful	15
Group/1on1	Group vs. 1on1, formal vs. informal	5
Call vs. text	Calls > texts	1
Shared Experiences	Taking away, phone as prompt, not in the moment, false sense of connection	8
Being interrupted	Golden rule, losing partner, shunted, lapse, losing listening	5
Ability to Listen	Not listening, attention span, talking to air, judging response, losing partner, lack of collaboration, avoidance tool	10
Multitasking/Multicommunicating	Can't multitask, less than 100%	3
Golden Rule	Influences actions,	3

		symbol	
Competitive Social Presence	Strategy	Giving up, story, quiet, impress, not successful, switching, blunt, quiet, humor, questions, contextual, wait, dramatic	14
	Context	Authority vs. close, hierarchical status, transparency, giving orders, priorities, avoidance/passive aggressive, passive aggressive/revenge, casual vs. serious	9
Entitled Social Presence	Being Confronted	Don't tell me what to do, accepted confrontation	5
	Confronting	Addressing issue, golden rule, contextual, who to blame, defensiveness, passive aggressive	11
	Phone, face-down	Intention, serious	4
	Putting Tech Away	Contextual, intention	6
	Listening	Learn, life-changing, intention, respect, open-minded, conflict, humility, connection, problem solving, gift-giving	12
Invitational Social Presence	Negative Reaction	Didn't like invitational effort	1

Table 3

Exemplars: Phone Checking Behavior

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
3	F, 23	"I think it is ok to have them visible because, I mean there are times when it truly is more important, I guess especially if you are expecting something or there are urgent situations that pop up, but-- and I even see the like checking to read something real fast-- it's normally the responding time that like, seems to take away most strongly from things."
16	F, 23	"I think when you're talking to someone it is just not okay (to check the phone). But I think it really depends, for example, if I had my phone somewhere in my pocket or something, it's not okay to just take out and look at it. But if I have it on the desk, I can probably just peek at it. (It depends on) the degree of your action involved because doing all of this, it's very distracting and it shows that you are not really paying attention. But if it's just there and you can just peek at it, it's kind of just moving your eyeballs."
22	F, 24	"I think it's generally unacceptable in like, appointments. I would never have my phone on me if I was getting a haircut, or if I was like, at the doctor's office, or like I, I see a therapist, and I would never ever pull out my phone while I was with her, because why, that seems like, rude. Or professional meetings... I would never pull out my phone unless I needed to check something that they asked me about. But I won't even write notes on my phone, like if I have notes I want to bring to a meeting, I will write them down in a notebook or on a piece of paper because you have no idea what someone's doing if they have their phone. They could be like, 'oh, I'm using it for notes,' but there's no way to know that, so I don't want the to think that I'm on my phone for something else. So I find that to be inappropriate."
19	F, 29	"I would say if you're in a space where your attention has been requested. For example, right now I don't have my phone out because I'm here to participate in this, and so I'm volunteering my time and attention to this activity. Similar ones could be lectures, or presentations, or meetings, or social. But I think the level of acceptability varies, on the one hand, depending on how perceptible your checking your phone is. If you're in a crowded auditorium, then I think it's

a little more acceptable to look at your phone during a lecture than, say, if you were in the front row of a group of 15."

- 3 F, 23 "If it's someone I talk to quite a lot. If it's like a somewhat routine conversation of just like, if I'm talking to my roommate about what we did that day, and we're just like sitting in the kitchen, like we're maybe talking at the kitchen table but if we're talking about our day, I might check the phone."
- 9 F, 36 "It's also dependent on the intimacy or the relationship. If you are with your boyfriend or you're with your sister or mother or someone really close, and something jumps and you know that it's urgent, I think I tend to be less polite and just - because if you see them all the time, is you're not devoting this time to be with them, it's not the only moment in the year you're with them."
- 15 F, 25 "I had a friend recently visit from a European country so I'm like, 'It took you a long time to get here.' So I would feel kind of weird taking out my phone and just chilling while she's right there because we never get to see each other. However, with someone that I see in the office every day or sometimes our partners will just -- I'll just do that with one of my boyfriends and be just chilling. Because we're just having this quiet sitting together time. And you don't have to be focused on the other person. But if it's a friend who's visiting from very far away, I want to focus on them because you don't have much time together."
- 15 F, 25 "If it's a new friend, the first time I'm hanging out with someone, you kind of be overly respectful and don't do anything that is uncomfortable. Some people like to, 'hey, it's totally cool with me if you have your phone out,' and somebody else will be like, 'I really prefer not,' because some people can be really straight forward about it, which is great. As for first date situations, I really think you need to put everything aside and just-- that's one of those things that you don't-- come on... you have to get to know someone to know their preferences with their phones."
- 10 F, 27 "When I'm meeting someone new for the first time, I wouldn't check my cell phone if I'm engaging with someone new. It's bad because I'm thinking about all my friends that I hang out with or if I'm out-- if I'm out to dinner with
-

someone or brunch or something like that, I make it a point to put my phone away. So if it's-- I'm seeing friends that I haven't seen in a while, I won't answer my phone. But if it's someone that I see often, I'm more inclined to check my phone. (Because) I probably know their expectations better and it is a level of comfort, so if you're out to eat, I feel like that's more of a formal thing. You're making time to go out to eat, so you should be very present in that moment. Whereas if I'm having friends over that are over all the time, they live like down the street from me, it's like I'm more in my comfort level. I'm in my house, ike I feel like I can do things and they don't really care. They're doing their own thing. Whereas when you're at dinner, you have to be 'on' kind of."

- 9 F, 36 "It's a matter of what is the agreement and the purpose of the conversation or the reason why you are with others. For example, if you're in a party and you're in a living room and you arrive to the party alone, well you are alone with your phone, so thank god there's a phone and if you don't know anyone in the party or if you're introducing little by little, well then you have your time you're going to be sitting down... I'm going to check my phone and that is not impolite at all. Everyone is hanging out and that way, and then, right. Not at all if you're at a dinner. No. Not acceptable if you're at a dinner, you're enjoying with the people that are having the dinner."
- 6 M, 18 "I usually, I'd say family dinner is a time when I've like, never used my phone, or just dinner with people in general. Unless it's something casual, like, you know, going out to wings with the bros, then that's fine. But if it, this is like a formal dinner with relatives, friends, so on, and yeah, no phones."
- 13 F, 19 "Like a theater performance or... a movie, something where other people are dedicating their time to craft and you're kind of there to observe and pay attention and respect it. Then I feel like the phone shows a lack of respect toward what they're doing. Just because the focus is almost on your own-- I mean obviously, it depends on the context. If you're-- something bad happened and you need to respond to something, but if you're just texting a friend about something, I feel like most of the time that can wait until after, especially because you paid to see something and, um, you're just, your focus is on something else and it's also just
-

disrespectful to the other people around you because it can be very distracting."

- 14 M, 24 "So if it's a one-on-one experience, I probably will focus more on the situation because there's only two people engaged. And so if you're distracted, that's a big deal because it means you're losing 100% of the conversation. But if there are more than two people, I feel like it's okay if I, say, move my attention away once in a while because the conversation would be going with or without me. So I think it depends. And also it depends on, say, if it's a friend hanging out, it's just cool for us to engage in a face-to-face conversation while we keep, say, a budget of presence on digital devices. Or it could be a formal meeting, say, with colleagues, or say, my boss, than I will probably consider the situation to choose my behavior."
- 14 M, 24 "I think where to put your phone is just a form. It doesn't really matter where the phone is, but the willingness of that person to be a part of the conversation. So I will say still when there are multiple people engaged in the conversation, I will be relatively loose or cool as people being distracted once in awhile because we will keep going anyway... But when there's a small group of people-- say, it's two or three people, everybody is highly engaged, you should probably-- but it depends, say, , if it's two or three close friends. We will know that this time and space is highly valued. Since you're here, it doesn't make sense for you to be distracted. But if it's two or three people that is not that familiar, we should probably set a consensus before we keep going. Since we're here, we could deal with personal things after we finish the current stuff, like highly efficiently. And yeah, just don't be dragged down by other things."
- 20 F, 27 "I think it's okay to have your phone out, especially if you're in a big group because not everyone's going to be talking to you all the time, so you can just-- I don't know-- go on your phone and check it. During one-on-one conversations, I would-- I mean, you can still have your phone on, but I wouldn't like the person I'm talking to just be on their phone more than they were talking to me. (when asked what difference is between group and 1on1) because I wouldn't feel the need to talk to the person who's on their phone. I could talk to someone else, but if I'm with only one other person and they're on their phone, I have nothing else to do. I have to go to my phone as well. I mean, it's not want to do,
-

but I guess I have to."

12 F, 28 "I think, for a one-to-one conversation, um, I would prefer to have cell phones off the table because it's just you and the other person, and there's no point in bringing in the phone. But in a larger group, I think it's everyone's free will, it's ok, it's a huge group and there are more people. If someone doesn't listen to you, you can turn to the one on the right. Or shout across, like 'hey, both left and right are occupied with their phones, what are you doing.' So in a bigger group, maybe. In an informal setting it's also ok. In a formal setting, as usual, there should be some ground rules."

Table 4

Exemplars of Reciprocation of Phone Use (Budgeted Social Presence)

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
10	F, 27	"Yes, I've definitely done that. Um, and I don't know if-- it could be for many reasons that I do that. A, it's a reminder that I haven't checked my phone in a while. Maybe something's going on, or it might just be a form of awkwardness if I'm not being talked to and I'm just sitting there just I want to do something. It's like I don't know what to do with my hands, like awkwardness."
18	M, 23	"If there's something pending. So if I felt buzzing in my pocket or something like that. Or, something else that I know is going on and I want to tap into or check or something, and they kind of leave the connection. And they start looking at something and responding to somebody else and they're just kind of gone for a little bit. Then my reaction is, 'Okay. Well then, it takes two to tango.' So I'm also just going to look at this. But I try and stay conscious of whether they've come back to the table or not."
13	F, 19	If they are on a call or something, than during that time, you can't just stare at the ceiling, so I pull it out to see whether I missed any messages or calls or any emails, and then quickly reply to those, until the call is done. Because otherwise it is very odd when the other person is talking and you are sitting there just doing nothing and staring around, because people look at you in a weird way. So you might as well be sure that you are occupied as well."
19	F, 29	"Yes, definitely, either because I've wanted to take out my phone and take that as a cue, or maybe because seeing them take out their phone, I don't want to appear like I'm staring at them using their phone. So maybe it's an attempt to not look weird... because if you're in a conversation with someone, if they're looking at their phone, it could either be I don't want them to see me looking at their phone and feel like I'm making a comment about them being on their phone. But also if they're on their phone because they're not paying attention to you, then I don't want that person to look up and see me not being paid attention to... it's like a passive-aggressive move to be like, 'well, I have a phone too.' But I think also it's to do with the activity."

22	F, 24	<p>"It depends. So I always give it a certain amount of time. Like if they're checking their phone real quick and then they put it away, I won't pull out my phone. But if they're going to be on their phone for an extended amount of time... I'm going to pull out my phone. But if I was out to drinks or dinner with someone, and they were checking their phone to check their phone, if I don't check my phone, they put theirs away faster. So I don't do it unless I know it's going to be an extended period of time, I'll just wait."</p>
16	F, 23	<p>"Yeah, sometimes when you're having dinner or having a meal with someone, sometimes it happens just you're not talking. You're just having a moment of silence and sometimes the other person takes out her phone or his phone and I would just feel kind of weird if I'm just sitting there doing nothing."</p>
5	F, 25	<p>"Yes, I would say it depends on the situation. When other people pull out their phone, it sort of gives you... social encouragement. You feel like this is socially allowed, at least between you two, that you excuse to start pulling your phone. But it also depends on how quickly that person texts. If she or he finishes very quickly, I probably don't have the time to pull out my phone, etc. Or it could be another situation where I pull out my phone and be like, 'Oh, do you want to see the cute dogs my friend has?' So that's another way to pull it out. Whereas if the person is texting, you might have the chance to pull out something else on the phone. So depending on the situation, truly."</p>
14	M, 24	<p>"Sometimes, yes. It also depends. So if at the moment we were just ending a period of conversation-- so we were both checking if there's anything going on, like on the internet or on social network, then probably, yeah. We'll do it simultaneously. But if, say, it's an ongoing conversation, but my friend has an incoming call, or he has to check a message, I will probably just wait because we both have a silent agreement that he will come back soon after he checks or finishes with the cellphone."</p>
23	M, 25	<p>"It's almost like a social experiment when I'm in a public place and you see, especially if no one has their phone out at first, you see one phone come out, and then you can just watch all of the phones come out, almost in unison. And so I try to break the mold and not do it, but it takes a certain amount of willpower to do that sometimes, because then</p>

you're the one who ends up twiddling your thumbs and giving those looks like, 'get off your phone,' and then people almost get irritated with you because you're like, 'I'm trying not to do the phone thing.' You know, 'let's come back to a personal conversation.' But yeah, it's not to say that I don't ever pull my phone out, because there's this - it's almost like a feeling of isolation when everyone else seems to be occupied or doing something and you're just like, 'oh, well maybe I should be doing something, too. Let me check what's going on.'

Table 5

Exemplars of Phone as Conversation Enhancement (Budgeted Social Presence)

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
14	M, 24	"It depends. There are occasions, say, when I know the Chinese name of something, but I am not 100% sure of the corresponding English name of things. So I will probably resort to, say, Google on the right translation of the things I'm mentioning, but it has to stop there. After the cellphone or they even had to fulfill their task or responsibility in delivering the message, we resume to our previous conversation... but if somehow it became a distraction like, say, after you find out words, you continue to your other things. That would probably be a problem. So I think in the scenario that we described, the cell phone should be a tool to facilitate your conversation, but if it did the opposite thing, then I don't think it makes sense."
15	F, 25	"I think it helps. In fact recently-- what were we doing? So (a few of us), we were all just talking and one of them goes, 'I don't think we've won the Olympics in this sport for like 10 years.' That can't be right. And so that could've-- without phones, I would've been like, 'Well, I guess we'll have to look it up in the encyclopedia someday.' But then we were just like, 'Oh. No, we won that in 1920-something.' You know what I mean? Something random like that. So it kind of solves a question. And I guess some people argue that could kill conversations. We could've argued another 20 minutes on, 'Really? But I wonder if--' but I found that that's not something worth debating. First, you can't just Google, 'What's the meaning of life?' right? You can, but (laughter). That's a conversation that you can have that Google might help. Like, 'What's that one quote from Nietzsche," or whatever. But I don't think that's a conversation killer." (15)
17	M, 23	"I think it's harder to say whether it helps because I think once you take it out, you kind of give the green light for the phones to be out after that. I think it can-- if it's a really irreverent topic, then it can be funny. Or it can help-- if it's important, it can help contribute to the mutual understanding of what's going on. But then there's, of course, the technological issues involved, where if it's

loading, or it doesn't-- I've had times where I'm like, 'oh, let me show you this thing,' and then it doesn't pop up. And that is a conversation killer."

19

F, 29

"I think it's amazing. I'm really enthusiastic about that aspect of it because I think there's a certain amount of-- I was going to say anti-Internet, but I would call it anti-Internet, but the more frequent one that I've heard come up is anti-Wikipedia sentiment. Or maybe just like a search. But like this idea somehow looking something up online is less valid than having knowledge or somehow-- almost like laziness being attached to that activity. When my personal feeling, is that it's amazing that people without specialized knowledge could be connected to specialized knowledge in their pocket in a way that they never have before."

Table 6

Exemplars of Phone Use in Awkward Situations and Avoidance (Budgeted Social Presence)

Transcript Number	Demographics	Examples
6	M, 18	"I haven't lived during the time when there were no cell phones, so I'm not sure, but from at least my view on human psychology, I think people just pull out their phones when they don't want to listen anyway. And like, you know, in the eighties, people would do the same thing except rather than use a cell phone, they use the newspapers to block other people out or, you know, they would get lost into space, just without a phone. I think the phone is just a more convenient way and a more, a more convenient way to avoid social situations or just boredom, so on. If a person's not interesting, an event's not interesting, you know, you have the whole world there you can look at. So it's just convenient, especially if you're not part of a group, like you know, you meet like new people. They have their own group and they've been friends for years and you just tag along and you're kind of like hanging off the edge of the group. It (cell phone) gives you a group you're not a part of. And also, you know, it's just the-- I'd say it's a way to curtail awkwardness because you know, you're on your phone then people won't, I guess, disturb you."
18	M, 23	"I mean, it's almost like this invisible shield, in a sense. I mean-- or a five year old who holds up a paper bag and thinks that they're actually hidden, and they're not. And so sometimes I actually just laugh at it, because I'll see somebody else do it... it's unspoken communication, and it's become normalized, too. So it's kind of a signal to pretend like you don't see someone, I guess. But again, sometimes it makes me feel awkward, and so I also take out my phone, and sometimes it kind of actually pushes me to purposely not do it, I mean, precisely because that's what kind of my feeling is."
8	F, 26	"It changes all of the dynamics of social awkwardness and that's what I think is a really good point because that's when I find myself bringing out my phone. But then I'm like if I bring out my phone, they're still going to know... you still feel like you have to come up with a legitimate excuse as if someone was going to ask you why you're using your

		<p>phone, so you still have that sense of hope that someone's going to come talk to you. So I still think that it's supposed to be this liaison between you and an actual real person, and I still think that is our fundamental conception of the purpose of the cell phone."</p>
23	M, 25	<p>"I think people, a lot of times, don't want to have those conversations with a stranger, so they'll just (gestures to look down at pretend phone) 'what's happening on my phone, anything, like I'll just pretend like I'm getting texts or something.' So I think that is part of it. But the ironic part of it is that I think having those conversations with strangers just improves our conversational skills, and so by missing out on that, I think it detracts from our meaningful conversations we have with loved ones or friends or whatever it might be."</p>
15	F, 25	<p>"So I think it's used as a mechanism. I think people kind of realize that now. It's a meta-knowledge of if this person wasn't on their phone before but they're suddenly just whipping it out to be very interested in the New York Times. You're like, 'oh, maybe something's going on."</p>
8	F, 26	<p>"So to what extent is the cell phone a barrier or not a barrier. Is it a signal of boredom, or a signal of come talk to me? Or is it a signal of don't come talk to me? So in that way it seems like a paradox to pull out your phone in these awkward situations because you're almost turning people away, so you never really know how to navigate it. So I think we've just entered this milieu of how to not be awkward at a party."</p>

Table 7

Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence - Context

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
1	F, 26	"If the professor didn't say anything and she is in a role of authority, then I didn't know if I should cross over into that role. In situations in the classroom, if the teacher doesn't say anything, than I guess I don't normally, either. And I don't know why, I guess it's an authority thing, and maybe because I don't know their situation, like maybe there's an emergency happening or something like that, but I would say, whenever I do it (practice entitled presence), it's usually with someone I'm closer with."
1	F, 26	"It's never been a person of authority, it's always been people who I have at least a somewhat close relationship with, like I told my siblings, or I'll be very direct with them. I'll be like, 'hey, put your phone away,' or something like that. Or with friends, like, I might say-- I guess I say it jokingly, or in a humorous way. I don't know that I've ever demanded, just because, I guess I've never really-- in moments where I've wanted to ask someone to put their technology away, it's been in moments where I feel like I couldn't. So I guess, in class, when I see people with their phones out, that is frustrating to me, but I wouldn't go up to someone and say, 'you should put your phone away.'"
3	F, 23	"It feels demanding of them, or like, I wouldn't ask-- yeah, I just don't feel like I am in charge of anyone, and that feels like something you would do if, like, teachers ask students to put phones away and stuff because they're the boss, they're in charge, they can do what they want. But people I'm conversing with, I wouldn't think about, like, giving them orders, even if maybe I would wish they did. I don't think I would ever say anything."
23	M, 25	"(when working at a school), I had to do it like everyday. But in other situations, yes. Most of the time, it would only be someone I'm very comfortable with, family members or partner or roommate, something like that. And even then, it's usually kind of playful. I hate to be like the guy whose like, 'agh, put your phone away kids, rah rah,' you know. I don't want to be that person."

13	F, 19	"Honestly, I just feel like it's in a pretty authoritative statement. Even if you don't phrase it as such. Even if you're like, 'hey, do you mind putting your phone away while we have lunch?' It is still like telling them what to do and I don't know if I would feel comfortable saying that to someone if we were planning on just having like a friendly lunch. However, if I was planning on telling them something like serious or something like that, I would be okay with saying that. But if we're just meeting up, I don't know if I'd feel like I have the right to tell them what to do."
5	F, 25	"It depends on the situation, truly. And also how close the relationship is. For example, if you are my boss, or if you're someone who has a higher social status than me, even though you're using your phone, I wouldn't be able to say anything or set any rule because I'm in kind of an inferior status... but if we're in a more equal status, or even if I'm perhaps in the higher status if we are-- I don't know, I guess if we are close, I would be more likely to speak up, but if we just met for the first time, I would just not do so... and also because for people who don't know each other really well, it's hard to judge other people just because you don't know other people. So I guess I would rather wait to see what exactly the relationship is going to be."
2	F, 24	"I would never tell an adult to put their phone away, like what? That's like telling them, 'don't put their drink down.' Like, get out of here. I don't think I would tell someone to not do anything. One, you're an adult. You should know what you're doing. Two, like who am I to tell you what to do, what's our relationship, probably not like that. And three, if you're going to do something stupid, it's your bad."
18	M, 23	"People who are good at that are people who don't really actually care about it, I think, who aren't actually genuinely irritated by it. One of my friends, he'd be great at disarming somebody because he doesn't really care, which is so ironic because he doesn't care. I actually am irritated by it so I think that I'm not great at delivering that. But I will say that the nature of the relationship matters. Like if it's one of my close friends, we kind of bicker all the time or we're very honest with each other and just, it's like an old couple or something. Then it's not really going to-- nothing's going to go downhill. And he might not even listen. I think that though - I think I've probably only said that to people who

I'm closer with. So maybe that's part of it. I don't know that I really said it to anybody who I'm starting off a friendship with or who's good graces I want to be in. I think that's just hard because again, I don't think it's justified, but I think that they will inevitably kind of feel sour towards you for suggesting that they shouldn't do that."

4 F, 29 "Mostly because I also studied it, you know. So you feel like empowered to do so, or now that I've become more conscious of it. I also think it's important to, uh, to let other people be conscious of it."

21 F, 35 "They should know I know for a fact, I don't mind if someone tells me how they feel if I'm using the phone. I always feel it's better the other person knows how you feel, because it's always better to be honest with each other rather than, you know, having everything work in your head. Because they know that you don't like it, so next time they don't do it again. You can say it nicely, so I always put it politely, like 'if it's important, I can wait.'"

Table 8

Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence – Confronting Others

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
7	M, 25	"If someone were to pull up the phone while I was talking? I don't think I'd leave, but I might say, like, 'hey dude, do you mind texting later? It can wait.'"
20	F, 27	"Yes, I mean, if I know that the person won't be offended by it or like, 'oh my god, this person's being annoying,' yeah, then I would definitely go ahead and tell them to put their phone away."
15	F, 25	"Probably people I'm closer to, like a partner, I'll be like, 'hey, you've been on the phone for 10 minutes now. Can we get back to doing the thing we were doing?' or whatever. But I'm always pretty cautious about it because, again, it feels like I'm intruding on their agency if I do it. But I'm always fine if people ask me, so I guess it's a thing of not wanting to intrude. But like I said, if people I've very comfortable with, I'm like, 'hey, pay attention to me.' I'll do it jokingly, too, like 'pay attention to me.'"
23	M, 25	"Again, sometimes people can get irritated if you tell them to like, get off their phone, because they think you're invading their privacy, maybe? I'm not sure. They think that when they look down, they're in a silo of isolation or something."
18	M, 23	"Oh, I think it's a matter of just psychology. I mean, I think it puts people on the defense, and I don't think that they're justified in being sour at me if I were to bring that up. But regardless of what I think, I think they would get sour, or I think they do get sour for the most part. And then it just ruins, right? Then it just kind of opens the door to more distraction and sourness I guess."
8	F, 26	"I do that to my mom all the time when we're watching movies. And she gets really mad. She's like, 'no, I am paying attention, I can do more than one thing at once.'" So there's this defensiveness on the other hand, I would say I've encountered more of that. So I've just stopped asking and just kind of ignoring and hoping that-- it's just like, not worth it in my house space. You get all these dynamics, all

these other conflicts in your life become kind of motonomized in the form of technology. They become these symbols for how you represent yourself. I think that's a really unique thing about that. So I guess you know I never really-- so in that way, it's really hard for me to say, 'hey, can you put your phone away,' or 'can you get rid of that,' because you know that that's just such an integral part of who we have become and it's just, you find yourself making like seemingly serious emotional decisions based on this chunk of metal, and so, it was just so interesting that during that whole time I just... it's just so hard because it becomes this small version of this huge idea that maybe it does mean a lot. If I tell you to put your phone away, then you're going to tell me to put your phone away, and then it becomes everything."

Table 9

Exemplars of Entitled Social Presence – Being Confronted

Transcript Number	Demographics	Examples
7	M, 25	<p>"Yeah. I don't argue with them. I think they're right. Millennials have, I don't want to say addiction, but sometimes our overdependence on my cell phone and kind of like, I should remind myself, you can check your new texts later. You don't have to do it now. I should say 'look, you can like, look at your phone later and after someone's finished talking to you."</p>
5	F, 25	<p>"I was told by my close friend, when I was in undergraduate, and I didn't realize that it would hurt her feelings. She never uses her phone when we talk. And she was like, 'would you mind not using your phone?' And I was like, I felt sorry for it. I was like, 'ok.' So the next time I met her, I would not pull out my phone again."</p>
6	M, 18	<p>"I kind of get distracted with my phone when it comes to like reading the news, reading like funny memes, something. Yeah. I've been told a few times, like mostly in like family situations. It made me feel pretty normal because most of the time I'd agree, like yeah, I'm kind of getting absorbed in my phone. It can wait."</p>
2	F, 24	<p>"I would be pissed. Because like, first of all, I don't consider myself rude. So that's like them taking their-- they're like, 'I don't think you have your priorities right.' Meanwhile, I am very comfortable with my priorities, and I'm not just gonna whip it (phone) out and be rude."</p>

Table 10

Exemplars of Competitive Social Presence Strategies

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
22	F, 24	"So when I'm trying to talk to someone and they're not fully there, it's because they're thinking about something else or they're trying to do something else or they're trying to multitask, and it's not working. It's definitely happened to me before, and I eventually just give up. Like when I'm with someone and they are on their phone continuously, like picking it up, having a conversation, and putting it down, and clearly done with the conversation, I'll just stop. I'll be like, OK, well if you want to use your mental space to do that, I don't care if that's what you want to do, but I'm not going to try to fight for your attention. If you want to be on your phone, I'll be on my phone, I'll do whatever.... if you pull your phone out, too, then why are you even hanging out, you know what I mean? So I almost always try to keep my phone away until they get the hint."
6	M, 18	"If it's a stranger and, you know, they're not really interested in talking to you anyway, in which case I don't feel the need to compete because you know, if they're on their phone it means they're not interested in talking to you anyway. So yeah, it just doesn't matter. Means that the person isn't really worth your time, and I can't think of anyone who, who's, you know, important to me, doing that."
4	F, 29	"Right, like with my dad, because he's so bad at it (being present), I go drastic. Like I'll leave the room. It's also my dad so I can be a drama queen. So I'll say something ridiculous, like, 'then I got married and then...' or something like that... to catch his attention. Every once in a while I stopped talking. Like do that and then they'll just start noticing that it's really quiet and then they'll read it and I don't really say anything or do anything. It's just that they're like, 'oh, sorry,' kind of thing."
3	F, 23	"I guess it's either try and time it where, like, to get into something important or start with something more important or interesting, attention grabbing, almost like you've got to write a story with a hook and it almost feels like sometimes you've got to catch someone between where their attention can be grabbed and then get into it. Or

definitely, if it's something that needs to be said right away, maybe tone of voice, or maybe start by like, even though maybe you're in the same room or like, just start by saying their name, and really like, 'this is-- I want your attention, this is important.'

- 11 F, 26 "Um, well it depends on how close I am to them, but um usually go for the blunt approach, just like, um, like with my roommate or something, I'll just be like, 'hey, you, like eyes over here (laughing).' I know it's a very seductive object. But like, you know. I actually, I find myself using humor all the time to diffuse semi-awkward situations, that's just a life strategy. But um, you know, especially when, it's like you're kind of feeling awkward or it's. yeah, I guess kind of direct approaches or asking them a question that's not a yes or no answer to try to pull their attention back, or it's kind of like, I've been to meetings where like, your boss will shame you a little bit for not paying attention. Not me personally... where it's like there, there's a discussion that's happening around the table. They know you're not paying attention. So they ask you a direct question, like, what do you think about what just what's being said? And then that person's kind of put on the spot a little bit and they have to be like backtracking and be like, oh, well, uh, to be honest, I wasn't paying attention. Nobody wants to be that person."
- 12 F, 28 "I've done everything possible in that situation. The first time I was more about, 'hey, we got together because we wanted to talk about things,' or anything; it's more like a social get-together. And other times I've mirrored the person, I've said just forget it, I might as well do whatever I want and see if something's happening on my phone. And then there were also times when I was just avoiding meeting certain people who I know for a fact would be on their phones in the conversation."
- 19 F, 29 "Depends on the person, because I think the relationship with the person is going to determine how much you think you're owed their attention. I think it depends because it depends on what I know. I keep saying I so that it sticks within general statements. If i know some-- or if I have an idea of someone as being a person connected to their phone, I'm going to react to it less than if I see someone on their phone and I don't-- for example, someone who I have difficulty reaching by phone, were they to get really
-

		involved in their phone while I was talking to them that would have a different impact on me than if I saw maybe someone who was younger than me, who just by default I would assume lives on their phone more than I am."
8	F, 26	"It's just amazing, I guess, when think about competition, trying to compete, I'd say more so with the ways in which the use of technology has maybe realigned our rate of switching between things. And not necessarily trying to compete with the phone itself but compete with where the other person is going between the phone, the conversation, etc. I think that creates an overall sense of non-presence in the other person, and that might be subconscious of what you're trying to compete with."
23	M, 25	"I don't think you can compete with a cell phone. They're too tantalizing. But yeah, I think that's kind of where me and my partner's little joke comes from... we try to say or do something silly enough to draw their attention away from it, you gotta like snap them out of it or something. It's almost like a trance. So I don't think you can-- you can't throw little notifications and ego boosts at them physically because that's what they're dealing with on their phone, so you have to just do what you can with what you've got, I guess. Maybe try to change the conversation, sometimes I'll do that, just to like-- because if they feel like the conversation is going in one direction and it's not going to change, I think that's when people are most likely to check their phones because it's like, 'oh, I'll just pick back up where I was,' and won't have missed much. And maybe if you just like, bring some random topic out of left field and they'll be like, 'oh, what am I missing now, I need to come back to this.' That might be a method."

Table 11

Exemplars of Invitational Social Presence

Transcript Number	Demographics	Example
21	F, 35	"Most of the time, what I do is if I'm at a meeting or something, because my phone is silent, I always turn it upside down so that I don't see the screen. Because if you see the screen, your focus goes to the phone to see what alert is coming. If you can't see the screen, you don't see anything at all. So whenever I'm at work, or when I go to meetings, I always make sure to put the screen on to the table side so that I don't see anything at all. And I put it on full silence so that it doesn't vibrate or anything until I finish my meeting."
9	F, 36	"If I was in a restaurant, if you are having a dinner-- I always have, I have the phone and the wallet face down... as a sign that i'm not listening what's happening here (gesturing to phone) but with the person who is in front of me."
23	M, 25	"I find that so much easier to do when I don't have my phone on my person. So if that means leaving it up in my bedroom and having a conversation in the living room, I just feel more in tune with that conversation. And that's not to say it's impossible to have a serious, devoted conversation with the phone in the pocket. But I've just found that if I don't have it, it's an out of sight, out of mind kind of thing, and it's much easier to attend to what the person is saying and have a deep conversation, especially if it's something emotional or trying."
10	F, 27	"If I was ever in a meeting with a student, I would never-- I don't even have my phone on or near me. That's just a big no-no. If I'm meeting with any of my bosses or colleagues, I also don't. I only bring it just if there's potential for an emergency or if I have to keep checking my email, but typically I don't, I just have it on silent. (It's an) act of respect, and I want them to know that I'm completely present and engaged and listening to what they're saying. I also don't want to be fired (laughing)."
16	F, 23	"There's one time when I'm with a friend and she did the whole-- she told me that-- she took out her phone and she

told me that she was going to turn it off because she wanted to spend time with me which is sweet but it's also kind of weird at the same time. I just feel like it kind of puts that same expectation on you and it kind of puts on an assumption because it doesn't really cross my mind that-- I don't think I meant to distract myself with my phone, but if she's done that same thing and she explicitly told me, I feel like I have to do the same. And if I'm not doing it, it's kind of like I don't care about this."

21 F, 35 "The thing is, when you don't understand, sometimes people are not bothered listening because they don't want to learn. But there are people who want to learn, so they will actually listen, ask, clarify. It depends on the person. If they're willing to learn something new, they will really listen to you whether you are from two different knowledge levels or whether you are from two different parts of the world, you will still have a conversation because you really want to have the conversation, or whether they're willing to learn. But if someone's not willing to learn, no matter how much, even if you spend the whole day trying to explain, they won't get it. So you might as well not waste your time."

15 F, 25 "I think it's kind of a gift-giving exchange in a way of conversation. That's what it is to me. You're exchanging ideas or thoughts or helping someone. For example, there's three kinds of conversation I'll just list. A friend who's going through a hard time, you're just listening and giving feedback so someone feels like they aren't alone in this. Or a political debate with someone. You're both, whether it's a good one or a bad one, just trying to exchange ideas and get someone on your side or just exchange ideas. Like, 'hey, have you considered this,' or whatever. And a different kind of conversation is just like the day or like, 'oh yeah, a lady in the store punched a dude.' You're like, 'oh man, that's wild!' It's just a gift-giving exchange of the person, yourself, and your day to someone. So i think if you don't listen, then you can't do the exchange, because you're only giving. You're not getting anything back."

22 F, 24 "I don't think there's any negative to listening. It's so cliché, but I always think about how we have two ears and one mouth because you're supposed to listen twice as much as you talk. I think the same way that we're on our phones, you can feel like you're invisible to the outside world, that

		when you're talking, your voice is the only voice, and the more that you listen, I think the more humble a person is. Because when you're listening to other people, there's an infinite amount that you can hear, and I feel like there's infinity minus one that you can talk."
11	F, 26	"Especially with like conflict stuff, if you are needing to understand why this person is frustrated or understand why things haven't been working, like most of the time it comes-- the breakdown is because people aren't listening or they don't want to listen. So it's almost like either like a denial factor or just like they haven't been paying attention or you know, and so it's just kind of like, I don't know, listening is just crucial, frankly. I mean, talking is crucial to being able to articulate yourself, but um, if you don't listen to people then you're just living in isolation."
10	F, 27	"I think it's hugely important to just socialize and if you want to be listened to and if you want to vent or complain or talk about something or discuss your thoughts, like you need to reciprocate that and listen to others when they want to voice those thoughts because then you're just going to run out of friends if you don't. I just think that's hugely important and not just with friends, with at work and with new acquaintances as well. Like you want to-- you want to show that you're someone that's open minded and listens and I think conversation is hugely important to our way of life. It's how you learn new things and it's kind of how you challenge yourself in that dialogue."
13	F, 19	"It's just respect-- having respect for other people. Um, especially because-- you might not know, but other people might be consciously putting away their phones, or consciously not focusing on themselves and focusing on you when you have issues, especially because I feel like sometimes we don't realize how much people do for us, but then we, like, we think we're doing so much for others. So kind of just being respectful. it shows it's a sign of respect when people have kind of shown the same to you in the past. And then also, it's just important to listen because people are interesting. It's important to hear other perspectives, other people's stories and backgrounds and not just, you know, focus on yourself or focus on whatever's going on on your phone."
6	M, 18	"It's a sign of respect. You know, if you clearly show you're

not listening, it makes the other person feel like maybe they're wasting their time or their energy talking to you, or it makes them feel like they're just not funny, or what they're saying isn't very interesting, which is, you know, not a very good feeling. If you listen to someone, it means, you know, you take what they say seriously. It means it's more of a friendly situation. you know, friends, friends don't just not listen."

References

- Aagaard, J. (2016). Mobile devices, interaction, and distraction: a qualitative exploration of absent presence. *AI & Society, 31*, 223–231.
- Allred, R. J., & Crowley, J. P. (2017). The “Mere Presence” Hypothesis: Investigating the Nonverbal Effects of Cell-Phone Presence on Conversation Satisfaction. *Communication Studies, 68*(1), 22–36.
- Andersen, P. A., Guerrero, L. K., Buller, D. B., & Jorgensen, P. F. (1998). An empirical comparison of three theories of nonverbal immediacy exchange. *Human Communication Research, 24*, 501–535.
- Baney, J. (2004). *Guide to Interpersonal Communication*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Baron, N. S., & Campbell, E. M. (2012). Gender and mobile phones in cross-national context. *Language Sciences, 34*(1), 13–27.
- Bayer, J., Campbell, S., & Ling, R. (2016). Connection Cues: Activating the Norms and Habits of Social Connectedness. *Communication Theory, 26*, 128–149.
- Berger, C. (2008). Interpersonal Communication. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Burgoon, J. K. (2016). Expectancy Violations Theory. In C. R. Berger & M. E. Roloff (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication* (1st ed., pp. 1–9). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cameron, A. & Webster, J. (2011). Relational Outcomes of Multicommunicating: Integrating Incivility and Social Exchange Perspectives. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 754-771.
- Chotpitayasunondh, V., & Douglas, K. M. (2016). How “phubbing” becomes the norm: The antecedents and consequences of snubbing via smartphone. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 9–18.
- de Souza e Silva, A., & Frith, J. (2012). *Mobile interfaces public spaces*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Demir, M., Ozen, A., Dogan, A., Bilyk, N. A., & Tyrell, F. A. (2011). I matter to My Friend, Therefore I am Happy: Friendship, Mattering, and Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12, 983–1006.
- Dieter Czechowsky, J. (2008). *The impact of the BlackBerry on couple relationships*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Wilfrid Laurier University. Retrieved from <http://scholars.wlu.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2055&context=etd>
- Domenici, K., & Littlejohn, S. W. (2006). *Facework: Bridging Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Drago, E. (2015). The Effect of Technology on Face-to-Face Communication. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, 6(1), 13–19.

- Duran, R. L., Kelly, L., & Rotaru, T. (2011). Mobile Phones in Romantic Relationships and the Dialectic of Autonomy Versus Connection. *Communication Quarterly*, 59(1), 19–36.
- Falk, A., & Fischbacher, U. (2006). A theory of reciprocity. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 54, 293–315.
- Finkel, J. A., & Kruger, D. J. (2012). Is Cell Phone Use Socially Contagious? *Human Ethology Bulletin*, 27(1-2).
- Forgas, J. P., & Fitness, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Social Relationships: Cognitive, Affective, and Motivational Processes*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62.
- Gergen, K. (2002). The Challenge of Absent Presence. In: Katz, J., & Aakhus, M. (Eds.), *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gikas, J., & Grant, M. M. (2013). Mobile computing devices in higher education: Student perspectives on learning with cellphones, smartphones & social media. *Internet and Higher Education*, 19, 18–26.
- Goffman, E. (1980). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goldsmith, D. J. & Lamb Normand, E. (2015). Politeness theory: How we use language to save face. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodtt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in*

- interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 267-278).
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hartman, J. L., & McCambridge, J. (2011). Optimizing Millennials' Communication Styles. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 74(1), 22–44.
- Hecht, M. L. (1978). The Conceptualization and Measurement of Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 4(3), 253–264.
- Hyman, I. (2014). On a Date with You and Our Cell Phones. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/mental-mishaps/201407/date-you-and-our-cell-phones>
- Jones, W. H., Moore, D.S., Schratte, A., and Negel, L.A. (2001). Interpersonal Transgressions and Betrayals. In R.M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Behaving Badly: Aversive Behaviors in Interpersonal Relationships* (1st ed., pp. 233-256). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kelly, L., Miller-Ott, A. & Duran, R. (2017). Sports Scores and Intimate Moments: An Expectancy Violations Theory Approach to Partner Cell Phone Behaviors in Adult Romantic Relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*, 81(5), 619-640.
- Kerner, I. (2013). Your smartphone may be powering down your relationship. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/10/health/kerner-social-relationship/index.html>
- Kraushaar, J. M. and David Novak. 2010. "Examining the Effects of Student Multitasking with Laptops during the Lecture." *Journal of Information Systems Education* 21(2):241–51.

- Lanham, R. A. (2006). *The economics of attention: style and substance in the age of information*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Laurenceau, J. P., Rivera, L. M., Schaffer, A. R., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (2004). Intimacy as an Interpersonal Process: Current Status and Future Directions. In D. A. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lin, H. L. (n.d.). How Your Cell Phone Hurts Your Relationships. Retrieved June 30, 2017, from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-your-cell-phone-hurts-your-relationships/>
- Ling, R. (2012). *Taken for grantedness: the embedding of mobile communication into society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marshall, S. (2001). Do I matter? Construct validation of adolescents' perceived mattering to parents and friends. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 473-490.
- Mazmanian, M. A., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2005). CrackBerries: The Social Implications of Ubiquitous Wireless E-Mail Devices. In C. Sorensen, Y. Yoo, K. Lyytinen, & J. I. DeGross (Eds.), *Designing Ubiquitous Information Environments: Socio-Technical Issues and Challenges* (Vol. 185). Boston, MA: Springer.
- McDaniel, B. T., & Coyne, S. M. (2016). "Technoference": The interference of technology in couple relationships and implications for women's personal and relational well-being. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 5(1), 85-98.

- Miczo, N. (2012). Reflective conversation as a foundation for communicative virtue. In T. J. Socha & M. J. Pitts (Eds.), *The positive side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 73-89). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Miller-Ott, A., & Kelly, L. (2015). The Presence of Cell Phones in Romantic Partner Face-to-Face Interactions: An Expectancy Violation Theory Approach. *Southern Communication Journal*, 80(4), 253–270.
- Miller-Ott, A. E., & Kelly, L. (2017). A Politeness Theory Analysis of Cell-Phone Usage in the Presence of Friends. *Communication Studies*, 68(2), 190–207.
- Misra, S., Cheng, L., Genevie, J., & Yuan, M. (2014). The iPhone Effect: The Quality of In-Person Social Interactions in the Presence of Mobile Devices. *Environment and Behavior*, 48(2), 275–298.
- Mlot, S. (2015, June 3). 70 Percent of Population Will Have Smartphones by 2020. *PC Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.pcmag.com/article2/0,2817,2485277,00.asp>
- Mobile Fact Sheet. (2017). [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/>
- Nakamura, T. (2015). The action of looking at a mobile phone display as nonverbal behavior/communication: A theoretical perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 43, 68–75.
- Plant, S. (2000). *On the mobile. The effects of mobile telephones on social and individual life*. Motorola. Retrieved from http://www.momentarium.org/experiments/7a10me/sadie_plant.pdf

- Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2012). 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.
- Rainie, L., & Zickuhr, K. (2015). *Americans' Views on Mobile Etiquette*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/26/americans-views-on-mobile-etiquette/>
- Reinsch Jr., N. L. and Turner, J. W. (in press). Multicommunicating: New Behaviors, New Constructs, and New Research. To appear in *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*.
- Reinsch Jr., N. L., Turner, J. W., & Tinsley, C. H. (2008). Multicommunicating: A Practice Whose Time Has Come? *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 391–303.
- Reis, H.T. and Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck (editor) *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions*. New York; Chichester: Wiley.
- Roberts, J. A., & David, M. E. (2016). My life has become a major distraction from my cell phone: Partner phubbing and relationship satisfaction among romantic partners. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 134–141.
- Rogers, L. E. (2001). Relational Communication in the Context of Family. *The Journal of Family Communication*, 1(1), 25–35.
- Schlain, L. (1998). *The alphabet versus the goddess: the conflict between word and image*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.

- Smith, A. (2012). *The Best (and Worst) of Mobile Connectivity*. Pew Research Center.
Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2012/11/30/the-best-and-worst-of-mobile-connectivity/>
- Srivastava, L. (2005). Mobile phones and the evolution of social behaviour. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 24(2), 111–129.
- Strayer, D. L., Drews, F.A. and Johnston, W.A. (2003). Cell Phone-Induced Failures of Visual Attention During Simulated Driving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 9(1):23–32.
- Taylor, P., Keeter, S., & Pew Research Center. (2010). *Millennials: A portrait of generation next: Confident, connected, open to change*. Washington, D.C: Pew Research Center.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Harris Bond, M. (2001). Aversive behavior and aggression in cultural perspective. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Behaving badly: Aversive behaviors in interpersonal relationships* (pp. 257-293). Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.
- Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Turkle, S. (2012). *Alone Together: why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Turkle, S. (2015). *Reclaiming Conversation: The Power of Talk in a Digital Age*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Turner, J. W., & Foss, S. K. (2018). Options for the construction of attentional social presence in a digitally enhanced multicomunicative environment.

Communication Theory, 28(1), 22-45.

Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., & Jackson, D. D. (2011). *Pragmatics of human communication: a study of interactional patterns, pathologies and paradoxes*.

New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

White, C. H. (2015). Expectancy Violations Theory and Interaction Adaptation Theory: From Expectations to Adaptation. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodtt (Eds.),

Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple Perspectives (2nd ed., pp. 217-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.