Which screens to share in stores with which customers?

Abstract

Following retailers' attempts to tangle the digital and physical realm together, digital devices have been provided to shop assistants to support them in their selling process. Accordingly, they are expected to use their screens while interacting with their clients. The objective of this paper is to identify the most suitable screens to share with customers during a service interaction. It introduces the concept of «perceived sharing affordance" into the marketing literature by identifying the characteristics of screen-devices perceived by customers as enabling their sharing. The findings show distinct devices categories associated with the customers' screen-sharing motives following the perception of what they «afford» to do in a sharing process.

Key words: Phygital, shop-assistant, joint-shopping, screen-sharing, selling-process

> Yonathan Silvain Roten
Panthéon-Sorbonne Paris I University- France
Interdisciplinary Research Pole in Management Sciences (PRISM Marketing)
Email: ys.roten@gmail.com

> Régine Vanheems
IAE Jean Moulin Lyon 3 University - France
Magellan Research Center in Management
Email: regine.vanheems@orange.fr

Introduction and objectives

Shopping together on the same screen has become quite a common practice. Already in 2007, 92% of people in Canada spent between 1.5 and 3 hours a week with their spouse on the Internet and between 1.5 and 4.6 hours with their children (Kennedy et Wellman, 2007). In France, 81.25% of French adolescents say they have already made online purchases with their parents (Durand-Megret, 2014). The phenomenon of shopping together on the same screen, that can occur with different persons (family members, friends and shop assistants) and in different places (at home, in public or commercial spaces) can be explained by the daily time spent on the Internet (Kennedy and Wellman 2007).

Figure 1: Shopping screen-sharing activities with a relative / with a shop assistant

(Images: Thinkstock)

Concerning the commercial places, if retailers have made large investments in stores to provide digital screens for customers' self-service use (Filser 2001), they also supply digital devices to their shop assistants in order to support them in their service process with customers. Whereas some French retailing brands have begun to encourage their shop assistants to go online with their clients when interacting with them, U.S. Nordstrom fashion retailer has already promoted 'co-shopping' practices where customers and shop assistants "shop together" online on the same screen. However, if numerous research have identified consumers' motivations to shop on-line (Childers et al. 2001), very few research have been conducted on their motivations to go on a screen with a shop assistant (Vanheems, 2013 ; authors, 2017a,b,c,d, 2018a).

The objective of this paper is to identify the best ways for shop assistant to share a screen with their customers according to their shopping motivations. More precisely, it aims at identifying the most suitable screens to be shared and the best way to do it. The concept of "Perceived Affordance" gives a first framework to analyze the most adapted screens for interaction. The implementation of this concept, originally from the field of Ecological Psychology (Gibson, 1979) and adapted to Human Computer Interaction (Norman, 1988) is rooted in the assumption that the willingness of a customer to go with a shop assistant on a screen will depend on his perceived features of the screens and on their coherence with his screen-sharing motivations.

This paper is structured as followed. A literature review about the reasons why customers shop together is firstly reported. After being presented, the concept of "Affordance" is used as a framework to identify the perceived features of the devices and the way they fit customer's motivations. The methodology and the main results are then presented. Finally, implications and contributions are developed.

Literature review

Why do people shop together?

Why do People shop together on the same screen? As no research has been conducted on the motivations to do such a common activity, a preliminary literature review is needed to recall firstly the reasons why people shop and secondly why they do it with another person on their sides. Some decades ago, Tauber (1972) conducted a qualitative research to understand the reasons why people shop. He showed that getting a product was not the only motivation to go to a store. On

the contrary, different motivations he classified into personal and social motivations may explain such a behavior. Twenty years later, Babin, Darden and Griffin (1994) showed that shopping can be motivated by utilitarian and hedonic factors.

As a particular case of shopping, shopping with someone else in a store can be motivated by utilitarian or emotional motives. Motivations of shopping together may vary across context and according to the identity of the partner (Kiecker and Hartman, 1994, Borges et al., 2010) and his personal/relational characteristics (e.g., gender, relation length) (Beatty and Talpade, 1994; Furse et al.,1984; Wagner, 2007). In the family context, Lim and Beatty (2011) showed that the decision of a couple to shop together can be motivated by hedonic reasons (expected shopping pleasure) as well as by utilitarian reasons (purchase relevance, financial risk). Concerning perceived risk, shopping together is "a manner to cope with anxiety and stress in a meaningful decision process" (Hartman and Kiecker, 1991). Moreover, companion shoppers may "perform many duties traditionally performed by the retail salesperson" (Lindsey-Mullikin, and Munger' 2011, p.7).

In terms of consequences, shopping with another person in physical stores has been recognized as having mainly a positive impact on purchases in terms of both volume and sales (Mangleburg, Doney and Bristol 2004; Sommer, Wynes and Brinkley 1992). Nonetheless, Borges, Chebat, and Babin (2010) suggested that the positive valence of such a shopping experience depends both on the motivation of the consumer to shop jointly and on the identity of the shopping companion.

Why do people shop together on the same screen?

This literature review, about the reasons why people shop together in physical world, confers a first framework to understand what can motivate people to shop together in the digital world, i.e. around the same screen. Such screen-sharing shopping activity can be expected to be driven by the same types of motivations (hedonic, utilitarian). Furthermore, these motivations are supposed to vary according to the identity of the partners and according to the customer's shopping orientations (Gehrt and Carter, 1992). In a previous research (authors, 2017a,b,c,d, 2018a), three types of motivations to share a screen have been identified: utilitarian, social and individual motivations.

The utilitarian task-related dimension stems from a need for functional assistance in order to succeed at the shopping task in the most efficient manner. The social activity-related component on the other hand expresses an intrinsic motive for social bonding and togetherness. Regarding the individual control-related third motives, it stresses a more individualist need, either active (i.e.: the willingness to have an impact on the shopping process) or reactive (i.e., a reaction to hinder a potential loss of control in the process). These motivations are conform with McClelland (1985) motivational psychology theory called "the three big needs theory", claiming that every human behavior may be addressed within three basic needs described as "achievement, affiliation and power" (Sokolowski et al., 2000). These dimensions which may be described also as transactional, relational and personal action/reaction-oriented in a shopping perspective, continuously evolve and change in their intensities according to past experience and perceived contextual cues (i.e., which can be sorted according to an adapted P.O.S. interaction paradigm[1]).

From the motivations to surf jointly to the perceived "sharing affordance" of the screen

When involved in a screen-sharing activity for shopping, customers are living a "hybrid interaction" as they interact in the physical world (sharing a physical place in which they are close to each other) as well as in the virtual one (sharing a digital place where they surf together). Such an "hybrid interaction" creates complexity and involves not only personal, emotional, interactional, spatial dimensions but also technological ones. Screen-sharing activity may be considered therefore as "new hybrid interactions combining Human-Human Interactions with Humans-Computer Interactions" (authors 2017b). The screen is the artefact that gives rise to this new hybrid interactions that can take place via different tools (display screen, screen table, service kiosk, personal computer, laptops, tablets, smartphones, etc.). As the characteristics of such tools can determine motivations to interact together, the theoretical concept of "Affordance" offers a first framework to analyze their ability to allow such a hybrid interaction. The theory of affordance was first developed by Gibson (1979) as

[1] The Partner, Object, Situation perception of the actor (authors, 2017a, 2017c, 2017d, 2018a) is adapted from Punj and Steward (1983) Person, Object, Situation (P.O.S) interaction framework

an ecologic psychological theory implying "the complementarity of the animal and the environment" (p. 127) in terms of what the natural environment offers to the animal survival actions. In 1988, Donald Norman introduced the concept of affordance into the Human-Computer-Interaction (HCI) field to understand the affordance of a medium. Its principle is based on the perception of the "action possibilities" of a medium by an actor. It assumes that artefacts need to be assessed in terms of what they enable to do rather than only according to their technical physical or even digital components (e.g. see Wells, 2002 extensive review on affordance and computation). The affordance theory is still applied today to evaluate the fit of the "technology" as perceived by the actors. For instance, ElAmri (2015) proposed a classification of connected hybrid objects on the basis of the affordance theory, sorting them according to consumers' perception of what they afford to do. In our research, screens are evaluated according to their perceived ability to allow a share used, that is to say according to their perceived "sharing affordance". In the lineage of this research, the aim in this paper is to evaluate the sharing affordance of screens when they are used with shop assistants in stores:
Are specific screens perceived as more adapted to use together with consumers in stores? Does this perception vary according to their motivations to share a screen?

Method

The objective of this research is to identify the most suitable screens to share with customers during a service interaction and whether they are linked to the motivations of customers to share a screen with a shop assistant.

Sampling and interviews procedure

Since it is the first research exploring the consumers' perceptions of the sharing devices that can be used in stores, an exploratory qualitative approach was chosen. Twenty French customers aged from 16 to 79 were interviewed through semi-structured interviews. Our sampling choice (See Appendix 1) based on diversification (Miles and Huberman 1994) was intended to achieve a theoretical saturation threshold (Glaser and Strauss 1967). External diversification was first achieved by interviewing men and women from distinct socio-economic levels and family situations. A process of internal diversification was then performed according to the "purposeful sampling" design (Palinkas et al. 2015) for the identification and selection of individuals knowledgeable about or experienced with the phenomenon of interest. Based on the need to yield cases that are "information-rich" (Patton 2002), it focused on respondents living with a partner and/ or with grown-up children, who have experienced more numerous situations of screen-sharing interactions in both private and commercial spheres. They were first required to describe a recent shopping experience in store in order to understand their shopping orientations. Then, using a funnel methodology, they were asked about their shopping digital habits, before, during or after visiting a "bricks and mortar" store. Finally, they were required to remember firstly an experience of surfing on the Internet with friends or family members and secondly with shop assistants in stores (See Appendix 2: Interviews guide).

Recalled and Simulated Screen-Sharing Situations

However, at the time of this research (2015), as all respondents succeed to recall a sharing screen interaction with relatives or friends, only slightly more than half of the customers remembered screen-sharing interactions with shop assistants. A scenario-based procedure was therefore adopted for interviewees who did not remember such interactions with shop assistants. These respondents were asked to project themselves into "a screen-sharing scenario" with a shop assistant with whom they remembered having a verbal interaction during their visit in the store. This request for projection was necessary to approach behaviors not yet experienced by all or not fully consciously. Luo's (2005) research drawing on Dahl, Manchanda and Argo's (2001) study has suggested that *"the effects of imagining a social presence on purchase behavior can be similar to the effects of an actual presence"* (Luo, 2005, p.290). Moreover, such "scenario" methodologies have been applied in research on couples' joint-shopping motivations in stores (e.g., Lim and Beatty 2011) and shoppers' attitudes when faced with retail technology (Inman and Nikolova 2017). Bateson and Hui (1992) also supported the use of these simulation techniques, citing them as having advantages over retrospective memory-based ones and providing ecologically valid tests.

The content analysis procedure

A content analysis was carried out according to the methodological recommendations of Evrard et al., (2009)

and Bardin (1977). The interviews were recorded and fully transcribed, and a content analysis was carried out, according to scholars' methodological recommendations (Andreani and Cochon ; Harwood and Garry 2003; Malhotra 2007). A pre-analysis was performed consisting in selecting the corpus to be analyzed (interviews) and reading it meticulously (Bardin 1977). An encoding step was then carried out, choosing and defining the presence of sequences of phrases having complete meanings by themselves as "units of meaning". A corpus categorization, organization and classification process was performed when a set of significant units of record (the codes) were grouped by analogy of meaning and sorting based on the criteria of the entire encoded material. Finally, a process of reorganization of classifications and interpretation by an inferential process yielded an open model. While the horizontal analysis (between respondents) of the interviews highlighted the different features of the screen-devices, the vertical analysis (within respondents) enabled to sort distinct categories of devices and to determine how they are specifically perceived in a screen-sharing perspective. The interviews grid (horizontal and vertical analysis) allowed to examine the relation between the perceived "sharing affordance" of each kind of devices and the customers' screen-sharing main motivations.

Findings

The findings first identify the main features of screen-devices perceived as impacting the motivations of customers to use them jointly with a shop assistant. Then, a typology of digital devices shared between shop assistants and customers in stores is proposed, according to the different screen-sharing motivations of the customers.

Are screens suitable for joint shopping?

Concerning the screen devices, they were described in terms of what they allow (or not) to perform jointly. Two dimensions have been identified: the visibility convenience of the screen and its belonging.

1. The visibility convenience of the screen

The first dimension that has emerged from the content analysis is related to the visibility convenience of the screen. Two visual themes appear: the size of the screen and its angle.

The screen size

The size of a screen illustrates the actors' perception whether a specific screen "affords" more than one person to look at it simultaneously- *"Anyway smartphones, it's a screen made for one person"* (M., 18). Consequently, customers perceive instantly whether it may be *"pleasant"* to share a screen, first according to its size - *"Since on smartphones, it's a small screen ..., on the computer it's still more (…) pleasant"* (M., 18). The sharing affordance of small-sized screens has been described as *"not easy"-"I was next to him (to the shop assistant), so it's not easy because anyway if it's in front of the screen, you're still a little bit aside relatively to the screen because the screen is not so big"* (C., 60). However, the question whether the sharing is *"convenient"* or not also depends of the number of persons crowded around the same screen - *"It's not convenient to be 7 people in front of a small screen"* (M., 18).

The perceived size of the screen is in fact related to visibility issues rather than only physical position convenience - *"It is above all that they see better 'so, visually, it is preferable"* (L., 16). Logically, the size of a screen needs to afford its sharing - *"To watch on a big screen, it would be nice, you may have an image that is better than that on a small mobile screen"* (D., 55). The visual aspect appears as the first condition required of screen-sharing practices and directly related to its affordance to share it with a shop assistant.

The screen angle

A second visual theme that came into light is the possibility to move the screen angle to enable a better visibility - *"He had his computer screen turned towards us and as he went along, he added other parts of the table, we could see everything he added"* (S., 27). The gesture of changing the orientation of a screen to enable a better visibility to the customers is perceived as an invitation to share it and to be a part of the process occurring at the screen - *"Well, with open*

screens at Darty (a consumer electronics retailing brand), well we are with them; what is good is that they turn the screen, you see what they type (...); he was looking at the same time, and I saw everything that was displayed" (O.,38).
A screen which can be turned easily is viewed by customers as a tool which c affords a shared use. Moreover, it seems also easier to turn a screen toward the partner with a mobile device than a fixed one - *"I'll take the laptop for her, I'll tell her "look, what do you think"* (T., 48). In this way, a more effective and cheerful oral and visual communication can then be achieved. The effect of a fixed screen, on the contrary, seems to hinder the communication process between the dyad. *"The (fixed) computer, one cannot take it at hand to tell the other "look…"; the computer is fixed, people are fixed facing the computer and that's what bothers me "*(S.,27). The possibility to turn the screen and variate its angle is perceived therefore as a complementary visual affordance allowing a more pleasant shared use of the device.

2. The belonging of the screen-device

The second dimension is surprisingly not a technical feature of the device. It is related to the belonging perception of the screen-device. The content analysis highlighted that the possibility to use a digital device is associated to its perceived belonging -*"It is the one to who the computer belongs that generally look at it..."* (M., 18) – There is a social taboo that prohibits any active operation at a screen that is perceived as the personal possession of another person - *"Honestly I will not, it's his, his computer (of the shop assistant), I will not touch it"* (PJ, 78). When a screen is considered to belong personally to another person, it usually doesn't "afford" to operate it jointly. Nonetheless, this interesting social norm seems to be moderated by the strength of the link between the partners. When strong-ties partners may feel socially comfortable to touch the device of each other's, that is not the case of weak-ties partners (strangers, acquaintances or shop assistants). In such cases, the partner feels that touching physically the personal device of his occasional screen-sharing partner is far outside the accepted social norms of weak-ties partners' interactions. It is the reason why customers are not poised to actively operate a device perceived as personally belonging to the shop assistant. This perception of device belonging affects therefore the "screen-sharing affordance" evaluation of the customer.

When screens are not able to satisfy the same motivations …

Distinct screens were perceived differently according to their ability to satisfy various sharing motivations. The screen "sharing affordance" seems to be linked with the motivations of the respondent to share the same screen. Actually, we can identify different types of screen-devices that are perceived as more adapted for functional assistance ("Display screen-devices"), for social interactions ("Interaction screen-devices") or for personal control-related use ("Individual screen-devices").

1. The "Display screen-device"

Some devices were perceived as better adapted to functional assistance. The devices we call "Display screen-device" are characterized by a "good visual quality" for both actors (a larger dyadic[2] size and an opened angle) and conceived as belonging to the partner. Sometime, the very shop assistants' act of turning the screen angle to enable a better visibility to the customers is perceived as fulfilling the utilitarian motives of the consumers – "What is good is that they turn the screen, you see what they type (...)" (O., 38). Therefore, such display screen "affords" first the completion of utilitarian task-related motives/ achievement needs of the consumer – "If the screen (of the shop assistant), if I can see things easily or not. That will certainly be something that will make me join or go away and look elsewhere"(P., 55)

2. The "Interaction screen-devices"

Another type of devices that we name "Interaction screen-device" better "afford" mutual activity at them. These devices are constituted by a good visual quality for both interlocutors (a larger "dyadic" size and an opened angle) but perceived as a public or communal belonging (not the personal belonging of any of the partners). For instance, public interactive kiosks in stores with a touch screen enabling mutual activity are classified in those devices category. With this type of devices, the feeling of togetherness and affiliation - "Well…, we are with them"(O., 38) through cooperation - "If it

[2] The term "dyadic size" is used here in order to define the size perception of the "visual sharing affordance" of the screen to two partners.

is someone that is like you or looking for the same thing as you, it can be a form of cooperation and can be nice"(M., 18) is reinforced during the shared activity. This sensation of a shared process is the result of the possibility to have a real exchange when also operating the device mutually and actively - "It can be a moment of exchange... from a quality point of view, it can be nice" (D., 55). Consequently, social activity-related motives to share a screen - "I like it a lot because I... I like to feel part of it" (C., 60) seems to be spurred by this type of devices.

3. The "Individual screen-devices"

These screen-devices have been designated as "Individual screen-devices" as they enable only a unilateral control of the process. It can be symbolized by the customer's smartphone when he is the one leading the surfing process - "If I do not really find an article, well, I can show it to her on my phone" (L., 17). Consumers striving to preserve their autonomy during a screen-sharing exchange with a shop assistant prefer to use their own screen - "I would prefer to be on my screen "(M., 18). Their need of active control during the screen-sharing process -"It's directly the image of the product on my smartphone"(S., 27), restricts any possibilities to enlarge the sharing with the shop assistant beyond a quick glance at the screen - "If I'm surfing with my phone, uh, I can go and show something to someone but we're not surfing both" (S., 27). Here, the use of individual screen devices, stemming from active individual control-related motives may lead only to successive or parallel visual sharing practices between the customer and the shop assistant - "So he can go search directly on his computer, uh ... whether he has it or not and in which place…, so I think it helps them quite a lot" (S., 27).

Nevertheless, "Individual screen-devices" may be also the partner's personal device. In the commercial sphere, the shop assistant's personal mobile device or his/her work computer at the assistance point are additional examples of these kinds of devices. In this case, the sharing affordance of individual screen devices may satisfy reactive individual motives associated with the need to react to a perceived loss of control/power - " I place myself next to him and I look at the screen" (M.,63). This need of visual control also determines the physical position of the customer behind the shop assistant trying to monitor the process s/he is doing at the screen - "She was in front of the screen and I looked like that from behind, uh" (P.,79). In sum, when the shop assistant uses an "individual screen-device" in a sharing process, it stimulates the fulfillment of reactive individual motives associated with the need of reactive control of the consumer.

The table below summarizes the association of the motives to share a screen and the three distinct types of devices according to their visual and social sharing affordance

Table 1

The association of the screen-sharing motives and the types of devices according to their sharing affordance

Type of screen-device/ sharing affordance parameters	Motives to share a screen	Visual sharing affordance		Social sharing affordance
		Size of the screen	Orientation of the screen	Belonging of the screen
Display screen-device	*Utilitarian task-related*	*Dyadic*	*Semi-Opened*	*Shop assistant's device*
Interaction screen-device	*Social activity-related*	*Dyadic*	*Opened*	*Communal device*
Individual screen-devices	*Individual control-related*	*Small*	*Semi Closed*	*Customer's/ Shop assistant's Personal device*

Discussion

The results of this research show that the different screens may be more or less appropriate to fulfill the distinct motives to share a screen. Gaver (1992) claims that " Social activities are situated in their environment: if collaboration depends on complex, subtle social relations, it also depends on a medium in which these relations can work". In our case, the medium is represented by the perceived "sharing affordance" of the screen device. Such an affordance naturally depends on the situation. For instance, the nature of the links between the surfing partners[3] may have an impact on this sharing affordance. As viewed earlier, screen-sharing situation with strong-ties partners (Kiecker and Hartman 1994) appears naturally to moderate the effect of belonging. People feel usually more convenient to operate the device of a more "intimate partner" than the one of a stranger or a "weak ties" partner. Thus, it can be expected that the screen size as well as the belonging effect have less influence in screen-sharing practices between close partners than in a commercial context between shop assistants and customers. In the commercial sphere, the impact also depends on the customer's perceived professional roles of the shop representatives. This role conception might depend on the consumer's cognitive script and accepted social norms of interaction in a commercial context (Goudarzi and Eiglier 2006). Notwithstanding, it may also vary according to the motivational disposition of the customer (i.e., his shopping orientation) and cultural factors of proximity (Hall, 1967). However, the fit of the device to the first dominant motive to share a screen (utilitarian, social, individual) will also be an important factor affecting the decision and the manner to share a screen. Actually, the perceived "sharing affordance" of the device may evolve and change with the intensity of the different motives to share a screen, shaping also the decision to pursue the joint shopping activity at this specific screen-device, or to continue it alone or together at a same or separate screens.

The theoretical implications of this research lie in the applications of the affordance theory to screen-sharing hybrid interactions. It highlights first the dimensions generating the perception of the sharing affordance of a digital tool by customers. Interestingly, not only technical hardware features (size and orientation visual features) were revealed, but also social dimension (the belonging perception of the device). Then, based on these features, a classification of three types of devices used in stores by customers and shop assistances (Display, Interaction, Individual) was proposed on the basis that they enable (or not) different "possible actions" (Norman, 1988) related to the consumers' screen-sharing motives. Since the customer anticipates distinct "possible actions" while sharing these different categories of devices, this new concept of perceived "sharing affordance" can be accounted as a theoretical contribution to Marketing research on subjects related to Marketing Collaborative Practices and Human Computer Interactions.

Conclusion

Nowadays, retailers are trying to provide customers a more engaging and coherent shopping journey, resulting in an enhanced satisfaction. Nonetheless, when they invested in self-service devices intended for customers, they did not question the fundamentals. Why a customer will be willing to use the self-service screens of the store (Glérant-Glikson, and Feenstra 2017; Procacci and Pellicelli 2019), when he has at least one personal screen at his immediate disposition[4]? Similarly, when providing efficient digital tools to their sales' staffs enabling to check stock availabilities on line or to show brands characteristics and compare models online, they didn't think whether and how these new screens can be integrated smoothly in the face-to-face verbal interaction of customers and shop assistants.

Only in the last years, shop assistants' screens have been clearly "opened" to the customers' sight on the premise

[3] Even if a screen-sharing process may occur between a shop assistant and a customer knowing each other's for years

[4] In 2014, already 42% of consumers were using their smartphone to conduct a research online while being in stores - https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-insights/how-digital-connects-shoppers-to-local-stores/ Moreover, a study from 2017 claims that nearly 60% of shoppers look up product information and prices while using their mobile phones in stores - https://www.retaildive.com/news/how-shoppers-use-their-smartphones-in-stores/444147/

that customers will be more satisfied when looking with the shop assistants at the screen. Nonetheless, some recent research has shown that the introduction of technology during interaction with service encounters may constitute either a barrier or a benefit (Giebelhausen, et al., 2014). Subsequently, this study has been conducted to analyze the features of the technology involved in digital devices present in stores and the motives of customers to share these devices with front line employees. In fact, the choice of a device in the store is rarely chosen by shop assistants in a customer centric perspective. The shop assistant usually imposes the use of a specific screen, even if its characteristics is not congruent with the willingness of the customer. That issue can create dissatisfaction especially when the screen is perceived as not appropriate to the situation, that is to say when it cannot "afford" the customer's dominant sharing motives.

This study aimed at identifying the most suitable screens to be shared during a consumer-shop assistant in-store interaction has highlighted three types of screens (Display, Interaction, Individual) according to their visual (size and orientation) and social (belonging) perceived affordance. Interestingly, these types of screens surfaced as associated with different motivations to share a screen. These results show the importance of identifying the main screen-sharing motivation of the customer in order to choose a compatible screen to share.

Understanding customers' perception of screens according to "what they afford to do" on it constitutes the main managerial contribution of this paper. Aggregating screen-sharing practices within the trend of adaptive selling (Koel 2015; Roman and Iacobucci 2010; Weitz, Sujan, and Sujan, 1986), shop assistants could be trained to discern the main motive inducing a customer to share a screen and choose a compatible screen-device, having a corresponding sharing affordance. In this manner, anticipated positive instrumental, social or individual values expected from this joint activity could be fulfilled (authors, 2018b). Nonetheless, one of the limitations of this study remains its level of analysis, focusing only on the customer's perspective without taking into consideration the shop assistants' appetence to share a screen with a customer and its perception of the sharing affordance of the different digital tools used in-store. Even if it seems like a complex task, considering a dyad perspective of screen-devices sharing affordance in an interdependence perspective[5] might enable to understand the crossing of two similar/ opposite or complementary partner's affordance of the same device. Furthermore, this paper has only stressed the association between screen-devices perceived sharing affordance and motives to share a screen. As a matter of fact, upcoming researches might also focus at understanding the congruence of screen-sharing motives, screen-sharing affordance, screen-sharing modes and benefits. Indeed, the impact of this phygital screen-sharing practice on customers' perceived values and satisfaction constitute an intriguing issue with important theoretical and managerial potential contributions. While the scope of this study stands at the private customers in retailing stores, its perspective might be similarly enlarged to B2B and applied to business customers in future research.

References

Andreani, JC, and Conchon, F. (2005). Méthodes d'analyse et d'interprétation des études qualitatives: Etat de l'art en marketing. *In International Marketing Trends, Congress (Venise)* 1-26, ed. Jean-Claude Andreani and Umberto Collesei, Paris: Marketing Trends Association,

Babin BJ, Darden WR and Griffin M. (1994). Work and/or fun: measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping. *Journal of consumer research 20*(4):644–56.

Bardin, L. (1977). Content analysis. *São Paulo: Livraria Martins Fontes.*

Bateson, J. E., and Hui, M. K, 1992. The ecological validity of photographic slides and videotapes in simulating the service setting. *Journal of consumer research, 19*(2), pp.271-281.

Beatty, S. E., and Talpade, S. (1994), Adolescent influence in family decision making: a replication with extension. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(2), 332-341.

Borges, A., Chebat, J. C., and Babin, B. J. (2010). Does a companion always enhance the shopping experience? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 17*(4), 294-299.

[5] I.e. when one person's motives and perceived affordance of a device, affects the motives and device perceived affordance of the partner- (e.g., Cook and Kenny 2005)

Childers, T. L., Carr, C. L., Peck, J., aand Carson, S. (2001), Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping behavior. *Journal of retailing, 77*(4), 511-535.

Cook, W. L., & Kenny, D. A. (2005). The actor–partner interdependence model: A model of bidirectional effects in developmental studies. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *29*(2), 101-109.

Dahl, D. W., Manchanda, R. V., and Argo, J. J., 2001. Embarrassment in consumer purchase: The roles of social presence and purchase familiarity. *Journal of consumer research, 28*(3), pp.473-481.

ElAmri, D. (2015), *"L'Affordance des nouveaux produits hybrides connectés et leur catégorisation par les consommateurs"*; in proceedings of "15eme journee du Marketing Digital, Paris Sorbonne".

Evrard, Y., Pras, B., Roux, E., Desmet, P., Dussaix, A. M., and Lilien, G. L. (2009). *Market-Fondements et méthodes des recherches en marketing* (No. hal-00490724).

Filser, M. (2001). Le magasin amiral: de l'atmosphère du point de vente à la stratégie relationnelle de l'enseigne. *Décisions Marketing*, 7-16.

Furse DH, Punj GN, Stewart DW (1984), A typology of individual search strategies among purchasers of new automobiles. *Journal of Consumer Research*.,10(4): 417-431.

Gaver, W. W. (1992, December), The affordances of media spaces for collaboration. *In Proceedings of the 1992 ACM conference on Computer-supported cooperative work* (pp. 17-24). ACM.

Gehrt, K. C., and Carter, K. (1992). An exploratory assessment of catalog shopping orientations: the existence of convenience and recreational segments. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 6(1), 29-39.

Gibson, J. J. (1979), *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston, MA, US.

Giebelhausen, M., Robinson, S. G., Sirianni, N. J., and Brady, M. K. (2014). Touch versus tech: When technology functions as a barrier or a benefit to service encounters. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(4), 113-124.

Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. (1967). Grounded theory: The discovery of grounded theory. *Sociology the journal of the British sociological association, 12*(1), 27-49.

Glérant-Glikson, A., and Feenstra, F. (2017). *Identifying and understanding value sources while interacting with in-store SSIT* (Self-Service Information Technologies). HAL.

Granbois, D. H. (1968). Improving the study of customer in-store behavior. *The Journal of Marketing*, 28-33.

Goudarzi, K., and Eiglier, P. (2006). La socialisation organisationnelle du client dans les entreprises de service: concept et dimensions, *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* (French Edition), 21(3), 65-90.

Hall, E. T., Birdwhistell, R. L., Bock, B., Bohannan, P., Diebold Jr, A. R., Durbin, M., ... and La Barre, W. (1968). Proxemics [and comments and replies]. *Current anthropology, 9*(2/3), 83-108.

Hartman, C. L., and Kiecker, P. L. (1991). Marketplace influencers at the point of purchase: The role of purchase pals in consumer decision making. *Enhancing knowledge development in marketing*, 461-69.

Harwood, T. G., and Garry, T., 2003. An overview of content analysis. *The marketing review, 3*(4), pp.479-498.

Inman, J.J. and Nikolova, H., 2017. Shopper-facing retail technology: a retailer adoption decision framework incorporating shopper attitudes and privacy concerns. *Journal of Retailing, 93*(1), pp.7-28.

Kennedy, T. L., and Wellman, B. (2007). The networked household. *Information, Communication and Society*, 10(5), 645-670.

Kiecker, P., and Hartman, C. L. (1994). Predicting buyers' selection of interpersonal sources: the role of strong ties and weak ties. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 21.

Koel, M. (2015). Un état de l'art sur la vente adaptative. *in International Marketing Trends, Congress (Paris)* ed. Jean-Claude Andreani and Umberto Collesei, Paris: Marketing Trends Association:

Lim, J., and Beatty, S. E. (2011). Factors affecting couples' decisions to jointly shop. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(7), 774-781.

Luo, X., 2005. How does shopping with others influence impulsive purchasing? *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 15 (4), pp. 288–294.Malhotra, N. K., 2007. Review of marketing research. In *Review of Marketing Research* (pp. v-v). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Mangleburg, T. F., Doney, P. M., and Bristol, T. (2004). Shopping with friends and teens' susceptibility to peer influence. *Journal of retailing*, *80*(2), 101-116.

McClelland, D. (1985) *Human Motivation*, Cambridge University Press.

Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis. 2. Aufl., *Thousand Oaks et al*.

Norman, D. A. (1988). *The design of everyday things* (Originally published: The psychology of everyday things), New York, NY: Basic Books.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., and Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and policy in mental health and mental health services research*, *42*(5), 533-544.

Patton, M.Q., 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oakes.

Punj, G. N., and Stewart, D. W. (1983). An interaction framework of consumer decision making, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(2), 181-196.

Procacci, S., and Pellicelli, C.A. (2019). The impact of Artificial Intelligence on consumers experience: the case of Mc Donald touch screens – *in International Marketing Trends, Congress* (*Venise*) ed. Jean-Claude Andreani and Umberto Collesei, Paris: Marketing Trends Association.

Roman S., and Iacobucci D., (2010) Antecedents and consequences of adaptive selling confidence and behavior : a dyadic analysis of salespeople and their customers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38,3, 363-382.

Sokolowski, Schmalt et al., (2000), Assessing achievement, affiliation and power all at once, The Multi-Motive Grid , *Journal of personality assessment*, 74(1) p 126-145.

Sommer, Robert, Wynes, Marcia, Brinkley, Garland, 1992. Social facilitation effects in shopping behavior, *Environmental Behavior* 24 (3)285–297

Tauber, E. M. (1972). Why do people shop? *The Journal of Marketing*, 46-49.

Vanheems, R. (2013). La distribution à l'heure du multi-canal: une redéfinition du rôle du vendeur, *Décisions Marketing*, 43-59.

Wagner T. Shopping motivation revised: a means-end chain analytical perspective. *International Journal of Retail Distribution Management* 2007; 35(7):569–82.

Weitz, B. A, Sujan, H., Sujan, M (1986). Knowledge, motivation and adaptive behavior : a framework for improving selling effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing*, 50, 174-191.

Wells, A. J. (2002) Gibson's affordances and Turing's theory of computation. *Ecological psychology*, 14 (3). pp. 140-180.

Appendix 1: Interviews sampling

	Age	**Birth place**	**Home town**	**Profession**	**Living situation**	**Gender**
R1	48	Togo- Africa	Paris	Psychologist	Married + children	F
R2	18	Surenne	La Rochelle	Student	Bachelor, living with his parents	M
R3	60	Surenne	Anthony	Architect	Married + children	M
R4	39	La Rochelle	Bois Colombe (92)	Journalist	Divorced + children	F
R5	38	Joinville Manche	Bois Colombe (92)	Journalist	Divorced	M
R6	60	St Jean d'Angely	La Rochelle	Ludothecary	Married + children	F
R7	23	Luxembourg	Saint Cloud(92)	Student	Bachelor - living alone	M
R8	55	Paris	La Rochelle	Producer	Married + children	M
R9	55	Luxembourg	Paris	Cartoonist	Divorced	F
R10	60	Strasbourg	Paris	Teacher	Married	F
R11	34	Strasbourg	Paris	Journalist	Married + children	M
R12	27	Nice	Messe	Speech Therapist	Bachelor - living alone	F
R13	56	Paris	Paris	Accountant	Married + children	M
R14	48	Alger Algeria	Neuilly sur Seine	Surgeon	Living with his partner	M
R15	56	Marseille	Courbevoie	Building keeper	Divorced + children	M
R16	16	Paris	Palaiseau	School girl	Bachelor, living with his parents	F
R17	78	Reaux - Charente Maritime	La Rochelle	Retired	Married + children	M
R18	79	Déllys - Algeria	La Rochelle	Retired	Married + children	F
R19	59	Casablanca Marroco	Issy-les-Moulineaux	Accountant assistant	Married + children	F
R20	39	Strasbourg	Issy-les-Moulineaux.	Communication / Education	Married + children	M

	Men	Women	Bachelor	Married + children	Divorced + children	Divorced	Retired
	11	9	4	5	5	4	2
Percentage	55%	45%	20%	25%	25%	20%	10%

Appendix 2: Interviews sampling

1. Presentation and Method

2. Part One - Open Interview - Non-directive and narrative (Store purchase experience)

3. Part Two - Semi-structured

Theme A: Preliminary information search before purchase / consumption

Theme B: The seller in store

Theme C: The use of a digital device in store (From narrative to projective)

Theme D: Stories of shopping screen sharing with friends and family members. (From narrative to projective)

Theme E: Stories of shopping screen sharing with shop assistants at the point of sale (From narrative to projective)

4. Remarks, conclusion and thanks