CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL INTERACTION: HOW COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES ALTER GOFFMAN'S DRAMATURGICAL MODEL?

Nguyen Trung Kien

Institute for Development Studies and Assistance (IDSA), VUSTA
Email: kiennguyenxhh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The dramaturgical model in sociology was developed by Erving Goffman in his famous work "The Presentation of Self in Everyday life" published in 1959. This theoretical model views social life as a stage on which an individual plays a role of performer, trying and tries to impress audience throughout her/his show. This viewpoint is one of Goffman's substantial contributions to comprehension of social interaction in day-to-day life. However, recent advances in communication technologies, especially the diffusion of the Internet and mobile phones, have brought many significant changes to social world. Those changes have led to the demand of revising Goffman's theory in order to better capture the nature and rules of current social phenomena. This paper aims at assessing Goffman's dramaturgical model by examining contemporary social interaction based on recent improvement in communication technologies. Four main points in his framework including the interaction order, self, front, and backstages and frontstages are put into discussion. By reviewing recent research, the paper suggests some modifications to Goffman's theory and leaves some questions for the future research to investigate.

Keywords: Communication technologies, dramaturgical model, Erving Goffman, the interaction order, the Internet.

1. Introduction

When an individual bodily presents herself or himself to others, her/his show begins. Such an individual is a performer who gives her/his audiences the impression of her/himself, convincing them to believe in her/his creditable image. That is how Goffman views social life from the dramaturgical approach. In this paper, I would like to argue that the significant improvements in information and communication technologies have altered "Goffman's" dramaturgical model. This paper first provides an overview of Erving Goffman's dramaturgical model based on his work published in 1959, it then summarizes recent advances in communication technologies that have an increasing influence on contemporary social interaction, and finally drawing on some latest scholarly studies, it discusses four main modifications of Goffman's theory of dramaturgy in order to make them better explain social encounters in everyday life.

2. Erving Goffman and the dramaturgical model

Erving Goffman (1922-1982) is the

prominent sociologist of not only the twentieth century but also the whole history of the discipline. In his most-cited book entitled *"The Presentation of Self in Everyday life"* (1959), he proposes a so-called theatrical framework that regards social life as a stage and individuals as performers. He however is not the first one to do so. William Shakespeare does. In his famous work, this author (Shakaspeare, 1822a, pp. 10-11) writes:

All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely player:
They have their exists and their entrances;
And one man his time plays many parts.

And he (1822b, p. 100) presents this idea elsewhere:

What good love may I perform for you?

Those quotations from Shakespeare give us a sense that social life is just a stage on which human beings are players and the way they love does not only rely on their naturally instinct but also on how social norms consider as good love. What Shakespeare implies here can be fit into the Erving Goffman's sociological imagination presented in his dramaturgical theory.

In his career, as Branaman (1997, p. lxiii; see also Manning & Smith, 2010, p. 52) summaries, Goffman has built various models and employed different metaphors to depict the nature of social life, such as drama (1959), ritual (1955, 1956a, 1956b, 1957, 1963, 1967), game (1963; 1969). However, the dramaturgical framework might be his most popular theory. In his most imaginative work (1959), Goffman utilizes an array of theatrical terminologies such as performer, character, team and audience; stage, front region, back region; masks, cues and props; routines and parts; performances coming off or falling flat; dramaturgical needs, dramaturgical skills and strategies; impression management; and so forth. Social life is viewed as a stage on which an individual tries to give a performance to her/his audiences, and such a performance transforms her/him into 'a stage performer' (1959, p.19; 1974, p.124). A performer dramatizes her/his acts by trying to give expression to her/his observers in order to persuade them to acknowledge her/his idealized character – the commendable and honorable image of her/himself (see 1959, p. 27; p.219). In other words, the player always tries to show the "good" side of her/his personality to the people with whom s/he encounters. The perspective Goffman proposes is still relevant to analyze social phenomena in contemporary society. In the next parts, the paper will look through recent developments of communication technologies that have profoundly influenced social world.

3. Recent advances in communication technologies

The late twentieth century has witnessed the fourth revolution in information technologies following the three previous ones: writing, the printing press, the broadcast mass media (radio and television) (Macnamara, 2010, pp. 1-2). This fourth revolution has happened in three main fields: 'micro-electronics, computers, and telecommunications' (Castells, 2011, p. 39). In which, the birth of the Internet, especially of the diffusion of the World Wide Webs and new social media, has given rise to the connection from computers to computers around the world (Castells, 2011, pp. 45-50), helping turn a one-way communication system to two-way and multi-way ones.

Since 1990s, the privatization of the Internet has also brought about the spreading of the Internet in human being's everyday life (see Castells, 2011, p.65). The number of Internet users has noticeably proliferated since its primary form appeared in 1969. According to Castells's estimation (2011, p.375), in 1973, there were only 25 computers in the network; in the early 1980s, the Net was only limited to a few thousand users; however, by

mid-2001, this figure grew to around 700 million users. Other statistics (Miniwatts Marketing Group, 2012) show that by June 30, 2012, there were 2,405,510,175 users, accounting for 34.3 % of world population. By December 31, 2014, that figure sharply increased to 3,079,339,857 users, making up 42.4% of world population (Miniwatts Marketing Group, 2015). That migh be said that four in every ten people are using the Internet.

In that trend, the global world has been drawn closer together. This fact somehow realizes what Marshall McLuhan (1964) termed "global village" whereby inhabitants from all four corners of the world have become each other's neighbors. Based on the development of the Internet, the use of social network sites and blogs has become a 'global phenomenon' (Vasalou, Joinson & Courvoisier, 2010, p. 719). Both social network sites and blogs can be seen as new forms of mass media based upon the World Wide Webs. They are both 'web-based services' but direct individuals to different goals. While social network sites are used to help 'users to articulate and make visible their social networks' (boyd & Ellison, 2007, p. 211), blogs are designed to make users able to express themselves (boyd, 2006a) in diary- or journal-style. Social network sites were started in 1990s, with the launch of SixDegrees.com in 1997, followed by Cyworld in 2001, Friendster in 2002, LinkedIn, MySpace and Hi5 in 2003; Flickr, Facebook and Multiply in 2004, Yahoo!360, YouTube, Xanga, Bebo, Ning, AsianAvenue and BlackPlanet in 2005, Twitter in 2006 (see boyd & Ellison, 2007, p. 212), and recently with Google + in June 2011 (Google, 2015). In which, Facebook is considered as the most popular site owing to its number of users (by September 14th 2012, this site reached 1 billion monthly active users (see Facebook, 2012). 'Blog' was coined in 1999 is the

shorted name of 'Web logs' proposed in 1997 (boyd, 2006a; Goggin, 2012, p. 22). Some scholars technically view blogs as 'frequently updated webpages with a series of archived posts, typically in reverse-chronological order' (Nardi, Schiano & Gumbrecht, 2004, p. 222), some call 'a social action' (Miller & Shepherd, 2004), others regard as 'a medium' (boyd 2006a; Moor & Efimova, 2004). Blog is now based upon various platforms such as Google Blogger (http://www.blogger.com), Wordpress (http://wordpress.com), Drupal (https://drupal.org), MovableType (http://www.movabletype.org), TypePad (http://www.typepad.com), or Gawker (http://gawker.com). The prevalence of social network sites and blogs has offered the Internet users a vast number of chances to create their own online networks with the feature of interactivity, so to speak, many-to-many communication (see Castells, 2011; Flew, 2008; White, 2011).

Moreover, the growth of telephonic technologies has called forth the diversity of mobile devices, especially of smart phones. The common functions of smart phones are to access to the Internet, to transmit data including text, voice, image, video and so on (Geser, 2004). Further, the recent rise of hybrid products such as tablets, notes or ultra-books makes the access to the Internet even much easier and more convenient.

Since the fourth revolution of information technologies took place, our society has never been the same. Since the industrial revolution in England a few centuries ago turned social world into an industrial society, the fourth information revolution started in the late twentieth century has reformed extensively social life, as Castells argues, to an informational society. Many scholars observe that the informational society has given rise to many new forms of social interaction. The use of the Internet, especially social network sites is regarded as the way

enabling the individuals to tie themselves to a new community and express themselves in different ways (Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012). In fact, the use of social network sites has created a new form of community - 'virtual community' (Rheingold, 1993; see Castells, 2011, p.387), whose nature and features are distinct from the 'physical community' (see Reich, 2010). In other words, such social network sites enable individuals to better manage and maintain their social relationships. Many studies demonstrate that online social networks are used to connect not merely with friends and acquaintances in existing offline networks (see boyd, 2006b; boyd, 2007; boyd, 2004; boyd & Ellison, 2007; Donath & boyd, 2004; Robards & Bennett, 2011, pp. 307-8), but also with strangers (Murthy, 2012, p. 1061). By employing social network sites, it seems that an individual can make visible her/his social relationships. With regularly updated applications designed in social network sites, the individual is able to search, view, review, invite, even limit or block a contact with which s/he does want to connect. Consequently, many people nowadays attach their personal life to, if not to say, depend significantly on their online social network sites (Reich, 2010, p. 700). "In the context of" telephonic interaction, the increasing use of mobile phones has extremely affected the face-to-face interaction, because users are 'vulnerable to calls at any of day or night' (Gergen, 2002, pp. 237, 40). That is to say, an individual's personal life and face-to-face interaction can be interrupted by mobile phones anywhere at any time. Consequently, mobile phones and social network sites have grown to become a must-have accessory to modern human beings' day-to-day lives.

4. Alterations to Goffman's dramaturgical model

The changes in social life have deeply affected Goffman's theoretical model of dramaturgy. In the paragraphs that follow, this paper will discuss four main alterations to his theory including: the interaction order, self, front, and backstages and frontstages.

The new interaction order

As Goffman declares in his last essay (Goffman, 1983, p.4), the interaction order, which is 'the face-to-face interaction' and a 'substantive domain in its own right', is his 'analytically viable unit' throughout his academic works. Although there are various theoretical models built by Goffman, 'co-present' or 'physical' interaction remains substantial in his microsociology (1974, p. 495; 1983, p.4; see also 1959, p. 14; 2010, p. 6; 1967, p.1). The face-to-face interaction is a cornerstone of his dramaturgical model. According to Goffman, social interaction makes sense only if it happens during the physical co-presence of both actors because in such situation, 'the reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another's actions' arises (1959, p.26). Put simply, without face-to-face interaction, the actors cannot utilize his own 'psychobiological element[s]' such as 'emotion, mood, cognition, bodily orientation, and muscular effort' (Goffman, 1983, p.5) to affect the other onstage. In other words, to Goffman, the face-to-face interaction is the sole form of social interaction that can provide sufficient conditions (body, time and space), which enable the individuals to do face work and impose their impression upon others (Goffman, 1955).

However, the changes in communication technologies in recent decades pose a demand of extending Goffman's interaction order into a wider extent. There are scholars arguing that mediated interaction can possess the same features as face-to-face interaction does. Jenkins's study (2010, pp. 259-63), for example, shows that information and communication technologies such as telephone and mail, video chat and social networking sites in the twentieth-first century

have converted 'the interaction order' proposed by Goffman a couple of decades ago (1983) into the new one. Rettie argues that not only the face-to-face interaction can create a mutual monitoring between the interactants, but synchronous continuous media such as phone calls and video links can do the same (2009, p. 425). The qualitative study by this author also illustrates that even in the conversation on the phone, the users still feel that they are 'face-to-face' to their friends, just only 'without the face'. This means that the mobile phone's users can sense the 'physical person there' in their phone call conversation (Rettie, 2009, p.430). Of course, in both telephonic and computer-based interaction, the interactants can be in different locations, however, as Rettie demonstrates, they can share 'a time-frame and mediated copresence' (2009, p. 425). Other scholars come to agree that alongside 'physical' interaction order that requires the bodily copresence, the 'digitised' interaction order requiring the co-presence in time beside in space, has become significant in current life (Jenkins, 2010, pp. 271-272). Put it in another way, the temporal copresence in time can be separated from the spatial copresence while they are still of equal importance in facilitating social interaction.

The demand of putting mediated and telephonic interaction into microanalysis of social encounter has been proposed by some scholars (Jenkins, 2010; Ling 2009; Miller 1995; Rettie 2009, p. 421). It may be exaggerated to say that, however, social interaction is currently dominated by computer-based interaction, or by telephonic interaction. Rather, it should be stated that nowadays personal life is shared and entwined by three main forms of interaction: face-to-face interaction; computer-based interaction; and telephonic interaction. They together constitute social interaction in contemporary life to which I would call the multifarious interaction. By the multifarious interaction, I refer to many forms of interactions built around an individual, helping her/him create and impute her/his 'creditable' image on her/his audiences. This is the new interaction order that is no longer based solely on the face-to-face interaction, but on various forms of interactions including mediated interaction and telephonic interaction. It is also worth noting that these forms of social interaction are not isolated but interrelated and interlinked. An individual can get involved in two or three forms of interaction at the same time or move flexibly from one form to another. This point was implied by Castells when he argues that in fact, both virtual community and physical community are personal community which is the networks built around an individual (See Castells, 2011, 389). Given the this central position in such forms of interaction, an individual is capable of flexibly turning from this form of interaction to other forms in order to best manage his ideal character.

The multi-faced self

As a consequence of those changes in the interaction order, self and its presentation should be also altered. In his well-known work (1959, pp. 244-246), Goffman defines the self of an individual as two related parts, the self-as-character and the self-as-performer. While the latter is 'all-too-human' self which is attributed by the psychobiological desires and needs, fantasies and dreams and a capacity to learn, the former is the performed self which is a 'product' of the performance played on stage. Under the influence of the communication technologies, these both selves are reformed. The self-as-performer is altered because the individual has to learn new technologies to express her/himself. For example, alongside learning how to express her/himself via bodily gestures, s/he must learn how to use mobile phone to make a call, how to give a good impression via a phone

call conversation or how to create and update an impressive profile on Facebook or Twitter. Furthermore, s/he has also new desires of establishing or maintaining her/his networks by using mobile phones or social network sites. In other words, mobile phone and/ or social network sites s/he uses such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or LinkedIn have become parts of her/his show.

What we should pay more attention to, however, is the 'socialized self', that is, the self is socially constructed. The transformation of social interaction from the physical interaction to the multifarious interaction, as I proposed above, has given rise to the diversification of 'stages' on which the self is portrayed. This self is not the separated result of face-to-face encounters, but rather, the unique product of various forms of social interactions including telephonic, computer-based and physical interactions. In each of these domains, the individual attempts to persuade her/his audiences to believe in her/his praiseworthy figure. That is to say, to comprehend fully the self-as-character, we cannot perceive of her/him only as what s/he is presented in face-to-face interaction but also of what s/he is depicted in telephonic interaction and computer-based interaction. Therefore, it is proper to say that the performed self, corresponding with multifarious interaction, is the multi-faced self in the sense that the self seems to be divided into different 'faces' or 'the social positive value[s]' (Goffman, 1955) that are designed to be suitable for each interaction domain. With availability of three major domains, the individual hence can choose which sphere better delineates her/his image. A study shows that the users of social network sites prefer the expression of their 'true selves' on the Internet to that of in face-to-face interaction (Bargh, McKenna & Fitzsimons, 2002).

Another noticeable point is that in the face-to-face interaction, the individual must conform the social values and 'deference rituals' to make her/his image commendable (Goffman, 1956b). In other words, s/he must first understand about her/himself and choose the right social values that will make her/him become admirable in the audiences' eyes. The digital and telephonic interaction is no exception. To integrate into the digital domain, for instance, the performer must develop her/his consistent 'sense of self', by which others can easily identify her/him with others (Robards & Bennett, 2011, pp. 311-3).

Front's alteration

The distinction between the physical stage and digital and telephonic stages is 'front'. Goffman regards 'front' as 'the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance' (1959, p.32). Front includes two parts, first is 'setting', involving furniture, décor, physical layout, and other background items which supply the scenery and stage props for the spate of human action played out before, within, or upon it' (1959, pp.32-33). In the context of telephonic conversation, it can be seen that setting is constituted by both the performer's and her/his audience's locations where they are making the phone call. In this case, the 'scenic' front is not physical setting, but the telephonic setting is created by the phone call between them. This telephonic setting is affected by the real settings in which two phone users are staying. For example, the sounds of the television where the individual is standing might go into the telephonic setting and affect both phone users. In the video phone call, the two actors' real setting can be their scenic setting. However, this setting is limited by the capacity of the camera built in the mobile phones the two using. For instance, if a camera phone can produce high-definition video, phone users are able to sense better the setting of their interlocutors. In those cases, the two actors would like to interact with each

other in place that they are able control the real setting so that no unexpected things can interfere their phone conversation.

In the context of Internet-based interaction, setting is established by different applications and platforms. For example, in Facebook the interaction between the performer and her/his audience occurs in the context of timeline whereby they are capable of giving comments and replies in a status update, or in a photo or video posted. In addition, the performers and her/his audience can exchange messages in their chat window. Being different from telephonic interaction, the setting in the digital interaction is realized by the Internet's platforms and applications, that constitute the cyber space in which both two actors share with each other.

The second 'front' is 'personal front' which are 'insignia of office or rank; clothing; sex, age and racial characteristics; size and looks; posture; speech pattern; facial expressions; bodily gestures; and the like' (Goffman, 1959, p.34). That is to say, personal front is the face of an individual which appears before audiences. Contrary to setting, personal front is subjective because it is stuck to the individual's body or demographic characteristics. Generally speaking, the individual cannot alter her/his given or ascribed statuses such as sex, age or race. However, s/he can choose what clothes should be dressed, what bodily gestures should be demeaned, what tone should be addressed. These parts of personal front can be chosen by the individual's will or achieved her/his effort.

The expression of personal front in telephonic situation can include the performer's voice, the manner of texting messages and the use of emotional icons, photos and videos. If two actors use video call, their physical appearances also play the same role as they do in a face-to-face situation. In such a case, an individual would

like to present themselves in a desirable fashion.

The digital personal front is more diverse than that of telephonic one due to the capacity of creating and maintaining the individual's online profiles (boyd & Ellison, 2007; Dabner, 2012). In an online profile, the performer's personal front consists of profile/account's user name, profile picture, cover photo; a short introduction about oneself; some basic demographic characteristics including birthday, gender, sexual orientation, living location, languages; contact information including mobile phone, email address, personal website; personal history; work and education history; hobbies including music, movies, TV shows; social relationships including family, friends, groups; widgets, applications and others. The use of personal profile to express the online self is proven by many recent studies. For example, a survey by Lampe, Ellison and Steinfield (2007, p. 440) illustrates that the fields 'About me', 'Favorite Music', 'Favorite Movies', 'Interest' are the most popular fields preferred by Facebook's users to express themselves. In addition to text, there are several findings showing that the digital self has been increasingly depicted by 'explicit' display, such as profile picture, photo album (Hum et al., 2011; Zhao, Grasmuck & Martin, 2008). Each field of a profile can be regarded as a splitting piece of the online personal front. When those pieces mix up together, they will tell the audiences a clear story or film of the individual (see Robards & Bennett, 2011).

Given the diverse items of profiles, social network sites also offer the individual opportunities for dramatic realization and idealization on the Internet. This is due to the impression management of online self-presentation is more 'controllable and fluid' (Whitty, 2008, p. 2). This can be understood by the fact that the individual can control

which items should be published on the Internet in order to best portray her/his image. In other words, their audience might only view the 'good' or 'admirable' side of the performers (see Boon & Sinclair, 2009; Lampe, Ellison & Steinfield, 2007; Nosko, Wood & Molema, 2010) while other sides are hidden. This is similar to the case of mobile phone's users where the individual is able to decide to give her/his phone number to expected people or to express her/his voice softer than usual to impress the hearers.

The mix of backstage and frontstage

The diversification of the social self and the interaction order requires us to reconsider the concepts of 'frontstage' and 'backstage'. These terms are also called front region and back region in Goffman's terminology. A frontstage is where an actor uses to organize her/his show, while a backstage is where the actor rehearses for her/his show but tries to keep it away from the audiences' eyes. While the frontstage is where the individual gives the best out of her/him in order to make audiences see the desirable/admirable side of her/his personality, the backstage is where the individual presents her/his truer self, namely, s/he might behave in a manner s/he never wants to show in front of others.

In the telephonic context, for example, the back region of the performance is the current setting in which s/he is staying, that is hidden from the fellow's eyes. If two phone users use a video call, then the front region will be the limited part of the setting appearing in the phones' cameras. In the case of normal calls, the front stage is not visible, because it appears only in the conversation between the individual and her/his audience. In the instance of the Internet, the back stage is the same as that of telephonic conversation, but the front stage is more electronically constructed. It is more visible than that of telephonic situation, because its situation is defined in terms of status updates or window chats or photos or videos uploaded or topics discussed.

The most remarkable thing that attracts our attention is the entwinement between frontstages and backstages of three domains of interaction that the actor might involve. The actor no longer plays in a sole stage. Her/his participation in the physical setting, the telephonic setting and the digital setting can coincidence. Thus, it seems that we cannot sometimes draw a clear boundary between backstage(s) and frontstage(s). The use of mobile phone poses an essential case. For example, an individual is talking with her/his friends at a bar and then her/his mobile phone rings. In this case, the individual is currently the performer who plays before her/his friends as audiences and the space of the bar is the frontstage. However, when her/his mobile phone rings, s/he must talk with other friend via her/his mobile phone, so that s/he has to deal with two groups of audiences, one at the bar and one in the mobile phone conversation. The bar is the frontstage on which the individual gives the show to her/his friend, but it is also the backstage on which the individual uses to support her/his conversation with other friend via phone call. The mobile phone is the part of backstage in the phone call conversation but at the same time appears on the frontstage of the face-to-face talk. The fact that the mobile phone as a 'backstage device' can be brought onto frontstage of the face-to-face interaction, leads 'what was the frontstage' – the situation at the bar - to being 'a type of backstage' of the phone call situation (see Ling, 2009, p.278). The act of talking with other via mobile phone before a set of audiences, for instance, forces one deal with two frontstages at the same time, 'the local one and the telephonic one' (Ling, 2009, pp. 282, 288). This situation can be more complicated if the Internet-based interaction is involved. Imagine, for instance, an individual is talking

with her/his friends at bar but s/he is also on Facebook or Skype by her/his laptop or tablet to chat with other friends or to post a status or a tweet. The situation is denser when her/his mobile phone rings. In this situation, the individual has to deal not with dual frontstages but treble frontstages: the local one, the telephonic one, and the virtual one. Her/his laptop and mobile phone are her/his backstage devices but also can be brought on face-to-face frontstage. The physical surroundings are on the frontstage of face-to-face interaction but can be used as backstage devices for the digital interaction or the telephonic interaction. Hence, in the interplay of three domains of interaction, the distinction between back regions and front regions is very fluid, and the impression management must be flexible.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have examined the influence of the recent improvements of communication technologies on the microsociology and the dramaturgical model proposed by Erving Goffman. This paper shows that the communication technologies, especially the Internet and social network sites have significantly complicated contemporary social interaction. Through the dramaturgical lens, the interaction order has evolved to the extent that consists of not only the face-to-face interaction, but also the telephonic interaction and the digital interaction. In this new interaction order, the individual has to learn to express her/his self in new ways. S/he can choose to depict her/his self-image diversely from one domain to other. Her/his self can appear to be very different in one domain compared to that of in other domains. Her/his self is multi-faced self. The front in which the individuals play their shows is also diversified by each form of interaction. The individuals now have to take care of different frontstages and backstages if s/he wants to perform a good show for her/his own creditable image. These facts call forth a necessary alteration to Goffman's dramaturgical model in order to better explain the contemporary phenomena.

REFERENCES

Bargh, J. A., McKenna, K. Y., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2002). Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the "true self" on the Internet. *Journal of social issues, 58*(1), 33-48.

Boon, S., & Sinclair, C. (2009). A world I don't inhabit: disquiet and identity in Second Life and Facebook. *Educational Media International, 46*(2), 99-110.

Boyd, D. (2004). Friendster and publicly articulated social networking.

Boyd, D. (2006a). A blogger\'s blog: Exploring the definition of a medium. *Reconstruction, 6*(4).

Boyd, D. (2006b). Friends, Friendsters, and MySpace Top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. *First Monday, 11*(12). Retrieved from: http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1418/1336

Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 210-230.

Branaman, A. (1997). Goffman's social theory. In C. Lemert & A. Branaman (Eds.), *The Goffman Reader* (pp. xlv-lxxxii). United Kindom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (Vol. 1): Wiley-Blackwell.

Dabner, N. (2012). 'Breaking Ground' in the use of social media: A case study of a university earthquake response to inform educational design with Facebook. *The Internet and Higher Education, 15*(1), 69-78. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.06.001.

De Moor, A., & Efimova, L. (2004). *An argumentation analysis of weblog conversations.* Paper presented at the The 9th International Working Conference on the Language-Action Perspective on Communication Modelling (LAP 2004).

Facebook. (2012). One Billion Fact Sheet. Retrieved October 28 2012, from http://newsroom.fb.com/imagelibrary/downloadmedia.ashx?MediaDetailsID=4227&SizeId =-1

Flew, T. (2008). *New media: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (2002). 14 The challenge of absent presence. *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance*, 227.

Geser, H. (2004). Towards a sociological theory of the mobile phone: Publica.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 213-231.

Goffman, E. (1956a). Embarrassment and social organization. *American Journal of Sociology*, 264-271.

Goffman, E. (1956b). The nature of deference and demeanor. *American Anthropologist, 58*(3), 473-502.

Goffman, E. (1957). Alienation from interaction. *Human Relations*.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London, England: Penguin Books.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1969). *Strategic interaction*. Philadelphia: Unversity of Pensylvania Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order: American Sociological Association, 1982 presidential address. *American sociological review, 48*(1), 1-17.

Goggin, G. (2012). *New Technologies and the Media*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Google. (2015). Our history in depth. Retrieved July 21, 2015, from http://www.google.com/about/company/history/

Hum, N. J., Chamberlin, P. E., Hambright, B. L., Portwood, A. C., Schat, A. C., & Bevan, J. L. (2011). A picture is worth a thousand words: A content analysis of Facebook profile photographs. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(5), 1828-1833. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.04.003

Jenkins, R. (2010). The 21st-century interaction order. In M. H. Jacobsen (Ed.), *The contemporary Goffman* (pp. 257-274).

Lampe, C. A. C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2007). *A familiar face (book): profile elements as signals in an online social network.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems.

Ling, R. (2009). The 'Unboothed'Phone. Goffman and the Use of Mobile Communication. In M. H. Jacobsen (Ed.), *The contemporary Goffman* (pp. 275-292). New York: Routledge.

Macnamara, J. (2010). *The 21st century media (r) evolution: Emergent communication practices*: Peter Lang Pub Incorporated.

Manning, P., & Smith, G. (2010). Symbolic Interactionism. In A. Elliott (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Social Theory* (pp. 37-55). London & New York: Routledge.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, C. R., & Shepherd, D. (2004). Blogging as social action: A genre analysis of the weblog. In S. A. L. Gurak, L. Johnson, C. Ratliff, & J. Reyman (Ed.), Into the blogosphere: Rhetoric, community, and culture of weblogs. Retrieved from http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/blogging_as_social_action_a_genre_analysis_of_the_ weblog.html.

Miller, H. (1995). *The presentation of self in electronic life: Goffman on the Internet.* Paper presented at the Embodied knowledge and virtual space conference.

Miniwatts Marketing Group. (2012). World Internet Usage and Population Statistics June 30, 2012. Retrieved June 1 2013, from Miniwatts Marketing Group http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Miniwatts Marketing Group. (2015). World Internet Usage and Population Statistics December 31, 2014. Retrieved July 21, 2015, from Miniwatts Marketing Group http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Murthy, D. (2012). Towards a Sociological Understanding of Social Media: Theorizing Twitter. *Sociology, 46*(6), 1059-1073. doi: 10.1177/0038038511422553

Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why Do People Use Facebook? *Pers Individ Dif, 52*(3), 243-249. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.007

Nardi, B. A., Schiano, D. J., & Gumbrecht, M. (2004). *Blogging as social activity, or, would you let 900 million people read your diary?* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2004 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work.

Nosko, A., Wood, E., & Molema, S. (2010). All about me: Disclosure in online social networking profiles: The case of FACEBOOK. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(3), 406-418.

Reich, S. M. (2010). Adolescents' sense of community on myspace and facebook: a mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(6), 688-705. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20389

Rettie, R. (2009). Mobile phone communication: Extending Goffman to mediated interaction. *Sociology, 43*(3), 421-438.

Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*: MIT press.

Robards, B., & Bennett, A. (2011). MyTribe: Post-subcultural Manifestations of Belonging on Social Network Sites. *Sociology, 45*(2), 303-317. doi: 10.1177/0038038510394025

Shakaspeare, W. (1822a). As You Like It. In W. Dodd (Ed.), *The Beauties of Shakspeare:* (pp. 6-13). London: Frederick Warne and Co.

Shakaspeare, W. (1822b). King John. In W. Dodd (Ed.), *The Beauties of Shakspeare:* (pp. 93-104). London: Frederick Warne and Co.

Vasalou, A., Joinson, A. N., & Courvoisier, D. (2010). Cultural differences, experience with social networks and the nature of "true commitment" in Facebook. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 68*(10), 719-728. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2010.06.002

White, C. (2011). *Social media, crisis communication, and emergency management. Leveraging Web 2.0 Technologies*. Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis Group.

Whitty, M. T. (2008). Revealing the 'real'me, searching for the 'actual'you: Presentations of self on an internet dating site. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(4), 1707-1723.

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(5), 1816-1836. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2008.02.012.