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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine what differences exist between male and female customers in their displays of courtesy during purchasing interactions with cashiers. Based on previous research, it was hypothesized that female customers would display more sociability than male customers. Specifically, it was hypothesized that females would display more verbal behaviours, more eye contact and more smiling than male customers. These measures were combined into a composite measure of total sociability. Data were collected in three locations, the University of Victoria cafeteria, a coffee shop and a fast-food restaurant through unobtrusive direct field observation by two coders. Data analysis included inter-coder reliability, as well as independent means tests for each component measure, and the composite measure of total sociability. Consistent with the hypotheses, female customers displayed more verbal behaviours, smiling and eye contact, and correspondingly, more total sociability than male customers. While each of these differences was statistically significant, very little of the variance was explained by gender.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 The Importance of Politeness

As Goffman (1967/1997: 30) noted, “the gestures which we sometimes call empty are perhaps in fact the fullest things of all.” Politeness, instrumental or not, represents the ‘ceremonial rules’, which perform the social function of maintaining the presentation of a well-demeaned person and affirming the sacred qualities of others. These rules of conduct, according to Goffman, bind the actors together and represent “the bindings of society (Goffman, 1967/1997: 29-30).”

The flip-side of politeness is incivility, which Phillips and Smith (2003: 85) define as “commonplace actions and interactions that are perceived to be rude or inconsiderate”. They point out that when incivilities occur, they cause “anger, frustration, fear, disgust, unease and indignation” and undermine subjective feelings of security and solidiarity (Phillips and Smith, 2003: 101). Similarly, Garfinkel (1967: 35) describes the moral order as consisting of the rule governed activities of everyday life. The rules operate during the course of ‘familiar scenes’ that are ‘seen but not noticed’ when society is operating smoothly. As Garfinkel’s experiments demonstrate, when the rules that govern familiar scenes are breached, the moral order is undermined and the rules themselves may become salient, causing “bewilderment, consternation and confusion”, which, in turn, leads to “anxiety, shame, guilt and indignation”, as well as the anger and disgust of the violated and the embarrassment of the offender (Garfinkel, 1967: 52, 69).
Thus, politeness aids the functioning of society by affirming the sacredness of self and others and promoting solidarity, whereas incivility makes the unseen moral order evident, causing distrust and undermining solidarity.

1.2 Gender Differences in Politeness and Talk: Previous Research

While politeness and the interactions that make its display possible bind society together, politeness and talk are gendered. Conversations between men and women have been conceptualized by some sociolinguists as a kind of cross-cultural communication characterized by different norms of interaction (Holmes, 1995: 192; Tannen, 1990: 79). Males seem to operate in a culture characterized by a focus on individualism and gaining status in the context of competition. This is reflected by men’s conversational style, which is impersonal, technical and based on displaying knowledge. Females appear to operate in a culture characterized by a focus on support, connection, and intimacy, which is based on sharing personal content and is geared toward confirmation and consensus (Tannen, 1990; Holmes, 1995; Coates, 1986: 151-154; Aries, 1982: 132).

These patterns of communication correspond to gendered differences in the use of linguistic devices and behaviours. In both public and private settings, women tend to provide more encouraging feedback, apologize more, employ more hedging devices, tag-questions, and empty adjectives,¹ agree more, and ask more questions than men. Men tend to interrupt, change topics and exhibit challenging behaviours more than women (Holmes, 1995: 68-70; Tannen, 1994: 60; Coates, 1986: 101-109; 117-118; Graddol and Swann, 1989: 83, 94).
In addition, there are major differences in conversational behaviour between public and private settings. In public settings, men talk more than women (Holmes, 1995: 192-193; Tannen, 1994: 234-236). Holmes argues that public contexts offer the potential of achieving increased status. She argues that men use linguistic devices and behaviours to 'get and keep the floor', while women's tendency to offer encouragement facilitates these processes. Women, on the other hand, speak more in informal private settings in which personal relationships and establishing connections with others is emphasized (Holmes, 1995: 68-70, 192-193).

As Burgoon (1985: 347) notes, verbal and nonverbal channels are “inextricably intertwined in the communication of the total meaning of an impersonal exchange.” This is reflected by gender differences in paralinguistic aspects of communication such as tone of voice, loudness, pauses, and utterances without linguistic meaning. Women’s use of paralinguistic devices tends to encourage mutual participation in conversation by softening statements and ensuring that listeners share the same knowledge as speakers.\(^2\) This is consistent with an emphasis on agreement and solidarity between speaker and listener. Conversely, men’s different use of paralinguistic devices is based on asserting knowledge to maintain or increase status and indicates a competitive, rather than collaborative orientation (Holmes, 1995: 101-106; Tannen, 1990: 246; Contemporary Linguistic Analysis, 2000: 507).

Previous studies have also consistently reported gender differences in the use of paraverbal devices including gaze, smiling and body orientation during interpersonal interactions. Whereas females anchor their gaze on each other’s faces, occasionally glancing away, males gaze at neutral objects and only glance at each other occasionally.
(Tannen, 1990: 246; Hall, 1984: 83; Burgoon and Hoobler, 2002: 260). In addition, males tend to position their bodies parallel to others whereas females orient their bodies toward each other and have closer interaction distances (Tannen, 1990: 245-246; Hall, 1984: 83; Aries, 1982: 128, 131; Burgoon and Hoobler, 2002). Women and men also display differences in leaning and head orientation. Aries and Hall have shown that women demonstrate forward lean and head-tilt during conversation, which, they argue, express interest and responsiveness. Conversely, men tend to display less head-tilt, and demonstrate backward lean more frequently, which is consistent with lack of interest and displays of dominance (Aries, 1982: 128, 131; Hall, 1984: 102-103, 122; Burgoon and Hoobler, 2002: 260). Finally, women smile and thus express sociability more frequently than men during conversational interactions (Hall, 1984: 71; Burgoon and Hoobler, 2000: 260; LaFrance et al., 2003).

Women’s use of each of the communicative devices listed above has been conceptualized as reflecting an expressive orientation consistent with a “warmth-affiliative motive”, reflecting sociability, mutuality and concern for others. Men’s more limited use of these devices, on the other hand, reflects an instrumental orientation, which is consistent with maintaining distance and is associated with displaying control in relation to others (Hall, 1984: 83, 103, 145-146; Aries, 1982: 128, 131-132).

The gender differences in patterns of conversation and paraverbal and paralinguistic behaviours discussed above correspond to differences in forms of displaying politeness. Women view talk as a means to display sociability (Tannen, 1990: 76-77). This corresponds with displaying “positive politeness”, which “actively expresses positive concern for other” (Holmes, 1995: 5-6). Conversely, men view talk
instrumentally, as a means to convey information (Tannen, 1990: 76-77). This corresponds with displaying “negative politeness”, which reflects “non-imposing distancing behaviour” (Holmes, 1995: 4-6). This instrumental view is expressed by Goffman’s view of gratitude and thanking behaviour as functioning as a means to close out encounters (Goffman, 1971: 142). Theories of politeness typically focus on linguistic politeness. As a result, paraverbal and paralinguistic behaviours have not been specifically conceptualized as reflecting politeness. However, gender differences in the use of paraverbal and paralinguistic communication devices correspond with women displaying positive politeness, consistent with expressing positive concern for others, and men displaying negative politeness, consistent with distancing behaviour.

1.3 Tipping as Politeness: Previous Research on Purchasing Interactions

A majority of previous studies that examine purchasing interactions focus on the factors and behaviours that influence the size of tips given to waiters or waitresses. In terms of factors not directly related to service quality, previous studies have typically reported that tip size varies according to age (younger customers give proportionally higher tips than older customers), day of the week (tips are higher on weekends than weekdays), meal served (tips are higher at dinner than at lunch) and frequency of patronage (return diners tip at a higher rate than first time customers) (Bodvarsson and Gibson, 1999; Conlin et. al., 2003; Davis et. al, 1998). In addition, tips at restaurants are higher as a percentage of the bill when servers smile, make eye contact, introduce themselves by name, squat rather than stand up straight, offer an interesting task for
customers to do while they wait, mimic customers by repeating their orders back to them, attach a joke to the bill, draw a happy face on the back of the cheque, write "thank you" on the back of the cheque, write information about upcoming events or specials on the back of the cheque, and for female servers, when they touch female customers during interactions (Davis et al., 1998; Guegen, 2002; Rind and Borda, 1995, 1996; Rind and Strohmetz, 1999; Rind and Strohmetz, 2001; Stephen and Zweigenhaft, 2001; Van Baaren et al., 2003). Thus, tip size increases when servers display pro-social behaviours and employ tactics designed to enhance the mood of customers, which are both consistent with politeness.

The behaviours listed above, as well as factors that are directly associated with food service are consistent with the concept of 'service quality', which is defined in the literature as friendliness, attentiveness and promptness (Bodvarsson and Gibson, 1999). The main focus of tipping studies has been the extent to which the size of tips rises as service quality rises. The main finding is that there is a small but statistically significant and consistent positive relationship between perceived service quality and tip size as a percentage of the bill (Bodvarsson and Gibson, 1999, 2002; Lynn, 2000; Lynn and McCall, 2000). Thus tip size appears to be related to service quality. In addition, some researchers argue that tipping is a behavioural norm in Western culture that has been internalized (Conlin et al., 2003). Support for this argument includes survey responses indicating that customers give tips of a certain size, 10-15% in Canada and 15-20% in the United States and that customers who are alone leave tips that are the same percentage of the bill as customers in groups, despite being less likely to face social sanctions (Bodvarsson and Gibson, 1999).
1.4 Gender Differences in Tipping Behaviour

For both males and females, tips are generally higher if the customer and server are of the opposite sex (Conlin et. al., 2003). In addition, some studies have reported that female servers, on average, receive larger tips than male servers (Lynn and Latane, 1984; Stillman and Hensley, 1980). This could be related to certain pro-social and mood enhancing behaviours being viewed as appropriate for females but not males (Rind and Bordia, 1996). For instance, customers view being touched by male servers as inappropriate, whereas females receive higher tips when they touch female customers (Stephen and Zweigenhaft, 2001). In addition, male servers are not rewarded for drawing happy faces on the back of bills, whereas female servers are (Rind and Bordia, 1996). However, most studies report no overall difference between male and female customers in terms of the size of the tips that they leave (Conlin et. al., 2003; Guegen, 2002; Harris, 1995).

1.5 Limits of Tipping Studies

As I have noted above, the main focus of tipping studies has been to determine the extent to which tip size is related to service quality. Service quality, as a concept, includes two components – an instrumental component, speed of service, and in some cases, food quality, as well as a component based on sociability – friendliness, which is consistent with positive politeness, and attractiveness. However, tip size only measures
an instrumental component of customer behaviour that appears to be governed, at least to some extent, by strong social norms dictating that tipping occurs and that tips be a certain percentage of the bill. In general, studies on tipping are undertaken by researchers in psychology, management and business programs. Studies on tipping that are conducted by researchers in management and business programs are geared toward understanding and improving service quality, presumably to increase customer satisfaction, and in turn, revenues. Tips appear to provide a useful measure of customer satisfaction and thus provide insight into the tactics that promote it. These studies, quite reasonably, are not particularly concerned with gender differences in customer sociability, since this has no direct economic impact. Researchers who study tipping from a psychological perspective are concerned with the instrumental benefits of displaying pro-social behaviour and are similarly unconcerned with the sociable behaviour of customers. I am interested in customer service transactions for less instrumental purposes. While the instrumental effectiveness of pro-social behaviours is interesting, customer behaviour during public purchasing interactions can also provide insight into gender differences in everyday life.

Sociology tends to discuss gender differences in terms of theory, as stereotypes, or in terms of inequality. While these primarily macro-level concerns are valid, my goal is to contribute to understanding gender differences in everyday life. As such, my study examines customers in everyday service transactions with cashiers to provide an analysis of an observable phenomenon. Based on these observations of brief interactions between customers and cashiers in impersonal settings, I employ a quantitative approach to test gendered theories of politeness and talk by measuring the extent to which differences between men and women exist in terms of verbal behaviour, as well as degree of eye
contact, smiling and overall sociability. These measures are components of politeness generally and customer courtesy specifically. Courtesy refers to habitual politeness and as a term is particularly well-suited to service settings in which the actions and interactions of individuals in their roles as customers and cashiers are fairly routinized.

1.6 Purchasing Interactions – Courtesy on the Seam

Purchasing interactions with cashiers are an appropriate focus for my study of politeness for two reasons. First, service transactions are based on two main principles: equality of service and the expectation that anyone seeking service will be treated with courtesy (Goffman, 1983: 14). As a result, these interactions are not institutionally structured in a way that gender differences in behaviour would be expected. However, as Goffman notes, because these transactions are situated in a broader cultural context, a “tinting of behaviour” occurs based on ‘easily ascertainable ascriptive traits’, including gender (Goffman, 1983: 14-15). While Goffman focused on the behaviour of servers, his observations also apply to the ways in which customers behave toward servers. Second, while these interactions occur in public, paying for purchases is not a context characterized by competition or status gains based on exhibiting knowledge; neither are the interactions within these contexts premised upon fostering interpersonal relationships since they are frequently anonymous. As such, purchasing interactions exist on the seam of the public/private dichotomy, which makes them interesting given the gendered differences that previous research has identified between public and private contexts. These settings are also characterized by what Garfinkel (1967: 30, 70) referred to as
‘shared agreements’ and ‘standardized expectations’ in terms of conduct, which constitute incivility or impoliteness when they are violated.
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.1 Unobtrusive Direct Observation in Real Time

Courtesy, both distancing and affiliative, is displayed through both verbal and non-verbal channels. These include what is said and the context in which it is said, gaze orientations, smiling, body orientation and the length of the interaction. In order to measure gender differences in displays of courtesy, each of the aspects relevant to the situation, which are reflected through behaviour, must be examined. Since these behaviours frequently occur unconsciously, they often appear as different from what the actors intends to portray (Dooley, 1990). Similarly, as Goffman (1959: 50-51) has argued, sincerity is not as important to the success of social encounters as the appearance of sincerity. Consequently, what individuals understand and observe as the social behaviour of politeness is the most valid measure of it. Based on these considerations, I decided that directly observing customers during the course of public purchasing interactions was the best way to assess whether or not and to what degree gender differences in these behaviours exist.

Ideally, I would have used video since it would have allowed the other coder and myself to observe each interaction multiple times, which would likely have yielded the most precise observations. However, because of the practical, ethical and reactivity issues associated with it, I chose to observe customer behaviour in real time. The advantage of this method was that there was a steady supply of potential subjects. The
disadvantage was that the other coder and I had only one chance to observe the
behaviours being displayed by each customer.

2.2 Locations

I collected data for this research in three locations: the University of Victoria
cafeteria, a downtown coffee shop and a downtown fast-food outlet. These settings were
suitable because they were characterized by high volumes of purchases within relatively
short periods of time. As a result, the interactions between customers and cashiers were
brief and anonymous. While this limits the focus and generalizability of my study, it
avoided a ceiling effect that might have occurred during longer, more intimate
interactions. In addition, each of these locations had seating that allowed for the other
coder and I to observe the transactions unobtrusively.

By observing these purchasing interactions in a variety of settings, my study is
able to account for the influence of the character of particular settings on gender
differences in courtesy. Each of the locations in which I conducted observations was
frequented by different populations. The University of Victoria cafeteria primarily serves
students between the ages of 17-22 who are from middle and upper class backgrounds.
In contrast, the coffee shop and fast food restaurant serves an older population. In
addition, while the coffee shop, by virtue of its high prices, appeals to middle class
individuals, the fast food restaurant serves a wider clientele.
2.3 Sampling

Theoretically, I am interested in customers that engage in brief purchasing interactions with cashiers in impersonal settings, particularly in Canadian urban areas. My sampled population was the 2,000-4,000 customers who were potential sources of data during the observations. Based on a quasi-experimental design model, I sampled forty customers from each phase of each location three times, for a total sample of 720 different customers spread out over several cells. Thus, the customers were not randomly assigned to conditions, but there were forty customers per condition.

2.4 Hypotheses

My main hypothesis was that female customers would display more sociable verbal and non-verbal behaviours than men during interactions with cashiers. This means that I expected women to speak more often and more clearly than men, as well as smile and make eye contact more frequently than men. This hypothesis was based on three assumptions: 1) speaking more often, smiling more and making more eye contact reflects sociability 2) sociability reflects an affiliative orientation, which is more characteristic of females than males, 3) these differences in orientation and the corresponding behaviours hold across different days, phases of purchasing interactions, times and places.
2.5 Observations

I conducted observations for this research, along with a female coder from the M.A. program in sociology who had taken courses in methodology that had provided some training in observational techniques. In addition, she was willing to code for free and had learned to use my data collection system during preliminary observations. In an ideal situation, I would have been able to train coders who did not know the hypotheses to conduct the observations and use the data collection system. This would have safeguarded against researcher bias. Unfortunately, the funding and time required to train individuals was not available and the other coder was aware of my hypothesis during the data collection period. I did take three important precautions. First, I reassured her that I did not need the results to fit my hypothesis. Second, she kept her completed data collection sheets until all of the observations were finished. Third, we did not look at each other’s results during the observation sessions. Regardless of these precautions, knowledge of the hypothesis by both coders is a limit that could be improved in future studies.

The observations took place over a ten week period that began in October and ended in January.\textsuperscript{5} Observations were not conducted within two days of school or public holidays, including Thanksgiving, the University of Victoria reading break, Christmas, and New Years. Because individuals generally face less stress and fewer time constraints during the standard working day and work week than later in the day and on weekends, customer behaviour is likely to be different on weekends than weekdays and at different times throughout the day. As a result of these differences, observation sessions were
always held on weekday mornings to hold time of day and phase of the week constant.
The initial goal was to record observations of twenty male and twenty female subjects in each location once per week for one phase of the transaction. While this was achieved at the university cafeteria, two days were required to gather forty observations at the fast food restaurant and the coffee shop because there were more obstacles to clearly observing transactions. At the fast food restaurant, the cash registers which allowed for interactions to be observable were only used intermittently. As well, because of the high volume of customer traffic, our view was often obstructed by customers passing in front of us. In addition, unlike the cafeteria, the coder and I were relatively unfamiliar with the coffee shop and fast food restaurant. As a result, we missed many observations. Because we were concerned with remaining inconspicuous, we left after one hour regardless of whether or not we had recorded forty observations. In addition, because of other commitments, the other coder and I were often unable to conduct observations more than three times per week. As a result, while the forty observations listed in each week occurred within ten days of each other, they often occurred in different weeks. In total, observations of 720 subjects were gathered, evenly divided between males and females, arrival and departure phases, and each of the three settings. The observations were limited to interactions involving female cashiers because they are more common than male cashiers and to hold the gender of the cashier constant.6
2.6 The Three Phases of the Purchase Interaction

During my preliminary observations of purchasing interactions, I observed three distinct phases: arrival, transaction, and departure, that occurred during a vast majority of purchasing interactions. While the distinction between them was discernable at each of the three locations, there were slight variations based on the types of goods being purchased and the time span that preceded the customers obtaining their purchases. In the cafeteria, customers brought their selections to the cashier. In the fast food restaurant, cashiers took the orders of customers and there was a brief wait while the food was being prepared by other employees in the back. In the coffee shop, the cashier also took the orders of customers as well as preparing the items that were ordered. As a result, the transaction phase was longer in the coffee shop and the fast food restaurant than in the cafeteria.

The first phase of the purchase interaction was the arrival phase. This phase began when the cashier engaged the customer, either verbally or non-verbally, by either initiating the transaction or by responding to the customer. In the case of the cafeteria, it ended when the cashier took the money, meal card, or bank card from the customer. In the fast food restaurant and coffee shop, the arrival phase ended when the customer began ordering, since money was not exchanged until the order took place.

The second phase of the purchase interaction was the transaction phase. In the case of the cafeteria, this phase began when the customer paid and included the cashier swiping the card in the case of meal and debit cards and inserting cash into the cash register in the case of cash payment. In the fast food restaurant and the coffee shop, this
phase began after the customer began to order. In the cafeteria, the transaction phase ended when the cashier returned the card or change to the customer. In the fast food restaurant, the customers paid after the cashier communicated their order to the employees in the food preparation area, but well before the food arrived. This phase ended when the customer received their order. However, when customers ordered coffee or other items that did not require preparation, this phase ended when the cashier returned the debit card or change to the customer. In the coffee shop, the transaction phase ended, in some cases, when the cashier returned the debit card or change to the customer. In other cases, payment occurred first and the transaction phase ended when the customer received their order.

The third phase of the purchase interaction was the departure phase. In all three locations, this phase ended when the customer walked away from the counter and ceased to be engaged with the cashier. In the cafeteria, this phase began when the customer took their change or card. In the fast food restaurant and coffee shop, this phase began either when the customer received their change or debit card, or when they received their order, depending on whether they paid first, as was typically the case in the fast food restaurant, or whether they paid after receiving their order.

In sum, the arrival phase began when cashiers engaged the customer by initiating the interaction, or by responding to the customer. The arrival phase ended when the customer gave the cashier payment or when they placed their order. The transaction phase began when the cashier took the order or payment of the customer and ended when the cashier gave the customer their change or their order. The departure phase began
when the customer took their change or their order and ended when the customer walked away and ceased to be engaged with the cashier.

By conceptualizing the purchase interaction as containing three distinct units, the variations became more apparent. Various degrees and combinations of each of the main behaviours that I examined (smiling, verbal behaviour and eye contact) were displayed during each phase of the interactions. This highlights the diverse nature of the interactions: courtesy can be displayed in different ways, to varying extents and at different times during these interactions. However, for simplicity, I excluded the transaction phase from my observations. Verbal and non-verbal interaction, while they did occur occasionally, were both rare during the middle phase of the transaction, likely because of how busy the cashier was and because, in the case of the cafeteria and in some cases the fast food restaurant and coffee shop, the cashier had to face the cash register to physically secure the payment and make change. In the other cases, they were either communicating the order or preparing the order. These considerations excluded the possibility of facing the customer, an obvious impediment to exchanging social cues.

In addition, I decided to measure the arrival and departure phases separately. During pilot testing, there was insufficient inter-coder reliability achieved when recording observations for both of these phases. Recording so many subtle variations in behaviour in such a short period of time created a memory problem for the observers. While measuring these phases separately did not account for as many of the variations in terms of courtesy displays over the course of the entire interaction for each customer, it allowed for more accurate observations, as well as still being useful for measuring the gender differences displayed in each of these phases.
2.7 Measuring Sociability

The range of acceptable behaviours that customers can display during purchasing interactions is limited by unspoken rules or 'shared agreements'. Violations of these norms can take many forms, including common forms of verbal incivility, such as swearing, sexual remarks, and verbal aggression (Phillips and Smith, 2003: 91), bargaining for fixed price items (Garfinkel, 1967) and more extreme examples, such as physical violence, smoking, spitting, and sexual gestures. The measures of sociability that I used are limited to socially acceptable displays and are inclusive by virtue of the behaviours that I witnessed being limited to socially acceptable displays. Within the bounds of acceptable or conventional conduct, there were three main types of customer behaviour within the arrival and departure phases that were important in terms of displaying courtesy: verbal content, smiling and eye contact. I explain each of these measures below:

**Verbal Behaviour**

Verbal measures displayed the most variation of the three aspects of behaviour that I examined. They ranged from customers saying nothing at all during the course of the exchange, to greeting the cashier during the arrival phase, engaging in small talk, displaying thanking behaviour and expressing well-wishes during the departure phase. Between the two poles, customers mumbled incoherently, mumbled “thank you” or “thanks”, said “thank you” or “thanks” audibly one or more times. These behaviours
correspond with degrees of courteousness. Saying nothing, while not necessarily impolite, was the most distancing and least courteous. Because of the different functions and corresponding behaviours associated with arriving and departing from the paying area, ‘minimally courteous’, ‘more courteous’ and ‘most courteous’ verbal behaviours were different for the arrival and departure phases.

**Arrival Phase**

‘Minimally Courteous’

I considered responding to a cashier-initiated greeting without mirroring (responding to a greeting with the same or similar words without initiating further exchange) to be minimally courteous. While responding without mirroring was more than nothing, which would involve acting as if nothing was said, it is conventional to reply by saying something similar in return. This convention is based on the expectation that any customer is not so important that cashiers need to know their mood. Saying something similar in return restores at least an artificial symmetry (and hopefully genuine symmetry) in terms of status. However, responding without mirroring did occur at the fast food restaurant:

Cashier: “How are you today?”
Customer 317: “Okay.”

Also, mumbling, meaning an incoherent or non-linguistic utterance, is minimally courteous. While it is more than nothing, it is limited in terms of expressiveness in comparison to audible and articulate utterances, suggesting a lack of effort and/or interest in the interaction and/or the person involved.
‘More Courteous’

I considered responding to a cashier-initiated greeting by mirroring to be more, but not ‘most courteous’. Examples of mirroring included:

Customer (Pre-13: Male. The cashier greeted the customer by saying “hello”. The customer responded by saying “hi”.

Customer Pre-15, Pre-28: Male; Customer Pre-19: Female. The cashier greeted the customer by saying “hi”. The customer responded by saying “hi”.

Customer Pre-3: Male. The cashier greeted the customer by saying: “Hi, how are you doing?” the customer responded: “Good, how are you doing?”

While these verbal behaviours were courteous and expressed sociability, it was in response to the cashier’s courtesy, and did not include additional sociability on the part of the customer. As a result, while it was more than nothing, and more than minimal, it was no more than a customary social response.

‘Most Courteous’

I considered customer-initiated greetings or expressions of concern (e.g. asking “how are you?”) to be ‘most courteous’. I also considered mirroring a cashier-initiated greeting or expression of concern to be ‘most courteous’ if the customer went beyond mirroring, for instance by taking another turn at asking the cashier a basic sociable question:

Cashier: Hi, how are you?
Customer: Fine, how are you?
Cashier: Fine thanks.
Customer: Enjoying the weather? . . .
Any attempt to prolong the conversation, and any conversation that is non-instrumental, i.e. not about the item(s) being purchased or the money being exchanged (with the exception of joking about either), exceeds conventional requirements and expectations of politeness in most settings characterized by anonymity and frequent transactions. In the rare cases that I witnessed small talk, a majority of the exchange occurred during the transaction phase. One example of exceeding conventional requirements is included below:

Customer Pre-3: Male. During the arrival phase, the cashier asked the customer: “How are you doing?” The customer replied: “Good, how are you doing?” The customer then asked: “You guys [meaning the cafeteria staff] off for reading break?”

**Departure Phase**

‘Minimally Courteous’

Like the arrival phase, I viewed mumbling in the departure phase to be minimally courteous by virtue of being more than nothing, but below social expectations in terms of being audible and coherent. Because thanking behaviour is common during this phase of the purchase interaction, mumbling “thank you” or “thanks” was often understandable despite being stated quietly or inarticulately. As a result, during this phase, I considered minimal courtesy to include non-linguistic or incoherent utterances, as well as inarticulate but understandable statements of thanks.

‘More Courteous’

I considered clearly audible and articulate statements of “thanks” or “thank you” during the departure phase to be ‘more courteous’. These were either initiated by the
customer or were in response to a cashier saying thank you. While articulately saying “thank you” is polite, it does not exceed conventional expectations regarding courtesy and is considered ‘common courtesy’. While saying “thank you” without prompting is likely more courteous than mirroring, neither exceed common courtesy. In addition, neither is as non-sociable as mumbling in terms of effort. Finally, after the cashier said ‘have a good day’ or ‘bye/goodbye’ or thank you/thanks, the customer no longer had an opportunity to initiate the exchange. Based on the same principle, I also considered mirroring well-wishes (e.g. have a good day// you too) to be ‘more courteous’.

‘Most Courteous’

I considered well-wishes (e.g. “have a great day”, “take care” etc.), multiple thanking, thanking with emphasis (e.g. “thank you very much”, “thanks a lot”), saying goodbye and engaging in small talk to all be ‘most courteous’. Some examples are listed below:

Customer Pre-3: Male. “Thanks a lot, bye.”

Customer Pre-5: Male. The cashier said “have a good night”. The customer said “you too . . . bye.”

Customer Pre-24: Male. The customer said “thank you”, the cashier replied “thanks”, and the customer said “thanks”.

Customer Pre-25: Gender not Recorded. The customer said “thank you”. They then talked briefly about reading week.

Like the arrival phase, each of these examples exceeded the behaviours conventionally understood as ‘common courtesy’.
Eye Contact

Unlike verbal measures, the same range of eye contact behaviours applied to both the arrival and departure phases. In addition, these were less varied than verbal behaviours. During my preliminary observations, I observed four main gaze behaviours displayed by customers during purchasing interactions. These ranged from making no eye contact at all with the cashier (‘nothing’) to making sustained eye contact (‘most courteous’). In between these two poles, I observed customers glancing once at the cashier, which I considered to be ‘minimally courteous’, and glancing multiple times at the cashier, which I considered to be ‘more courteous’. In terms of sociability, glancing can be thought of as running parallel to mumbling, in that it is more than nothing, but indicates only a minimal degree of acknowledgement and engagement with the cashier. The reason that glancing multiple times is ‘more courteous’ is because the increased frequency of the behaviour reflects increased engagement with the cashier.

Smiling

Like eye contact, smiling was measured in the same way during both the arrival and departure phases of the purchasing interaction. In addition, the range of smiling behaviours was more limited than verbal behaviours. During my preliminary observations, the smiling behaviours of the customers that I observed ranged from not
smiling at all (‘nothing’) to sustaining a smile throughout the phase of the purchasing interaction (‘most sociable’). In between these two poles were grimaces, characterized by a brief rise of the corners of the mouth, multiple grimaces and small smiles, which included brief but substantial upward lip movement. Like mumbling and glancing, grimaces reflect minimal sociability, as they are more demonstrative than nothing, but less engaging than a full smile. Like multiple glances, multiple grimaces are ‘more courteous’ because the increased frequency of the behaviour reflected increased engagement with the cashier.

Thus, my conceptualization of sociability includes measures of verbal behaviour, eye contact and smiling. Behaviours within each of these measures range from ‘nothing’ to ‘most courteous’ based on the degree of expressiveness displayed by customers in relation to social conventions within each of the locations in which purchasing interactions take place.

2.8 Data Collection

Because of how closely related the sociability measures that I have listed are to the specific instructions for observers, I will describe the scale that was used for both data collection and analysis before discussing procedure and position:

For the verbal, eye contact and smiling measures, what I have referred to above as ‘nothing’, ‘minimally courteous’, ‘more courteous’, and ‘most courteous’ correspond with the numbers “0”, “1”, “2” and “3” respectively. These numbers served a dual
purpose. They were used for recording customer behaviours and served as an initial sociability scale for analysing the data.

With regard to smiling and eye contact behaviours, the instructions to observers for both the arrival and departure phases were as follows:

**Smiling:**

Circle “0” if the customer displays no smiling during the phase of the transaction. This means that there is no noticeable rise of the corners of the mouth.

Circle “1” if the customer grimaces only once during the phase of the transaction. This means that there is some rise of the corners of the mouth, but it is minimal and brief.

Circle “2” if the customer grimaces more than once OR if the customer exhibits a small smile during the phase of the interaction. This means that there is a substantial rise of the corners of the mouth, but it is brief.

Circle “3” if the customer exhibits a small smile more than once during the phase of the transaction OR if the customer sustains a smile during the phase of the interaction.

**Eye Contact:**

Circle “0” if the customer displays no eye contact with the cashier during the phase of the transaction.

Circle “1” if the customer glances only once at the cashier during the phase of the transaction.

Circle “2” if the customer glances at the cashier more than once during the phase of the transaction.

Circle “3” if the customer sustains eye contact with the cashier during the phase of the transaction.
Verbal – Arrival Phase:

With regard to verbal behaviours, the instructions to observers were different for the arrival and departure phases. The instructions for the arrival phase were as follows:

Circle “0” if the customer says nothing audible to the cashier and there is no visible sign of mouth movement that is consistent with speaking.

Circle “1” if the customer mumbles during this phase of the interaction. This means making a sound that is too quiet to hear, or which is audible but incoherent.
OR
If the cashier asks the customer “how are you?” and the customer responds only by answering the question.

Circle “2” if the customer mirror (responds to the greeting by the cashier with the same or similar greeting without initiating any further exchange) (e.g. hi./hi.; hi, how are you?/Fine, how are you?; hello./hi.)

Circle “3” if the customer initiates greeting, meaning saying hi, or asking “how are you?” to the cashier unprompted.
OR
If the customer jokes with the cashier about the food being purchased or the money being exchanged.
OR
If the customer speaks with the cashier about anything other than the food being purchased or the money being exchanged (e.g. the weather, the length of the cashier’s shift, upcoming holidays etc.), so long as the conversation begins before the cashier accepts payment from the customer.

Verbal – Departure Phase:

The instructions for the departure phase were as follows:

Circle “0” if the customer says nothing audible to the cashier and there is no visible sign of mouth movement consistent with speaking.

Circle “1” if the customer mumbles during this phase of the interaction. This means making a sound that is too quiet to hear OR which is audible, but incoherent OR which is understandable, but not well articulated.
Circle “2” if the customer says any of the following audibly and articulately: “thanks”, “thank you”, “cheers”, either unprompted or in response to the cashier saying “thank you” or “thanks” OR the customer says “goodbye” or “bye” audibly and articulately after the cashier says “goodbye” or “bye” OR the customer mirrors well-wishes (responds to the cashier’s well-wishes in the same or similar way (e.g. have a good day// you too).

Circle “3” if the customer does one or more of the following:
- says “thank you” or “thanks” more than once
- says “have a great day” or “take care”
- says “bye” or “goodbye” uninitiated
- jokes with cashier about the food being purchased or the money being exchanged
- speaks with the cashier about anything other than the food being purchased or the money being exchanged (e.g. the weather, the length of the cashier’s shift, upcoming holidays etc.), so long as the conversation occurs as or after the cashier returns change (money, debit card or meal card) to the customer.

Initially, the other coder and I recorded our observations by circling numbers on the data collection sheets that I developed for preliminary observations. However, we became familiar enough with the rating scale that we began to record the subject information and sociability scores on plain sheets of paper. This method made data entry easier and was a more unobtrusive choice than a tape recorder would have been.

2.9 Positioning

In order to effectively observe customer behaviours, the other observers and I had to remain inconspicuous, be able to communicate with each other and most importantly, be able to see and hear the customers. As a result, the other coder and I sat close enough to each other to communicate and close enough to the site of the interaction to see and hear. However, as a result of the differences between the settings, our orientations to each other and our angles of observation were different in each. Because of the way the
tables were set up, we sat across from each other in the University of Victoria cafeteria (See Figure 1). This was the best location in terms of our angle of observation, although our view was frequently interrupted by other customers. The other observer and I sat perpendicular to each other in the coffee shop as a result of the spatial set-up (See Figure 2). Our position in this location was advantageous because we were upstairs, which meant that we were rarely noticed and our view was never interrupted by other customers. The disadvantage was that we were slightly further from the cashier than in the cafeteria because we were a floor above the cash register. As a result, we missed many observations because we could not hear or see when customers looked down. The fast food restaurant was the most challenging because we had to sit beside each other and were virtually parallel to the cashier (See Figure 3). Because of this awkward positioning, we missed many observations because of customers turning their bodies slightly and because we had to take extra care to remain unobtrusive.

In each setting, the efforts of the other coder and I to remain inconspicuous were aided by a number of tactics. First, we only made observations for five minutes at a time and spoke to each other in between these intervals while looking away from the counter. This helped to avoid appearing as if looking at transactions was our main involvement. In addition, we brought stack of papers that we focused on intermittently to try to look less suspicious and to avoid drawing the sort of attention that leads to reactivity. Last, because there was more than one of us, we had a wider range of chair and body orientations afforded to us than an unaccompanied observer would. By keeping our chairs oriented toward each other, as much as possible, we hoped that our activities were viewed by outsiders as related to our interaction as opposed to data collection. Based on
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the fact that we were never approached by employees, managers or other customers, we seem to have succeeded in remaining inconspicuous.

Subject Selection and Observer Communication

When the other observer and I were ready to proceed with data collection, we determined which customers to record observations for by verbally agreeing. We typically achieved this agreement by identifying the gender of the customer and an identifying feature, such as their hair colour or an item of clothing. While collecting data for departure phase, the other coder and I tried to avoid conspicuousness by beginning the observation with one observer looking at the customers and one looking at the other observer. At the end of the arrival phase, in the case of the cafeteria, the observer looking at the counter informed the other that it had ended. At this point, the second observer looked toward the counter awaiting the start of the departure phase. At the coffee shop and the fast food restaurant, the observer looking at the counter would try to predict when the departure phase was about to end and inform the other observer. In each location, this tactic reduced the time that the other observer and I spent staring intently at the counter.

Exclusions

There were five reasons for excluding customers from recorded observations. First, we excluded individuals who arrived at the counter in groups. This is because it was difficult to determine who the verbal and non-verbal behaviours exhibited by a
customer were directed towards -- the people that they were accompanied by, or the cashier. Second, when the view of either observer was blocked during the target phase, which happened often as a result of regular traffic associated with being in a food-service setting, the observer whose view was blocked told the other observer to cross the subject off of the data collection sheet. Third, in situations when the hair of a customer interfered with the view of either observer of their face, they were excluded from the data. Fourth, potential customers who were making change rather than purchasing were excluded. The main reason for this is that if there is no purchase, then it is not a purchasing interaction. Fifth, if one of the observers was distracted and failed to notice or record the target behaviour, or if they were uncertain about what they observed, then they informed the other to remove that customer from the data collection sheet. This happened often as a result of the subtlety of the variations in behaviours and the speed at which they occur. The main principle for exclusion was therefore that it should occur if either observer's perception of the customer being observed was interrupted for any reason.

2.10 Coding and Index Construction

As I have outlined above, coders circled a number from 0-3 for each of the three target behaviours. In addition to recording the behaviours observed, these numbers constitute interval scale data for verbal, eye contact and smiling behaviour, as well as a measure of total sociability. To derive each of the individual target behaviour scales, I added together the numbers that each coder recorded. Since each coder selected a number ranging from 0-3, the interval scale for each target behaviour ranges from 0-6.
Using interval scales for analysing my data is appropriate for a number of reasons. First, the scores ‘0’, ‘1’, ‘2’ and ‘3’ represent distinct degrees of sociability ranging from ‘nothing’, ‘minimal’, ‘more’ and, ‘most’ respectively. They also represent the entire range of observed behaviours that were polite, which means at the very least, not rude, and that were inherently related to the interactions between customers and cashiers. Finally, because the differences between ‘nothing’ and ‘minimal’, ‘minimal’ and ‘more’, and ‘more and most’ reflected differences in behaviour that were both subtle and discernable, the distance between ‘0’ and ‘1’, ‘1’ and ‘2’, and ‘2’ and ‘3’ are commensurable. In addition, while the target behaviour scales range from 0-6, it is composed of 4-point scales ranging from 0-3. In general, interval scales are used for scales that are 5-points or higher. However, because my measurement accounted for the entire range of polite, or socially acceptable, behaviour in the context of a purchase interaction, and because the distinctions were so fine, additional categories would be superfluous. Based on these considerations, as well as accepted practices in sociology that treat 4-point to 7-point scales as interval, and because of the presence of a theoretically meaningful zero point, measuring at the interval level is justified.

I selected verbal behaviour, smiling and eye contact as measures of sociability because, with very few exceptions, they were the only behaviours that customers displayed that related to their interactions with cashiers. As a result, they were inclusive. Because of the close proximity between the customer and the cashier and the fact that the cashier almost always looked at the customer during the arrival and departure phases, I also considered each of the target behaviours to be equally important. Thus, the intervals in each of the individual scales are commensurable, the numerical measures are the same
in each scale and represent parallel measures of sociability, and the target behaviours measured are inclusive and equally important. As a result, the scores for verbal, eye contact and smiling measures can be meaningfully combined to measure total sociability. A combined measure is useful because it accounted for potential differences in how individual customers displayed courtesy as well as capturing the variability between the perceptions of the coders.

A measure of total sociability was derived for each subject by adding the scores of the three target behaviours together. Since each subject was rated from 0-3 on three different measures, the scale for each coder ranges from 0-9. As a result, the interval scale for total sociability, which combines the scores recorded by both coders, ranges from 0-18.
3.1 Reliability

Before analysing the data, a test of inter-coder reliability was calculated using Pearson correlations. Since this measure correlates measures of behaviours using the same scale, the Pearson coefficient, rather than the Pearson squared coefficient, represents the proportion of "true score variance" (McNemar, 1969: 165). The inter-coder reliability measures for the combined measures of verbal, eye contact and smiling, as well as total sociability are listed in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 720 Customers

There were high levels of agreement between the observers for the three component measures of sociability and very strong agreement for the total sociability index. There were a number of distinct trends in terms of reliability. First, across phase and location, the highest level of reliability was for total sociability, followed by the verbal measure and smiling, with the lowest levels of agreement for eye contact. Second, reliability was higher for observations during the arrival phase than the departure phase
(Table 2). Third, in terms of location, the reliability was highest for observations taken in the cafeteria and lowest for observations in the coffee shop (Table 3). Fourth, inter-coder reliability was higher for female subjects than male subjects (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Inter-Coder Reliability by Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Inter-Coder Reliability by Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Inter-Coder Reliability by Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inter-coder reliability was lower (below .70) in five of the total of seventy-two measures (four measures of sociability multiplied by eighteen observation sessions) (See
Table 5). Three of these five appear to be the result of an unusually bad day. In addition, each of the five scores occurred during the first week of observation. This strongly suggests that the observers were still becoming acclimatized to the newer settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Arrival 1</th>
<th>Arrival 2</th>
<th>Arrival 3</th>
<th>Depart 1</th>
<th>Depart 2</th>
<th>Depart 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
<td>n = 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between levels of agreement by location are likely related to a number of factors. First, the other coder and I conducted preliminary observations in the cafeteria. As a result, we were more familiar with it than the other locations. Second, unlike our observations at the fast-food restaurant and the cafeteria, the other coder and I were sitting a floor above the site of the transaction, which made observations more difficult.

The relatively low agreement in measuring the non-verbal behaviours of customers as compared to verbal behaviour is likely a function of distance and angle.
Verbal behaviour was easier to observe because the orientation of the customer's head had very little impact on the ability of the observers to hear. In addition, observing the verbal measure, while primarily relying on hearing, also had a small visual component, since seeing whether or not and how customers move their lips can compensate for lower volume. Non-verbal measures, on the other hand, are purely visual and were therefore more difficult to measure. In addition, measuring eye contact and smiling at the same time is challenging since the other observer and I had to attend to two distinct behaviours at once with only one sense. The lower agreement for non-verbal behaviours is also likely a function of distance. The fact that the reliability for total sociability is higher than for any individual measure suggests that the other observer and I recorded slightly different component measures, but were reliably observing the underlying phenomenon of courtesy.

Differences in reliability by gender were largest for verbal measures and smiling (Table 4). Interestingly, reliability for eye contact was virtually the same. However, there do not appear to be any patterns in the score differentials between the other coder and I that account for these differences (See Tables 6 & 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Descriptive Statistics by Coder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, reliability should be above .80 (Carmines and Zeller, 1979: 51).

However, this standard applies more to observations of written materials, self-reports, recorded behaviours or observations conducted in controlled settings than to field observations in real time. In fact, measuring reliability in field research is rare and in the cases that it is measured, the research does not measure the number or range of the behaviours that I address. Given these considerations, the level of inter-coder reliability is high.
3.2 Sociability Findings

My main hypothesis was that female customers would display more sociable behaviour than men during interactions with cashiers. I measured this in four ways: verbal behaviour, eye contact and smiling, as well as a composite measure of sociability that combined the three measures. I also expected that these gender differences in behaviour would hold across different days, phases of the purchase interactions, and locations.

To test these hypotheses, I performed a series of independent means tests for the overall sample, as well as a one-way analysis of variance for the three locations. As expected, females scored higher than males on total sociability, as well as each of the component measures (See Table 8). The difference was statistically significant for each measure (See Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male n = 360  Total N = 720
Female n = 360
Table 9: Gender Differences in Four Total Sociability Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>ETA²</th>
<th>Sig. (One-Tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-5.68</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-4.543</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-3.144</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-6.092</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 720

This finding holds for each component measure as well as the composite measure for the arrival phase (See Table 10), the departure phase (See Table 11), and at each of the three locations, with the exception of the eye contact measure at the fast-food restaurant, which was very close at .052 (See Tables 12, 13, and 14).

Table 10: Gender Differences in Four Measures of Sociability By Phase: Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (One-Tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-3.628</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-2.819</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-2.397</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-3.726</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 360
### Table 11: Gender Differences in Four Measures of Sociability By Phase: Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>-4.407</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-3.689</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-2.063</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-4.893</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 360

### Table 12: Gender Differences in Four Measures of Sociability By Location: Cafeteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-2.928</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-2.229</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-1.854</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-2.986</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 240

### Table 13: Gender Differences in Four Measures of Sociability By Location: Coffee Shop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (One-Tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-3.439</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-2.403</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-1.985</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-3.956</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 240
Overall, more total sociability, verbal courtesy and smiling were displayed in the departure phase than the arrival phase, although only the phase difference in verbal courtesy was statistically significant. In addition, customers displayed more eye contact during the arrival stage than the departure stage. This difference between phases was also statistically significant (See Table 15).

The gender difference in verbal behaviour was slightly more pronounced in the arrival phase than the departure phase, and the gender difference in eye contact was slightly more pronounced in the departure phase than in the arrival phase. The gender differences in total sociability and smiling were the same between the departure and arrival phases (See Tables 10 and 11). Thus, while there are differences between the arrival and departure phases in terms of the degree and types of sociability displayed, the statistically significant gender differences in each of the component measures as well as the composite measure still hold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>-3.494</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-3.201</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-3.617</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 240
There were also differences between each of the three locations in terms of degree and type of sociability displayed. The degree of total sociability displayed in the coffee shop was significantly higher than in the fast-food restaurant, and there was more total sociability displayed in the fast-food restaurant than in the cafeteria, although this difference was not statistically significant. In terms of component measures, smiling scores were significantly higher in the coffee shop than in the cafeteria and eye contact scores for the coffee shop were significantly higher than in both the cafeteria and fast-food restaurant (See Table 16).

In terms of statistically significant relative degree of gender difference between locations, verbal behaviour scores in the fast-food restaurant were higher than in both the cafeteria and coffee shop. In addition, the eye contact scores in the cafeteria and coffee shop were higher than in the fast-food restaurant (See Tables 12, 13 and 14).

Thus, while there were differences between the arrival and departure phases, as well as between the three locations in terms of the degree and types of sociability displayed, the statistically significant gender differences for each of the component measures as well as the composite measure hold. Regardless of the condition or the measure, female customers displayed more sociability than male customers. With one
exception, the eye contact measure at the fast-food restaurant (which was .052), these differences were statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>Sig. (Two-Tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sociability</td>
<td>Cof vs. Caf</td>
<td>Cof &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF vs. Caf</td>
<td>FF &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cof vs. FF</td>
<td>Cof &gt; FF</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verbal</td>
<td>Cof vs. Caf</td>
<td>Cof &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF vs. Caf</td>
<td>FF &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cof vs. FF</td>
<td>FF &gt; Cof</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eye Contact</td>
<td>Cof vs. Caf</td>
<td>Cof &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF vs. Caf</td>
<td>FF &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cof vs. FF</td>
<td>Cof &gt; FF</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Smiling</td>
<td>Cof vs. Caf</td>
<td>Cof &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF vs. Caf</td>
<td>FF &gt; Caf</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cof vs. FF</td>
<td>Cof &gt; FF</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite these consistently statistically significant differences between females and males, gender differences explain very little of the variation. As a result, these findings are not particularly strong. According to the eta-squared measure of explained variation (see Table 9), gender explains 1% of the variation in eye contact, 2.8% of the variance in verbal behaviour, 3.8% of the variance in smiling and 4.3% of the variance in total sociability. Thus, as figures 4-7 show, females scored higher on each sociability measure, but there is considerable overlap in terms of the displays of sociability by males and females.
Figure 4: Verbal Behaviour Scores by Gender

The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains the 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The lines across the boxes indicate the median.

Figure 5: Eye Contact Scores By Gender

The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The lines across the boxes indicate the median. 

* The white circles represent outliers.
Figure 6: Smiling Scores By Gender

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The lines across the boxes indicate the median.
** The white circles represent outliers.

Figure 7: Total Sociability Scores By Gender

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains the 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The lines across the boxes indicate the median.
** The white circle represents an outlier.
The purpose of this research was to examine to what extent gender differences exist between male and female customers in their interactions with cashiers. According to previous research, men (based on an individualistic and instrumental orientation geared toward gaining status) communicate in order to display knowledge. Women (based on an affiliative orientation that prioritizes confirmation and consensus) communicate in order to establish and maintain relationships. Correspondingly, men display "negative politeness", which involves non-imposing distancing behaviour, while women display "positive politeness", which involves expressing positive concern for others. Based on these findings, it was expected that female customers would display more sociability than male customers during purchasing interactions with cashiers. Specifically, it was expected that women would display more verbal behaviour, eye contact and smiling than men, and correspondingly, more total sociability, across different phases of the transactions and at different locations.

4.1 Indications of the Data

Consistent with each of the hypotheses of the study, females scored higher on each component measure of sociability. The mean female score on the verbal measure was 2.75, compared with 2.11 for males. This translates to an average of 'minimally courteous' for both male and females, although the female score is closer to 'more courteous'. The mean female score for the eye contact measure was 1.49 compared to
1.10 for males. This translates to about half-way between ‘nothing’ and ‘minimal’ for males and closer to ‘minimal’ for females. The mean female score for the smiling measure was 2.01 compared to 1.12 for males. This translates to between ‘nothing’ and ‘minimal’ for males and ‘minimal’ for females. The mean scores for the composite measure of total sociability were also consistent with the hypotheses of the study. The mean female score was 6.24 compared to 4.33 for males. This difference indicates that female customer displayed more overall sociability than male customers.

The differences between male and female customers were in the expected direction for verbal behaviour ($p < .001$), eye contact ($p < .01$), smiling ($p < .001$), as well as for the composite total sociability measure ($p < .001$). However, while these differences were statistically significant and in the hypothesized direction, the eta-squared measures of explained variance indicate that the effect of gender on sociability is weak. Of the component measures, gender explains the most variance for smiling (3.8%), followed by verbal behaviour (2.8%), and very little of the variance in eye contact (1%). In terms of overall sociability, gender explained 4.3% of the variance.

4.2 Interpretation

The findings of this study indicate that female customers display slightly more sociable behaviour than male customers during purchasing interactions with female cashiers. The fact that these differences were not particularly large suggests the existence of strong conventions in terms of how customers interact within these settings and that the strength of these conventions outweighs the impact of gender socialization. It is not
particularly surprising that the variance in conduct explained by sex is not large statistically since males and females living in the same culture, frequenting the same locations, share more commonalities than differences.

In terms of the relative frequency and strength of each component behaviour, male and female customers displayed more verbal behaviour than smiling and eye contact. Verbal behaviours were displayed more frequently than non-verbal behaviours despite the fact that cashiers typically faced customers and made eye contact during the departure and arrival phases. This difference between the frequency of verbal and non-verbal behaviours being displayed suggests that the strongest expectation for customers is to 'say something'. Following from this, it is possible that 'saying something' that is clearly articulated, and responding in kind to the greetings and well-wishes of cashiers meets minimum social expectations and represents 'negative politeness', whereas eye contact, smiling and initiating greetings, conversation and well-wishes exceed basic expectations and represent 'positive politeness'.

While the verbal and smiling components of the total sociability measure showed slight, but statistically significant differences, the eye contact component was, despite being statistically significant, substantially less sensitive to sex differences. In addition, eye contact was the least displayed behaviour of the three. This brings into question the validity of eye contact as a measure of sociability during relatively anonymous transactions. The infrequency of eye contact could mean that not making eye contact is a form of deference.

These results also bring into question the validity of treating eye contact as a measure of sociability that can applied to males and females in the same way. While
male customers displayed virtually the same degree of eye contact as they did smiling,
female customers displayed much less eye contact than they did smiling. Since eye
contact was displayed far less frequently than smiling, and since there was a substantial
difference in the ratio of eye contact to smiling, it is possible that eye contact means
something different than smiling for males and females.

4.3 Limitations of the Study

My study is limited in several ways: First, my study is limited in terms of
generalizability because I analyzed a limited number of locations, did not fully account
for differences in the dispositions of cashiers and the character of each setting, and did
not control for age differences. Second, because of the limited number of male cashiers,
my study was limited to customer interactions with female cashiers. As a result, my
study does not account for the differences in responses of customers to cashiers of
different genders. It is possible that my study shows that customers interacting with
cashiers of the same sex display more sociability than customers interacting with cashiers
of the opposite sex. If this was the case, the consequence would be that my study is
systematically biased toward more female politeness. Third, the objective observational
approach of the study provided no opportunity for participants to directly share their
perceptions of reality with the researchers, which means that the validity of my findings
could be completely dependent on the perspectives of the other observer and I. Fourth,
because of the brief duration of these purchasing interactions, I collected data for the
arrival and departure phases separately. As a result, I cannot account for the courtesy
displays of each customer over the course of the entire transaction. This is problematic because it is possible that like verbal behaviour, eye contact and smiling in general, sociability between the phases is interchangeable. Fifth, while only adults were selected, age was not controlled for. Since it is likely that there are differences in the conduct of young, middle-aged and older adults, this study did not account for differences in gender that occurred as a result of cohort differences. Sixth, I chose sex as the independent variable for this study because it is interesting and easy to observe, which was necessary given the short time-span within which the interactions that I was observing took place and my decision to conduct unobtrusive direct observation. However, the use of sex as opposed to gender has two key shortcomings. First, conceptually, maleness and femaleness are a matter of degree and using sex as a predictor does not capture this continuousness of gender variation (Baker and Chopik, 1982). Second, the use of a crude nominal measure, particularly a dichotomous one, reduces the precision of statistical analysis, whereas gender, which occurs along a continuum, increases the amount of variance than can be explained (Baker and Chopik, 1982).

4.4 Extensions

In terms of future research, the use of video would be extremely helpful because it would allow for the entire purchasing interaction to be observed, which would allow for a more complete measure of sociability. In addition, future studies should include interactions with male and female cashiers in order to determine the extent to which the sociable behaviour of male and female customers and the differences between them vary
according to whether the cashier is of the same-sex or the opposite-sex. Future studies could also follow the lead of tipping studies that hire waiters and waitresses as confederates and hold the dispositions of cashiers constant by hiring them as confederates (see Rind and Bordia 1995, 1996 and Van Baaren, 2003). In addition, if the cashier(s) were confederates, they could systematically vary the extent to which they display eye contact and smiling, as well as the words that they use. This would control for variation in the disposition of cashiers and provide a more stable basis for comparing the behaviours of male and female customers.

There are a number of possibilities for related research in the future, which are directly connected to the limitations discussed earlier and that could include the suggestions listed above. These possibilities fall into two categories reflecting two distinct, albeit complementary, orientations. The first involves continuing to explore what the best predictors of sociability are. The second involves examining perceptions of sociability. I offer ideas for future work based on each orientation below:

**Predictors of Sociability: Sex vs. Gender**

A future study could be designed to assess the degree to which sociability varies according to gender rather than sex. This would involve two steps. First, individuals, likely students in large university classes, would fill out questionnaires in which they would indicate their sex, age and other demographic information as well as answering questions geared toward identifying their position along a masculinity-femininity scale.10 In exchange, they would be given credit at the school’s cafeteria. The second step would
consist of observing (hopefully by recording) their behaviours during their purchasing interactions with cashiers. Their credit voucher would have a number on it that would match their questionnaire, which would allow the experimenter to examine courtesy displays in relation to the location of respondents along the masculinity-femininity continuum. While this would involve considerable time, coordination, money and cooperation from cashiers, as well as involving numerous ethical issues, it would provide a useful test of the degree to which sociability varies as a function of gender, not just sex.

The Significance of Sex Differences: Perceptions of Sociability

While sex is less precise than gender, it is still a crucial and more widely used classification principle in society than gender. It might be more applicable to examine how sociable behaviours are subjectively interpreted by cashiers, or others for that matter, to determine what constitutes conventional and/or acceptable behaviour and whether or not and to what extent this varies by gender. My study has shown that there are sex differences between males and females, although they are not strong. However, while these differences are small, it is because they involve behaviours that vary by the millimetres that mouths move, milliseconds that eyes meet and decibels that voices raise. These variations are far greater in terms of impression management and interpersonal perception than they are in physical magnitude. As a result, it would be interesting to ask cashiers to view videotapes of customers interacting with cashiers and to ask them to identify and/or rate examples of rudeness, politeness, friendliness and excessively sociable behaviours. This would make it possible to determine if there is a ceiling effect
for sociability that varies by the gender of the customer and the cashier and if there is a different floor effect. It could also facilitate determining the relative importance of eye contact, smiling and verbal behaviour and the extent to which they are interchangeable. This would involve more complexity, time and money, as well as meeting more stringent ethical requirements, but would yield more precise results.

4.5 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to determine to what extent differences exist between male and female customers in their displays of courtesy during purchasing interactions with cashiers. The data have shown that female customers display more verbal behaviours, smiling and eye contact, and correspondingly, more total sociability than male customers. These findings are consistent with my hypotheses. While the strength of these findings is not particularly strong in terms of explained variance, the nature of my design makes them noteworthy. The contexts that I studied limited the opportunities of customers to display sociability because of the brief duration of the interactions and the associated social expectations regarding acceptable behaviour. In addition, the interactions that I observed occurred in settings in which there was no status to be gained or relationships to be developed as a consequence of displaying politeness. Despite the limited opportunities and the absence of factors that often motivate courtesy, there were significant differences between male and female customers.

In some ways, this study offers more questions than answers. What is conventional customer behaviour? Does this differ for males and females? Is this related
to sex, to gender or both? How are the same behaviours that are exhibited by different sexes perceived by each sex? What factors explain the variance in customer behaviour? This study offers a starting point to these questions both theoretically, and perhaps more importantly, methodologically.
Endnotes

1 Examples of hedges include: “I guess”, “I wonder”, “You know”, “kinda”. Examples of tag-questions include: “wasn’t he?”, “isn’t it?”, “don’t you?”. Examples of empty adjectives include: “charming”, “cute”, “dear”, “sweetie”. Hedges and tag-questions function to soften statements, imply reduced certainty, are less authoritative, facilitate response, and reflect cooperation. Empty adjectives function to soften statements (Tannen, 1990: 227-228; Holmes, 1995: 72-74).

2 Tannen and Holmes have both identified gender differences in intonation, specifically the use of “high rising terminal” (HRT). HRT is a linguistic device characterized by a rise in tone at the end of an utterance and functions in a similar way as hedges and tag-questions in that it functions to soften statements and encourage mutual participation (Holmes, 1995: 101-106).

3 In some cases perceived service quality includes food quality, despite the fact that it is not under the control of servers (Bodvarsson and Gibson, 199; Harris, 1995).

4 Garfinkel (1967: 30) defines ‘shared agreement’ as an operation in which the “various social methods for accomplishing the member’s recognition that something was said-according-to-a-rule.” However, I take the concept of shared agreement to apply to actions as well as what is said.

5 Data collected commenced after an ethics waiver was granted by the University of Victoria Human Research Ethics Board (Protocol Number 380-04) on October 26 based on the proposed research being innocuous, ensuring the anonymity of subjects, and occurring in the public domain.

6 Over the course of the observation period, I observed interactions involving approximately fifteen different female cashiers. There were three different cashiers at the University cafeteria, four at the coffee shop and approximately eight at the fast-food restaurant.

7 Although I focused on them at the beginning of my study, I have chosen to exclude the length of interactions and the body orientations of customers. While these aspects of behaviour are important in other contexts, this is not the case in the context of public purchasing interactions. First, the length of the transaction is based more on factors such as the number of people waiting in line than on anything related to courtesy. While a lengthy interaction in another setting is frequently characteristic of a sociable exchange, a long interaction in a busy store or cafeteria would be viewed as unusual and less than courteous, since it would delay the other customers in line and place the cashier in an uncomfortable situation because of the customers in line. Second, because of the way that the cash register and counter are arranged spatially, the range of socially acceptable body orientations that could be displayed is essentially levelled, since the only socially acceptable behaviour for customers is to stand facing the counter. While different settings have different spatial arrangements, because of the conventions associated with what to do if you are buying something in a store with a counter, cashier and cash register, body orientation is not a useful indicator of sociability.

8 The only exception was a head nod, which seemed to be used as a substitute for saying thank you and occurred only occasionally during the observation period.

9 Reliability for direct observation in field research is common in nutrition research (see Baglio et al., 2004). Typically reliability is measured for identifying food items selected and consumed by children in school settings and inter-coder agreement ranges between .77 and .93. In addition, reliability has been measured for child behaviour in school settings. Reed and Edelbrock (1983) reported reliability scores of .92 for identifying behavioural problems and .83 for ‘on-task’ scores.

10 I take gender to mean culturally constructed distinctions between masculinity and femininity in terms of behaviours, attitudes and beliefs. However, as Jenkins (2000: 472) notes, definitions of gender range widely and can include internal self-perceptions, spiritual concerns, conduct within relationships, choice of
relationship partners, responses of others to the individual and position within a social structure. For a
detailed discussion on conceptualizing gender see Knaak, 2004.
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Appendix A: Box Plots for Total Sociability and Component Measures

Total Sociability

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The line across the box indicates the median.

Verbal Behaviour

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The line across the box indicates the median.
Eye Contact

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The line across the box indicates the median.

** The white circles represent outliers.

Smiling

* The boxes represent the interquartile range which contains 50% of values. The whiskers are lines that extend from the box to the highest and lowest values, excluding outliers. The line across the box indicates the median.