

Chapter 1.11

Social Presence

Patrick R. Lowenthal
Regis University, USA

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a social process (Harasim, 2002; Swan & Shea, 2005; Tu, 2000). Discourse plays a key role in the social process of learning (Harasim, 2002). Therefore, it is extremely important that we understand how students and teachers socially interact in online courses where asynchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) is the major form of discourse. Theories of social presence help explain how students and teachers interact and learn online.

BACKGROUND

Short, Williams, and Christie (1976) are credited with developing the initial theory of social presence. Short et al. developed their theory of social presence to explain the effects a communication medium can have on the way people communicate. Working from previous research in psychology and communication (i.e., Argyle and Dean's concept of

intimacy and Wiener and Mehrabian's concept of immediacy), Short et al. defined social presence as the degree of salience (i.e., quality or state of being there) between two communicators using a communication medium. They conceptualized social presence as a critical attribute of a communication medium that can determine the way people interact and communicate. Further, they posited that people perceive some communication media as having a higher degree of social presence (e.g., video) than other communication media (e.g., audio).

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the popularity of CMC grew, communication researchers began to apply the theory of social presence developed by Short et al. to CMC. Many of these early researchers came to the conclusion that CMC was antisocial and impersonal because social context cues were filtered out (see Walther, 1992).

In the mid 1990s, researchers with experience using CMC for educational purposes began to question whether the attributes of a communication medium determined its social presence (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000; Gunawardena, 1995; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997; Swan, 2003b; Walther, 1996). They argued that a user's personal

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-60566-198-5.ch280

perceptions of presence mattered more than the medium's capabilities. They also illustrated that contrary to previous research, CMC can be very social and personal (Gunawardena, 1995; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997) and even hyperpersonal (Walther, 1996).

MAIN FOCUS: SOCIAL PRESENCE

Definitions of Social Presence

There is not a clear, agreed upon, definition of social presence (Rettie, 2003; Tu, 2002). Instead, researchers continue to redefine it (Picciano, 2002). For instance, Gunawardena (1995) defined social presence as the degree to which people are *perceived* as “real” in CMC. Garrison et al. (2000), on the other hand, defined social presence as the ability of students “to *project* themselves socially and emotionally, as ‘real’ people” (p. 94). Tu and McIsaac (2002) defined social presence as “the degree of feeling, perception, and reaction of being connected by CMC” to another person (p. 140). Finally, Picciano (2002) defined social presence as student's perceptions of being in and belonging in an online course. Nearly everyone who writes about social presence continues to define it just a little differently; therefore making it very difficult for both researchers and practitioners to come to any firm conclusions about the nature of social presence.

Measuring Social Presence

Just as social presence is difficult to define, it is even harder to measure. There is little agreement on how to measure social presence (Hughes, Ventura, & Dando, 2007; Lin, 2004; Stein & Wanstreet, 2003). In fact, very few researchers have operationalized social presence into observable and measurable parts. The surveys and coding schemes developed by Gunawardena (1995; Gu-

nawardena & Zittle, 1997), Rourke et al. (2001), and Tu (2002b) have influenced the majority of research on social presence (e.g., Baskin & Henderson, 2005; Hostetter & Busch, 2006; Hughes, Ventura, & Dando, 2007; Lin, 2004; Lomicka & Lord, 2007; Na Ubon & Kimble, 2004; Richardson & Swan, 2003; So, 2005; So & Brush, 2007; Stacey, 2002; Swan, 2002, 2003a; Swan & Shih, 2005; Wise, Chang, Duffy, & Del Valle, 2004).

Gunawardena (1995; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997) and Tu (2002) created surveys to measure social presence based on past literature in the field. Whereas Gunawardena (1995; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997) and Tu (2002) focused primarily on surveying and interviewing students about their *perceptions* of CMC and social presence, Rourke et al. (2001) focused on identifying observable behaviors used by students to project themselves as “real” people. More specifically, Rourke et al. identified three categories and twelve indicators of social presence from their previous work, other literature in the field, and experience reading on-line transcripts (see Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001; Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2001; Rourke, Anderson, Garrison, & Archer, 2001); the categories and indicators of social presence are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Categories and Indicators of Social Presence

Categories	Indicators
Affective	Expression of emotions Use of humor Self-Disclosure
Interactive	Continuing a thread Quoting from other messages Referring explicitly to other messages Asking questions Complimenting, expressing appreciation, expressing agreement
Cohesive	Vocatives Addresses or refers to the group using inclusive pronouns Phatics / Salutations

Note. Adapted from Rourke et al. (2001).

6 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/social-presence/39717

Related Content

Place @-Branding and European Capitals: "City Visiting Cards" via Municipal Websites, Virtual Tours of Significant Places Flying with Google Earth, and Conversational Exchanges about City-Places Experienced/Imagined via Social Networks

Annamaria Silvana de Rosa and Elena Bocci (2014). *Dynamics of Competitive Advantage and Consumer Perception in Social Marketing* (pp. 126-168).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/place--branding-and-european-capitals/90818

Social Contributors and Consequences of Habitual and Compulsive Game Play

Donghee Yvette Wohn, Yu-Hao Lee and Elif Yilmaz Ozkaya (2019). *Internet and Technology Addiction: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 362-381).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/social-contributors-and-consequences-of-habitual-and-compulsive-game-play/228867

Business Models for On-line Social Networks: Challenges and Opportunities

Omer F. Rana and Simon Caton (2010). *International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking* (pp. 31-41).

www.irma-international.org/article/business-models-line-social-networks/49702

Bridging Provider-Centric and User-Centric Social Networks

José C. Delgado (2012). *Handbook of Research on Business Social Networking: Organizational, Managerial, and Technological Dimensions* (pp. 63-83).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/bridging-provider-centric-user-centric/60305

Gender and Anonymity in Virtual Teams: An Exploratory Study

Elizabeth Koh, Na Liu and John Lim (2011). *International Journal of E-Politics* (pp. 1-16).

www.irma-international.org/article/gender-anonymity-virtual-teams/51347