1989

Relationships Between Communication Style Variables and Sales Effectiveness

Elaine M. Notarantonio
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Notarantonio, Elaine M., "Relationships Between Communication Style Variables and Sales Effectiveness" (1989). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1024.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1024

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

BF637
C45
N622
1989

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNICATION STYLE VARIABLES
AND SALES EFFECTIVENESS

BY

ELAINE M. NOTARANTONIO

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1989

ABSTRACT

This research involves two studies which investigated the relationship of communication style variables with effective sales performance. Norton's (1978) communication style construct was used as a guiding framework.

Study 1, examined 74 real estate agents' self-reports of communication style, performance and general sales practices used. In addition, objective measures of respondent's performance were obtained from company records.

A stepwise regression analysis revealed the construct of precise as the only significant predictor of income. A step-wise discriminant analysis showed that the constructs of precise and impression-leaving were significant discriminators among groups of salespeople who were categorized based on income.

A cluster analysis was also performed. The three cluster solution was followed-up by a discriminant analysis. The discriminant analysis described two distinct sales types based on different combinations of the communicator style variables. The variables in the first discriminant function were labeled as "strong" while those in the second function were labeled as "casual".

The main finding from this study, however, was that precise was strongly associated with effective sales performance in a real estate organization.

Study II empirically tested whether or not different combinations of the precise and friendly subconstructs affect sales effectiveness.

It was hypothesized that the more Precise a salesperson was, the more effective the individual would be in selling the product. It was also hypothesized that the more Friendly the salesperson was the more effective s/he would be.

Four groups of students saw videotapes of a sales interaction. Each tape depicted one of four combinations of high and low levels of Preciseness and Friendliness. Subjects viewed the tape (n=112) after which they completed a 40-item questionnaire. Separate three-way ANOVAS for each measure were run with Friendly, Precise, and sex as independent variables for the communicator style measures and other selected items.

The results of this study point to precise not being positively associated with sales effectiveness. However, as in study I, the results do indicate that communication style variables which can be perceived as 'strong' are related and it is again suggested that by "blending" different combinations of variables together different pictures emerges.

Directions for future research are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank and acknowledge the many individuals who supported and guided me not only during the preparation of this dissertation but throughout the entire Ph.D. program.

Dr. Jerry L. Cohen, my major professor recognized the major hurdles that I needed to overcome in order to complete this program within a particular time period. His commitment and support to me in meeting my various deadlines required him to go far beyond what his responsibility would require. At the same time his highest standards were never compromised.

Dr. Paul Florin and Dr. Greg Lessne, were also very supportive and committed to me. They were always available, day or night, to answer questions and to provide direction.

A special recognition goes to Dr. Charles Collyer who believed in me from when I first applied to the Ph.D. program.

Finally, I thank my family. My husband, Ralph Charello for being my backbone during this program; my son, Derek Charello for understanding why I couldn't be there for him; my son, Evan Charello, for coming along in the middle of all this; and my parents, Mr. & Mrs. Notarantonio for every kind of support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Approval page-----	i
Abstract-----	ii
Acknowledgements-----	iv
List of Tables-----	vii
Introduction and Background-----	1
Method - Study 1-----	13
Subjects-----	13
Materials-----	14
Results-----	16
Discussion-----	21
Method - Study 2-----	24
Subjects-----	26
Apparatus-----	26
Procedure-----	28
Results-----	29
Discussion-----	33
Future Research-----	36
Table 1-----	38
Table 2-----	39
Table 3-----	40
Table 4-----	41
Table 5-----	42
Table 6-----	43

Table 7-----	44
Table 8-----	45
Table 9-----	46
Table 10-----	47
Table 11-----	48
Table 12-----	49
Table 13-----	50
Table 14-----	51
References-----	52
Appendix A-----	55
Appendix B-----	57
Appendix C-----	64
Appendix D-----	77
Bibliography-----	84

LIST OF TABLES

1. Means and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire items-----	38
2. Pearson Product Moment Correlations for CSM'S-----	39
3. Beta Coefficients for stepwise regression CSM'S-----	40
4. Means and Standard Deviations for Clusters-----	41
5. F-Ratios and Discriminant Function Coef. Cluster Analy.---	42
6. Pearson product moment correlations precise and practice--	43
7. Beta coefficients for regression for Sales Practice-----	44
8. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Lab study-----	45
9. Significant findings for ANOVAS-----	46
10. Cell Means for Dominance in precise x friendly inter.---	47
11. Cell Means for Monopolize in interaction-----	48
12. Cell Means for Strained in interaction-----	49
13. Cell Means for Sales type interaction-----	50
14. Cell Means for liklihood of buying interaction-----	51

Relationships Between Communication Style Variables and Sales Effectiveness

Norton (1978) has established a foundation for a communicator style construct. He defines communicator style as the way in which a person verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered or understood. He operationally defines the communicator style domain in terms of ten independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables or subconstructs are: (1) impression-leaving, (2) contentious, (3) open, (4) dramatic, (5) dominant, (6) precise, (7) relaxed, (8) friendly, (9) attentive, and (10) animated. The dependent variable, also a subconstruct, is communicator image and is included in the domain as an overall assessment of communicator ability. Communicator style is assumed to be different from personality in that it can be deliberately manipulated by the communicator (Norton and Nussbaum 1980).

Two primary lines of research have produced substantial empirical evidence for the reliability and validity of the communicator style construct (Bednar, 1982). One has focused upon the detailed analysis of each of the components which comprise the style domain. To date, four of these have been explicated in some detail: the dramatic (Norton,

Sypher, Clarke and Brady, 1977; Norton, Baker, Bednar, Salyer, and McGough, 1978), the open (Norton and Montgomery, 1979), the relaxed (Emery, Norton and Plain, 1980), and the attentive (Norton and Pettegrew, 1977).

The second line of research has focused upon relationships between communicator style and various perceptual processes and interpersonal consequences. Some topics that have been addressed include: teacher effectiveness (Norton, 1977; Norton and Nussbaum, 1980), dyadic perception of communicator style (Norton and Miller, 1975), the personnel selection interview (Norton and Bednar, 1979; Norton and Robinson, 1980), communicator style as an effective determinant of attraction (Norton and Pettegrew, 1977), sex differences in self-reported communicator style (Norton and Montgomery, 1979, Staley and Cohen, 1988), and communicator style and managerial performance (Bednar, 1982). All of these studies are characterized by the use of Norton's construct as a guiding framework.

In the selling process, exchange is typically initiated, maintained and terminated on a person-to-person basis. The salesperson's most basic activity during this exchange is communication. In the competitive marketplace, effective communication is of paramount importance. Along these lines, it is no exaggeration to say that the salesperson is the most important communicator in the entire organization. All other efforts are of no avail if the salesperson is unable to

communicate in a manner that induces purchase. For the firm to achieve full promotional impact in the marketplace, the salesperson must be an effective communicator. Insight into the communication process is therefore of vital importance. In spite of this, communication has received little attention in personal selling research (Capon, Holbrook, and Hulbert, 1977).

Although there have been many studies which have examined the determinants of sales effectiveness, very few look at communication style. Most of the early empirical work related to personal selling examined the personal characteristics of the salesperson. Several later studies have examined communication content followed by communication code, rules and to some extent style.

Churchill, Ford, Hartley and Walker (1985) conducted a meta-analysis to analyze the evidence in the literature about the factors that affect salesperson performance. The authors obtained 1653 observations of correlations between predictor and performance criteria. Given the large number of factors that have been investigated as possible determinants of a salesperson's performance, the authors categorized the correlations using the Churchill, Ford, and Walker (1985) model of salesperson performance. Their model holds that salesperson performance is a function of five basic factors: (1) aptitude, (2) skill level, (3) motivation, (4) role perceptions, and (5) personal, organizational, and environmental variables. The

results of this analysis show that the determinants rank as follows: (1) personal factors, (2) skill, (3) role variables, (4) aptitude, (5) motivation, and (6) organizational/environmental factors. Another conclusion was that none of the predictors by themselves accounted for a great amount of the variation in performance - less than 10% on the average. Finally, the results indicate that the strength of the relationship between the major determinants and salespeople's performance is affected by the type of products salespeople sell.

Weitz (1981), Friedman & Churchill (1987), and Szymanski (1988) discuss the importance of the degree of adaptiveness of salespeople when selling to clients. In this sense, adaptiveness is defined as "choosing the selling strategy that best meets the needs of the consumer" (Weitz 1981). The authors are specifically referring to the salesperson's ability to categorize subjects accurately at each stage of the sales process, that is, to engage in a qualification process at each stage. By properly qualifying the prospective client into the appropriate selling strategy category, the salesperson can access and apply the influence approach that maximizes the probability of a sale.

Past research efforts have attempted to uncover universal characteristics or behaviors that enable salespeople to perform successfully across a wide range of situations. Interactions between sales behaviors and aspects of the sales situation have

not been considered. Weitz (1981) contends that salespeople have the opportunity to match their behavior to the specific customer and situation they encounter. They can consider each interaction individually and present themselves and their product so as to be maximally effective in that interaction. In some interactions salespeople might find it more advantageous to present themselves as similar to their customers, while in other interactions salespeople might find it more advantageous to be perceived as an expert. This suggests that perhaps the ability to adapt one's presentation to the needs of the situation might be related to sales effectiveness.

Weitz, Sujan and Sujan (1986) provide a framework for research directed toward increasing understanding of the ability component of sales performance. The framework also centered on the specific ability to adapt sales behaviors effectively to the demands of the sales situation. These authors define adaptive selling as " the altering of sales behaviors during a customer interaction or across customer interactions based on perceived information about the nature of the sales situation." However, the framework focuses upon adaptation of content , not style. The authors believe that ability related to adaptive selling is a crucial aspect because it indicates the degree to which salespeople are able to take advantage of the unique communication elements associated with personal selling. Salespeople have the

opportunity to do "market research" on each customer and implement a sales presentation that is maximally effective for that customer. In addition, salespeople observe the reactions of their customers to sales messages and make rapid adjustments (Weitz & Wright 1978). It should be noted that the authors' framework for adaptive selling focuses on manipulation of the sales presentation content as opposed to style. Nevertheless, they recognize the importance of adaptive selling as an overall strategy.

In marketing, most studies that have considered communication style have done so indirectly. One recent exception is a study conducted by Notarantonio and Cohen (1988). This study empirically tested whether or not different communication styles affect perceptions of sales effectiveness using the Open and Dominant styles from Norton's (1978) dimensions. Four groups of students saw videotapes of a sales interaction. Each tape depicted one of the four combinations of high and low levels of Dominance and Openness. The experiment involved subjects viewing the tape after which they completed a 42-item questionnaire. Six composite scores were identified from groups of questions that were a priori related. Four of these composite measures showed significance; perceptions of the product being sold, the interaction between the salesperson and customer in the tape, probability of purchase of the product in the tape and perceptions of the salesperson being depicted in the tape.

Respondents, in general, rated the high Dominant/low Open and low Dominant/high Open conditions more favorably than the high Dominant/high Open or low Dominant/low Open. Notarantonio and Cohen (1988) provided some preliminary evidence for the use of Norton's style dimensions as predictors of sales effectiveness. Another finding from this study that is of notable importance is the finding of significant interactions between the Openness and Dominance dimensions. One of the points made in this study that is relevant to the present research was that by "blending" various combinations of the Open and Dominant variables a different picture emerged in terms of how a communicator was perceived as opposed to how a communicator would have been perceived based on either dimension separately. As mentioned earlier, communication style is something that can be deliberately manipulated by the communicator (Norton, 1978). It appears that in manipulating his/her style, the communicator, rather than to turn one dimension "off" while turning the other "on", tends to use different combinations of the variables such as was demonstrated with the high Dominant/low Open and low Dominant/high Open combinations. To use an analogy, it is not unlike the adjusting of an equalizer on a stereo component system.

Pace (1962) examined the relationship between oral communication and sales effectiveness. Specifically, the study attempted to identify the attributes of oral

communication that reliably distinguished between the selling behavior of the "better" and "poorer" salespeople. Two equitable groups of salespeople were differentiated into a more effective "high" group and a less effective "low" group by means of a Sales Effectiveness Index (SEI) and were compared in terms of selected aspects of their communication behavior. The SEI criterion was computed by dividing the net dollar value of sales by hours devoted to active selling. Each of the subjects was rated on six separate factors of oral communication (voice, language, bodily behavior, listening, personal attitudes, initial impression) and on a "gestalt" or overall impression. These factors are relevant to Norton's communicator style variables in that (1) each of the ten independent variables of Norton's measure are, in part, based upon the same six factors that were used in the Pace (1962) study and (2) Just as Pace used an overall rating, so does Norton refer to the dependent variable or eleventh subconstruct as "communicator image". The results showed that the more effective salespeople were rated higher than the less effective ones in terms of overall impression of communication. Pace suggests that oral communication skill is likely to be a reliable criterion for differentiating superior from inferior salespeople. Also, sales methods such as using "emotional appeals" and "dramatizing" distinguished between the more effective and the less effective salespeople. These methods seem to be analogous to Norton's animated and dramatic style dimensions.

It is interesting to note that, in the Pace (1962) study, ratings of salespeople on separate skills - taken one at a time- failed to distinguish between the more effective and the less effective salespeople. The general implication from this study is that salespeople who are less effective in basic oral communication skill will also be less effective in utilizing the more specialized aspects of persuasive communication. The Notarantonio and Cohen (1988) study described earlier, provides additional support for the use of Norton's communicator style measure as a measure of sales effectiveness.

Sheth (1976) suggests a paradigm where customers and salespeople can be characterized according to their communication styles as task-oriented, interaction-oriented or self-oriented. Sheth's conceptualization of the customer/salesperson communication style is based on a framework of leadership style suggested by Bass (1960,1967).

Williams and Spiro (1985) conducted an exploratory study which first developed scales to measure the communication style variable in personal selling and then tested whether the styles affected sales outcome. Williams and Spiro draw on Sheth's (1976) model; the scale items developed were more specific to the sales interaction context than those from the general Bass inventory.

The results of the Williams and Spiro (1985) study show that communication styles as measured by task, self and interaction orientation were significant in terms of

explaining sales variance. This finding supports the notion that communication style be considered as one of the dimensions affecting sales outcome. Furthermore, since communicator style is something that is assumed to be deliberately manipulated by the communicator; it is postulated that, in a sales situation, a salesperson can manipulate his/her style to provide for maximum sales effectiveness.

It is possible that one of the distinguishing characteristics of those salespeople who are high performers is that they are able to manipulate their communication style during a sales interaction, or at least recognize the need to do so. That is, perhaps the high performers are successful because they are able to recognize what style a particular sales situation requires and they so manipulate their own style. This contention can be supported by Williams and Spiro (1985). They state that, "...perhaps the successful salesperson is one who recognizes different customer [types] and adapts his or her communication style appropriately to interact with the customer" (p.440).

Further evidence for the distinction in communicator styles between "high" and "low" groups can be found in a study by Norton and Pettegrew (1977). This research investigated whether an effect could be found between communicator style components and attraction. Two conditions were studied. In the first condition, people were asked to respond to the

questionnaire with the person they liked best in mind. In the second condition, people were asked to respond to the questionnaire with the person they liked least among their acquaintances in mind. Two measures were used; an attraction measure, and a communicator style measure. The results show that communicator style variables appear to be strong covariates of attraction variables. The authors also found that a particular domain of communicator style variables recurrently emerge as best predictors of attraction. They are attentive, friendly and relaxed. The authors are also quick to point out that the characteristic influencing attraction may be mediated by context, situation and time.

Bednar (1982) examined the degree to which perceived communicator style characteristics of organizational managers and supervisors co-varied with their performance. Generally, the results of this investigation indicated that communicator style was significantly associated with different levels of managerial performance. Another major finding of this investigation was that perceived communicator style characteristics, associated with managerial performance, changed across self, superiors, subordinates and peer levels of perception. This finding reinforces the contention made by Norton and Pettegrew (1977) that style characteristics may be mediated by context, situation and time.

Based upon this body of literature, the researcher thought that it might be interesting to examine a group of salespeople

in an organization to see if there are any common link among those who are effective as opposed to those who are less effective performers. The present research attempts to examine some of the factors that characterize real estate salespeople in terms of communication style and in terms of other variables. Real estate salespeople were chosen for a number of reasons. The purchase of a home is a major one and purchasers tend to place their trust into the hands of a real estate agent. In essence a relationship develops between buyer and agent. It is the agent who will search the market for the type of home that is suitable for the client, as well as to keep the client apprised of any new market developments. If a client is not pleased with the agent's performance the relationship is usually terminated a new agent is sought. Communication therefore is central to maintaining this relationship.

This study is an exploration of what the potential differences and similarities are among top performing salespeople and those who are poorer performers in terms of communication style as measured by Norton's (1978) communicator style instrument (See Appendix A for descriptions of the eleven measures). The researcher also examined respondents' self-reports regarding perceptions of their own performance and sales practices relevant to communication style. It was hoped that some insight would be gained as to which communicator style and sales practice variables describe and discriminate among salespeople in terms of their

performance as well as which variables might be predictive of successful sales performance.

Finally, in order to gain more insight into the relationship between the variable(s) which emerge(s) from this study and sales effectiveness, a controlled laboratory situation was set-up to manipulate these variables. The purpose of this research was not to determine how salespeople should communicate in order to be effective; rather it was to identify and describe communicator style characteristics and other general sales practices which may be associated with independent criteria of sales performance.

Study 1 - Method

Subjects

Subjects for the field study consisted of salespeople from a regional Real Estate organization. From an initial pool of 300 subjects, 59 responses were received of which 55 questionnaires were usable. A second plea was made to non-respondents. This resulted in 26 additional returned questionnaires. Of these, only 15 were usable. The remaining 11 were not usable because the respondents were new to the company and had not made any sales so therefore could not provide dependent measures (income and company profit). A total of 74 usable questionnaires resulted.

Of those that responded, 77.5% of the subjects indicate that some of their sales training has included communication style, 85.9% work full-time, with 66.2% of respondents

indicating that they work more than 31 hours per week. In addition, 57.7% have been working for the company for more than 2 years.

Materials

Subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire which included three types of items (see Appendix B). The first set of items were Norton's (1978) communicator style self-measure short form. All questions on this scale ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). The second set of questions was developed by the investigator and were identified as: (1) the respondent's perception of him/herself (PER), (2) whether the respondent thinks that communication style is something that can be deliberately manipulated (MANIP), (3) whether the role of communication style is important in making a sale (IMP), (4) self-rating of sales performance within company (SELF), (5) whether respondent's communication style is different with a client than it is on a general basis (DIFF), (6) whether the respondent changes communication style when interacting with different clients (CHANGE), (7) the extent to which the respondent's sales training has included an understanding of communication style (TRAIN), (8) the average length of time it has taken the respondent to enter into a sales agreement (SALES), (9) whether the respondent works full-time or part-time (WORK), (10) how many hours per week the respondent works (HOURS), (11) time working for the company (LONG), and (12) units sold within the

past year (UNITS). The items which make up this scale are referred to as 'sales practice' variables for purposes of discussion.

In order to check for "test distortion", the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was included as the third set of items.

This scale was included to determine whether subjects were responding to the questionnaire items in a way that they saw as 'appropriate' or in a way that would make them 'look good'. Respondents were asked to identify themselves on the questionnaire so that the researcher could then obtain income information about each individual from the company's vice-president. Subjects were asked to read and sign an informed consent form (see Appendix B).

The participating company agreed to provide sales performance data on each of the respondents. Performance was measured by a dollar income amount for each individual as well as contribution to company profit. These are industry-wide standard measures of performance.

The two performance measures of sales effectiveness were transformed to the mean monthly contribution to company profit (Copro) and the mean monthly earnings (Income).

The questionnaires were given to the participating company's sales managers who, in turn, distributed the questionnaires at a weekly sales meeting.

Results

This section begins with a discussion of the questionnaire items. We first examine some of the descriptive measures, followed by Pearson product moment correlations, multivariate discriminate analysis and finally cluster analysis.

One would first want to turn attention to some of the descriptive measures so that the responses for this group of 74 subjects as a whole can be examined. As can be seen in Table 1 which presents complete summary statistics for the three item sets, most respondents consider themselves to be a friendly communicator ($\bar{M} = 1.548$) and not a contentious communicator ($\bar{M} = 4.514$). Respondents also saw themselves as attentive ($\bar{M} = 2.03$), as possessing a good communicator image ($\bar{M} = 2.03$), as impression-leaving ($\bar{M} = 2.58$), as relaxed ($\bar{M} = 2.60$) and to a lesser extent animated ($\bar{M} = 2.70$) and precise ($\bar{M} = 2.88$). The subconstructs of Dramatic ($\bar{M} = 3.45$) and Open ($\bar{M} = 3.42$) are approaching the neutral point on the scale. It is also interesting to note that, with the exception of contentious, none of respondents indicated disagreement with any of the other communicator style measures. Of the ten communicator style measures, contentious appears to be the only one with a negative connotation.

Respondents indicate that there is some recognition of communication style as a relevant strategy for a sales situation in response to the question of whether communication

style is important for making a sale ($M = 1.64$).

In order to assess the relationships among the variables, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated. As can be seen in Table 2, measures of individual sales performance (income, company profit and units sold) are highly related to each other. This interrelationship was expected since these variables all seem to be measuring the same thing. Therefore, income will be used as the sole measure of sales effectiveness for the remainder of this study. The only communication style variable that was significantly related to income was precise ($r = .308$). Precise was also significantly related to company profit ($r = .3618$). The correlations also show that the dominant, dramatic, animated, contentious, friendly and impression-leaving subconstructs were significantly correlated as well as the friendly, attentive, and relaxed subconstructs. In order to better understand how these communicator style variables were related to income, a forward stepwise regression analysis with Income as the dependent measure was performed with the ten communicator style variables. The only variable that was entered into the equation was precise with an R^2 of .106, $F(1,68) = 8.075$, $p < .01$. See Table 3 for beta weights and significance levels.

Respondents were then trichotomized into three groups, low, middle and high, according to their sales performance as indicated by income level. In order to assess which combinations of the subconstructs would best distinguish among

these groups, a discriminant analysis was performed on the communicator style variables. Of the ten communicator style variables, two emerged as discriminating among the three groups; Precise and Impression-leaving. Although neither of the two emerging functions was significant, the first function was marginally significant with a $\chi^2 (4) = 8.205, p > .05$.

Precise loads highest on the second function and loads in a negative direction on the first function. Group 1, the high performers, is lower on function 1 than function 2.

Application of these functions classified 45.8% of the cases correctly. This analysis indicated the precise communication style variable was the best discriminating variable among the groups.

In order to gain a better understanding of these 74 sales agents in relation to communication style, and to obtain an alternative way of viewing these subjects, a cluster analysis using Ward's (1963) method was performed. The three cluster solution was then analyzed using a step-wise discriminant function analysis to identify the subconstructs which contributed to distinguishing among the three clusters. The two discriminant functions were found to be significant, $\chi^2 (16) = 172.69, p < .001$ and $\chi^2 (7) = 75.670, p < .001$, with canonical correlations of .8849 and .8344. The means and standard deviations for the three cluster solution across the ten subconstructs of the communicator style measure are presented in Table 4. The standardized discriminant function

coefficients are presented in Table 5. Using these discriminant functions, it was possible to correctly classify 97.1% of the individuals as to communicator style. The first function shows that salespeople who are more impression-leaving, attentive, precise, open and relaxed than the others are falling together. A second function reveals individuals who are more animated, dramatic, dominant, friendly and contentious than the others.

In addition to looking at the ten communicator style variables, the researcher also examined the self-report responses of general sales practice variables. Examination of these variables provides a clearer picture of respondents' understanding and use of the concept of communication style. The descriptive information presented in Table 1 indicated that there was some recognition on the part of respondents that communication style is a relevant strategy for a sales situation. The importance of communication style in making a sale was recognized by 94.5% of the respondents, with a mean response of 1.644. Communication style is different when interacting with clients than it is on a general basis at least some of the time for 53.5% of subjects ($\bar{M} = 4$); and 84.9% indicate that they change their communication style when interacting with different clients ($\bar{M} = 2.89$). In order to get a better picture of how the precise communication style variable (which seems to be the strongest predictor of income), income and these sales practice measures were interrelated,

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated. Table 6 provides these correlations. As can be seen from the table, there is a strong correlation between a person's rating of him or herself in terms of sales performance and income ($r = .568$). It is also interesting to note that there is a relationship between an individual's communication style in a sales situation being different from what it is on a general basis and an individual's changing his or her communication style with different clients ($r = .516$).

The ability of the sales practice variable to predict income was examined by performing a stepwise regression on income. Two steps of regression were completed with an R^2 of .383, $F(2,60) = 18.66$, $p < .001$. Perception of self in terms of sales performance and number of weekly hours worked emerged as the two significant predictors of income. See Table 7 for the beta weights and significance levels. What appears to emerge from this latter analysis is that people who see themselves as good sales performers tend to be effective salespeople.

As a further follow-up, a stepwise regression analysis was performed on the general sales practice variables using weekly income per hour as the dependent variable. One step of regression was completed with an R^2 of .147, $F(1,61) = 10.51$, $p < .01$. Perception of self was the only variable associated with weekly income per hour worked.

In addition, in order to obtain a more detailed understanding of the relationship between the communication

style measures and the weekly income per hour worked, a second stepwise regression analysis was performed on the communicator style variables using weekly income per hour as the predictor. The only two variables entered into the equation were Dominant and Animated. Two steps of regression were completed with an $R^2 = .139$, $F(2,62) = 4.99$, $p < .01$. These results are not surprising, however, since Dominant and Animated are from the same "set" of variables as is Precise (i.e. strong set).

Discussion

Precise appears to be an important indicator of sales success for these individuals as shown by the fact that (1) the only communicator style variable which was significantly related to the performance measures of income and company profit was precise, (2) the step-wise regression for the communicator style variables includes precise as a significant predictor of income, and (3) precise is also entered into one of the functions for the discriminant analysis. Norton (1978) defines precise as a communicator who tries to be strictly accurate when arguing, prefers well-defined arguments, and likes proof or documentation with arguing.

On the basis of these results, one can separate the eleven communicator style measures into two categories: (1) strong variables and (2) casual variables. The strong variables are animated, dramatic, dominant, contentious, and precise whereas the casual variables are friendly, attentive, open, and relaxed. Impression-leaving and communicator image would be

considered neutral since they could conceivably fall into either category.

The cluster functions seem to be describing two distinct types of salespeople in terms of their communication style. As a result of the animated, dramatic, dominant, friendly and contentious communicator styles falling together, the first function seems to be describing an individual who is very outgoing. For the mostpart this type of individual displays communicator style variables which fall into the strong category, with the exception of friendly. The second cluster function describes an individual who demonstrates the impression-leaving, attentive, precise, open and relaxed communicator styles. With the exception of precise, these variables fall into the casual category.

Again, the precise variable emerged as significant in the correlation, regression and cluster analyses. However, the Cluster analysis also shows that individuals who score high on the impression-leaving, attentive, open and relaxed measures are also scoring high on the precise communicator style measure. As noted earlier, precise falls into the "strong" variable category while impression-leaving, attentive, open and relaxed fall into the "casual" category. It seems that when precise is "blended" into a combination of variables that are casual, it may take on new meaning. In addition, the combination of casual variables may also take on new meaning. In other words, one may moderate the other. The reader should

note that this appeared to be the case in the Notarantonio and Cohen (1988) study. In addition, Norton (1983), in his work on social magnetism, found that attentive, friendly, relaxed and open are all predictors of attraction. However, Norton cautions that these findings may be mediated by context, situation, and time. In relation to this, it would seem that the salesperson who possesses only those styles that Norton identifies as predictors of attraction, (attentive, open, relaxed and friendly), might not be perceived as very businesslike; but when precise is "blended" with these variables, as was the case with the cluster analysis, a communicator who is better suited to a business situation emerges.

Likewise, a second set of variables that seem to fall together in both the correlation and Cluster analysis includes animated, dominant, dramatic, friendly and contentious. With the exception of friendly, these variables fall into the "strong" communicator style category. Again, blending the friendly variable into a set of "strong" styles may serve to moderate the set and vice-versa.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlations revealed that there was no correlation between any communicator style variables and sales practice variables.

The stepwise regression analysis on the sales practice variables did show that, successful sales performance (as indicated by income), seems to be, in part associated with: (1)

one's perception of his or herself as above average terms of sales performance, and (2) number of hours worked. What this seems to be saying is that, in part, motivation and effort are determinants of sales success. The reader should again note that the second regression analysis which used weekly income per hour as the dependent variable showed that number of hours worked was covarying with income.

STUDY 2 - METHOD

The analyses from the field study indicate that the precise communicator style variable is a very important contributor to sales success. By manipulating this variable in a controlled setting, one can empirically test whether precision affects sales effectiveness. Along with precise, the researcher chose to manipulate the friendly communicator style variable. The friendly subconstruct was chosen for a number of reasons: (1) Norton (1978) states that the friendly style dimension is a solid predictor of attraction, leadership, and socialability; all factors that seem necessary for sales effectiveness, (2) The Pearson product moment correlation analysis from the field study shows that precise and friendly are not significantly correlated ($r = .0127$), and (3) it seems reasonable intuitively that a salesperson who is friendly would be perceived as more effective than one who is not, and so friendly was to be manipulated along with precise in order to examine independent observer perceptions of various combinations of these subconstructs.

This study empirically tests whether or not the precise and friendly communicator styles were related to sales effectiveness. The Precise and Friendly styles were used from Norton's dimensions. Four combinations of communication style were generated by combining these subconstructs. The four unique combinations of style variables used to operationally define the types of communicator styles were: high Precise/high Friendly, low Precise/high Friendly, high Precise/low Friendly and low Precise/low Friendly. The effect of combining and manipulating different levels of these variables on perceptions of a sales interaction by independent observers was investigated. A number of studies of communicator style have taken this approach of utilizing independent observers in order to examine perceptions. Pace (1962) examined the relationship between oral communication and sales effectiveness. Objective observers rated two groups of salespeople who had been differentiated into an effective "high" group and a less effective "low" group. Bednar (1982) obtained independent evaluations of communicator style and performance for managers from two organizations. Graetz (1974) also used independent observers in a study of relationships between aspects of verbal behavior of supermarket store managers and their managerial effectiveness. It was hypothesized that the more precise a salesperson is, the more effective the individual will be in selling the product and the more positively s/he will be perceived by others. It

was also hypothesized that the more friendly the salesperson, the more effective s/he will be. These variables may also interact but no specific effects were predicted.

Subjects

Subjects consisted of undergraduate Business Administration students enrolled at Bryant College. One hundred twelve subjects participated in the study. A demographic analysis revealed that 50.9% of the respondents were male and 49.1% were female. Students ranged in age from 17 to 39 years with 60.3% of subjects being between 19 and 21 years of age. Freshmen accounted for 11.7%, sophomores for 24.3%, juniors for 35.1% and seniors for 28.8% of the sample. The percentage of respondents indicating that they have purchased at least one car on their own was 59.6%. Forty-four percent of the subjects have held sales positions.

Apparatus

Four videotapes were produced by combining low and high levels of preciseness and friendliness. Each of the tapes depicted one of the four combinations of communicator style types. The scripts were developed in a way so that the "content" of the sales presentations were as similar as possible across conditions except to reflect the differences in communication style. Keeping in line with Norton's definitions, preciseness was manipulated by varying the degree of detail and accuracy which the salesperson provided to the customer. Friendliness was manipulated by varying the degree

to which the salesperson expressed admiration for, encouraged, and acknowledged the contributions of the customer (see Appendix C for scripts).

The hypothetical product being sold in all tapes was a new automobile. An automobile was chosen because, (1) like a home, it represents a major purchase, (2) New automobile salespeople can be categorized with real estate salespeople in terms of how they are perceived by the consuming public, and (3) the probability of students having had experience with the purchase of an automobile, or more specifically in dealing with an automobile salesperson, is higher than that of their having had experience with the purchase of a home or dealing with a real estate agent. The tape simulated an automobile showroom. The customer had just supposedly been shown a new automobile. The scenario in the videotape involved the salesperson and customer walking over to sit at a desk and discuss the auto that has just been seen. The interaction begins here and was varied depending upon the condition. The customer in the tape remained neutral and did not vary his style among conditions. It was the salesperson whose style was manipulated. Both actors were male and approximately twenty-one years of age. Both were average in height. Each tape was approximately three minutes in length.

Each of the four videotapes were pretested by showing them to small groups of subjects ($n=10$). Respondents were then asked to complete a communicator style measure which included

measures of preciseness and friendliness. These measures were seven-point scales of agreement with the value of 1 indicating strong agreement of possessing the trait. This was done in order to ensure that the communicator style being depicted on the tape was actually being perceived by the subjects.

A two-way analysis of variance (low-high Preciseness X low-high Friendliness) was performed for each of these two measures. For the measure of preciseness, a significant main effect between the low Preciseness ($\bar{M} = 4.75$) and the high Preciseness ($\bar{M} = 3.32$) groups, $F(1,38) = 10.01$, $p < .01$ was found.

For the friendliness variable there were significant main effects between the low Friendly ($\bar{M} = 4.95$) and the high Friendly ($\bar{M} = 2.67$) groups, $F(1,38) = 23.29$, $p < .001$. These results indicate that the tapes were perceived as intended. Subjects perceived the salesperson in terms of preciseness and friendliness as manipulated.

Procedure

Subjects were randomly assigned to conditions. In addition, within each condition, time of day and day of week were randomized. Groups of no more than five or six subjects were run at a time.

Subjects were asked to sign an informed consent form after which they were shown a videotape of the sales presentation (see Appendix D). After viewing the tape, subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire consisting of a series of 40

Likert-type items. The questionnaire consisted of items containing communicator style measures, items measuring attraction to the communicator, perceptions of the ability of the communicator as a salesperson, respondents' judgments of the probability of purchasing from the communicator, perceived similarity of the sales activity involved in selling a home and that involved in selling an automobile as well as demographic information (see appendix D).

Results

In order to examine whether there were differences between the conditions and between males and females in terms of how the interaction in the tapes were being perceived, separate three-way ANOVA's were run with Preciseness, Friendliness and Sex for the communicator style variables as well as for selected questionnaire items. All measures ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree).

The precise and friendly measures were first examined to be certain that the communicator styles were again being perceived as manipulated. For the precise construct, there were significant main effects for the Precise condition as well as an interaction with friendliness. Subjects in the high Precise group saw the salesperson as more precise ($\bar{M} = 3.59$) than those in the low Precise group ($\bar{M} = 4.66$), $F(1,100) = 10.798$, $p < .01$. In terms of the interaction, subjects in the high Precise condition rated the salesperson as more precise in

the low Friendly condition ($\bar{M} = 3.00$) than in the high Friendly condition ($\bar{M} = 4.10$), $F(1,100) = 5.197$, $p < .05$. However, in the low Precise condition perceptions of Preciseness were not as differentiated across friendliness.

For the friendly measure, there were significant main effects for the Friendly condition as well as a significant precise x friendly interaction. Subjects in the high Friendly condition saw the salesperson as more friendly ($\bar{M} = 3.52$) than those in the low Friendly condition ($\bar{M} = 4.94$), $F(1,100) = 27.597$, $p < .001$. The two-way precise x friendly interaction shows that in the low Precise condition there were much smaller differences in perceptions of friendliness between the low Friendly ($\bar{M} = 4.85$) and the high Friendly ($\bar{M} = 4.43$) conditions. When viewing high Preciseness however, subjects in the high Friendly condition rated the salesperson as significantly more friendly ($\bar{M} = 2.71$) than those in the low Friendly condition ($\bar{M} = 5.81$), $F(1,100) = 47.545$, $p < .001$. These results again indicate that the videotapes were being perceived as manipulated.

In order to examine which communicator style variables were related, Pearson product moment correlations were calculated and are shown in Table 8. As can be seen from the table, friendly, is positively related to open, attentive, communicator image and negatively related to dominant. The only other variable that precise is related to is impression-leaving.

To further investigate how the groups were differing on their perceptions of the sales interaction the ANOVA's for all the communicator style variables as well as for other items relevant to the results of this study were examined. Table 9 provides significant findings for these ANOVA's. As one can see from the table, there were main effects for Preciseness with the precise, animated, dramatic, dominant and impression-leaving measures. Also, in addition to "friendly" main effects on the friendly variable, the only other variable that was significant was the open subconstruct.

There were some significant interactions as found in the ANOVAs performed on the questionnaire items. Table 10 shows the cell means for the measure of Dominance. This interaction shows that subjects in the low Friendly condition saw the salesperson as more dominant in the high Precise condition than in the low Precise condition. However, in the high Friendly condition there were much smaller differences in perceptions of Dominance from low Precise to high Precise $F(1,108) = 15.012$, $p < .001$.

The cell means for the measure of "This salesperson monopolized the conversation in the Precise x Friendly interaction are shown in Table 11. Subjects in the low Friendly condition perceived the salesperson as monopolizing the conversation more in the high Precise than in the low Precise condition. Differences in perceptions of monopolizing were not as clear between low Precise and high Precise in the

high Friendly condition $F(1,108) = 5.730, p < .05$.

As shown in Table 12, respondents in the low Friendly condition rated the interaction between the salesperson and the customer as more strained in the high Precise condition than in the low Precise condition. In the high Friendly condition again, there were smaller differences $F(1,107) = 13.48, p < .001$.

Table 13 shows that respondents in the low Friendly condition indicate that they would be less likely to do business with a salesperson in the high Precise condition than in the low Precise condition. In the high Friendly condition, however, differences in responses between low Precise and high Precise were not as clear $F(1,107) = 15.129, p < .01$.

Finally, Table 14 illustrates the interaction for the likelihood that respondents would have bought the product from the salesperson in the tape. Subjects in the low Friendly condition indicate that they would be less likely to have bought the product from the salesperson in the high Precise than in the low Precise condition. However, in the high Friendly condition there were very small differences in responses between the low Precise and the high Precise conditions $F(1,108) = 6.344, p < .05$.

All of these interactions show that subjects in the low Friendly condition saw the salesperson or the situation in a less positive way in the high Precise condition than in the low Precise condition whereas, perceptions of the measure did

not change much from low Precise to high Precise in the high Friendly condition.

Discussion

The high precise communication style does not appear to be the most effective one for a sales situation, at least when viewed in a controlled situation. Respondents indicated that they would be less likely to do business with and less likely to purchase the product from the salesperson in the tape who demonstrated high Preciseness. Also, the interaction was seen as more strained and the salesperson was seen as monopolizing the conversation more when the high Precise communicator style was demonstrated. Perhaps customers may feel that they are being inundated with information overload when dealing with a salesperson who demonstrates the precise communication style in isolation.

As pointed out earlier, there were main effects for Preciseness with the animated, dramatic, dominant and impression-leaving measures. In all of these cases, subjects were viewing the salesperson as higher on the given subconstruct in the high Precise condition than in the low Precise condition. The Pearson product moment correlations also show that these variables are interrelated. These communicator style variables all fall into the "strong" category discussed in the previous study and seem indicative of what might be seen by independent observers of a sales interaction as an outgoing, and perhaps overpowering

communicator. This combination of variables appears to be somewhat similar to the combination of "strong" variables that came together in the field study, with a major exception - "friendly", a casual variable, was blended into the combination in the field study. As pointed out earlier, this can change perceptions dramatically. This was also illustrated by the two-way friendly x precise interactions shown in Tables 10 through 14. These interactions seem to suggest that, although preciseness, when considered in isolation, seems to be viewed in a negative way, friendliness may moderate this perception. If a salesperson displays friendliness along with preciseness, perhaps customers will not feel as overwhelmed. Again, this point is demonstrated by the fact that in the tape, subjects were not viewing the high precise salesperson in a less positive way than the low precise salesperson when high preciseness was coupled with high friendliness as they were doing in the low Friendly condition.

The friendly subconstruct is positively related to openness, attentiveness and communicator image and negatively related to dominance. In addition, since attentiveness, openness and friendliness are all positively related to communicator image, which Norton (1978) identifies as the dependent variable in his domain, it seems that a salesperson displaying these styles would be viewed in a positive way. Norton (1983) found that a person who is perceived to be friendly, attentive and relaxed in his or her style of

communication is seen as more attractive than a person who does not interact this way. This combination of "casual" styles is very close to that combination described in the field study.

Although in the field study, those salespeople who saw themselves as more precise reflected greater sales effectiveness, it appears that the automobile salesperson who was a precise communicator was not perceived in a positive way. One possible explanation for this could be that, although the buying processes for home and automobiles may be similar, the purchase of a home seems to be a more rational process whereas the purchase of an automobile may be more emotional in nature. It seems reasonable that a home buyer would be very concerned with obtaining the most accurate information and details about what is probably the major purchase of his or her lifetime. This need for such accuracy and detail may be unique to the purchase of a home. On the other hand, the buyer who is susceptible to emotional appeal in a sales interaction as may be the case with the automobile buyer, may be more receptive to a salesperson who displays the friendly, attentive, and open styles.

One must use caution, however, when interpreting these findings in terms of one isolated communicator style variable. In reality, a person would rarely demonstrate only one communication style. As point out a number of times in this study, different combinations of styles can change perceptions of sales effectiveness. In addition, Pace (1962) found that

ratings of sales people on separate communication styles taken one at a time, failed to distinguish between the more effective and the less effective salespeople in his sample. He draws the conclusion that generalized communication skill should be emphasized more than isolated details of communication behavior.

In terms of this study, rather than to examine any one variable in isolation, it may be more meaningful to look at a given variable's contribution to different combinations of communication style and their differences in terms of actual or perceived sales performance.

Future Research

Since communication style in a marketing context remains a relatively new field of investigation, there are several directions in which future research can move:

A field study that investigates differences in communication style among salespeople of an organization other than real estate would allow the researcher to examine which variables hold up across context and situation as well as what new variables might emerge.

Examination of customer's perception of sales interactions in a field setting would be of interest. The Williams and Spiro (1985) study used this approach. This kind of approach gets away from the problems associated with self-report measures and increases the external validity of lab results.

Finally, as a possible extension of the present study, the

researcher may want to manipulate combinations of several communicator style subconstructs in a controlled situation. For example combining friendly, attentive, relaxed and precise and comparing perceptions of a communicator displaying this combination with perceptions of a communicator displaying the combination without precise might give a more detailed analysis for this phenomena.

In summary, research which uses communication style as a way of understanding sales effectiveness is very scanty. It appears to be an approach which provides new insights and there are many directions in which it can move.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for the Questionnaire Items

<u>Variable</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Copro	101.40	66.55
Income	3317.74	2208.69
Dominant	3.25	1.79
Friendly	1.55	.71
Attentive	2.03	1.14
Relaxed	2.60	1.53
Contentious	4.51	1.99
Dramatic	3.45	1.86
Animated	2.70	1.57
Open	3.42	1.88
Impression-leaving	2.58	1.31
Precise	2.88	1.44
Communicator image	2.03	1.34
Persuasive Communicator	2.35	1.02
CS can be manipulated	4.49	2.23
CS is important for a sale	1.64	1.33
Rate own sales performance	3.12	1.50
CS different for client	4.00	1.84
Change CS for diff clients	2.89	1.49
Training included CS	3.37	1.62
Avg. time for a sale*	1.44	.60
Avg. no. hours work/wk*	4.94	1.35
Length of time w/ co.*	5.34	1.47
Units sold in past yr.*	4.13	1.92
SDScore	20.51	4.68

Note: All items are seven-point scales of agreement with 1 indicating strong agreement of possessing the trait with the exception of those items indicated by *).

Table 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Communicator Style Measures – Field Study

Measure	Co. Profit	Dominant	Friendly	Attentive	Relaxed	Contentious	Dramatic	Animated	Open	Imp. leaving
Income	.9846**	.108	.019	.171	-.074	.049	-.059	-.057	.022	.168
Co. Profit		.089	-.001	.159	-.083	.080	-.033	-.068	.003	.166
Dominant			.122	.161	.203	.217	.336*	.438**	.323*	.344*
Friendly				.382**	.267	-.125	.168	.337*	.172	.175
Attentive					.391**	-.037	-.053	-.098	-.181	.245
Relaxed						-.204	.030	-.029	.030	.331*
Contentious							.371*	.189	.153	-.042
Dramatic								.640**	.373*	.121
Animated									.404**	.149
Open										.019

Table 2 (continued)

Measure	Precise	Communicator image	Units
Income	.308*	-.067	.714**
Company Profit	.362*	-.089	.702**
Dominant	.092	.522**	-.078
Friendly	.013	.086	.012
Attentive	.236	.155	.035
Relaxed	.291	.275	-.106
Contentious	.112	.060	-.016
Dramatic	.238	.461**	-.140
Animated	.062	.266	-.095
Open	-.058	.249	.009
Impression-leaving	.543**	.291	-.065
Precise		.174	.169
Communicator image			-.062

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$

Table 3

Beta Coefficients for Stepwise Regression on Income for the
Communicator Style variables

Variable	B	t	p
Dominant	.068	.581	>.05
Friendly	.032	.277	>.05
Attentive	.117	.998	>.05
Relaxed	-.169	-.445	>.05
Contentious	.005	.043	>.05
Dramatic	-.127	-1.077	>.05
Animated	-.082	-.707	>.05
Open	.035	.306	>.05
Impression-leaving	.016	.119	>.05
Precise	511.813	2.842	<.01

Table 4

Univariate F-Ratios and Standardized Discriminant Coefficients
for the Three Cluster Solution for the CSM's

Subconstruct	F	p	Standardized Coefficient	
			function 1	function 2
Dominant	15.16	p<.001	.328	.124
Friendly	3.76	p<.05	(not entered)	
Attentive	14.03	p<.001	.441	.538
Relaxed	2.43	p>.05	-.276	-.086
Contentious	1.51	p>.05	(not entered)	
Dramatic	26.08	p<.001	.243	-.036
Animated	81.79	p<.001	.788	-.400
Open	10.01	p<.001	.040	-.380
Impression-leaving	32.84	p<.001	.114	.768
Precise	17.09	p<.001	.428	.273

Note: All F-ratios have 2 and 67 degrees of freedom.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the CSM Subconstructs
for the Cluster Groupings

Subconstruct	Cluster 1 (n=43)		Cluster 2 (n=16)		Cluster 3 (n=11)	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Dominant	2.44	1.40	4.19	1.76	4.82	1.53
Friendly	1.36	.54	1.69	.70	2.00	.10
Attentive	1.72	.88	3.19	1.22	1.73	.90
Relaxed	2.35	1.46	3.25	1.46	2.36	1.36
Contentious	4.26	2.04	4.69	1.78	5.36	1.63
Dramatic	2.81	1.58	3.56	1.31	6.27	.65
Animated	2.00	.85	2.63	.96	5.73	.79
Open	3.16	1.70	2.63	1.15	5.36	2.01
Impression-lvg	1.98	.86	4.19	.17	2.55	.82
Precise	2.30	.96	4.31	.58	3.09	1.30

Note: All scales range from 1(strong agreement)
to 7 (strong disagreement).

Table 6

Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the Precise CS Measure and the Sales Practice Variables

Variable	Income	Persuasive	Can Manipulate	CS important	Rate self	CS diff	Change CS	Training	Hours	Time
Precise	.308*	.252	-.056	.064	-.198	-.039	-.013	-.042	.218	-.
Income		-.149	.004	-.142	-.567**	-.065	-.025	.041	.518**	-.
Persuasive			-.219	.265	.215	-.041	.010	.090	-.210	-.
Manipulate				-.227	-.108	-.109	-.058	-.165	.118	-.
Important					.176	.093	.205	.165	-.099	-.
Self						.123	.311*	.001	-.449**	-.
Different							.516**	.279	-.218	-.
Change								.231	-.163	-.
Train									-.199	-.
Hours										.

* p<.01

** p<.001

Table 7

Beta Coefficients for Stepwise Regression on Income for
Sales Practice Variables

Variable	B	t	p
Persuasive Communicator	-.065	-.629	>.05
Can be manipulated	-.059	-.568	>.05
Comm.Style impt.for sale	-.034	-.331	>.05
Performance self-rating	-.416	-3.7	<.001
Comm.Style diff.w/client	.077	.740	>.05
Change C.S. w/ diff.clients	.195	1.892	.05
Avg. wkly hours worked	.313	2.803	<.01

Table 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the Communicator Style Variables - Lab Study

Variable	Relaxed	Dramatic	Precise	Friendly	Open	Contentious	Dominant	Impression-Ivy	Attentive	Communicato
Animated	-.041	.419**	.027	.146	.094	.057	.311**	.141	.140	.151
Relaxed		.075	.035	.197	.334**	.059	-.050	-.075	.182	.212
Dramatic			.152	.043	.022	.158	.422**	.272*	.143	.155
Precise				.066	.091	.054	.063	.288*	.172	.196
Friendly					.530**	-.041	-.308**	-.047	.321**	.437**
Open						.067	-.230	-.059	.329**	.428**
Contentious							.112	.074	-.066	-.067
Dominant								.422**	.125	-.051
Impression-Ivy									.263*	.139
Attentive										.496**

* p<.01

** p<.001

Table 9

Significant Effects for ANOVA's for Lab Study

Question	Main effects		Interactions		
	Friendly	Precise	Fr x Pr	Fr x sex	Pr x sex
Animated		X			
Dramatic		X			
Precise		X	X		
Friendly	X		X		
Open	X		X		
Dominant		X	X		
Imp-lyg		X			
Effective comm				X	
Interaction findly x			X		
Slsprsn monopolized		X	X		
Likelihood customer					
bought			X		
Interaction strained		X	X		
Interaction relaxed		X	X		
Type I like to do					
business with		X	X		
Likelihood I would					

Table 10

Cell Means for the Measure of Dominance in the Precise x
Friendly interaction

Friendly	Precise	
	low	high
low	3.41	1.59
high	2.04	2.16

Table 11

Cell Means for the Measure of "This Salesperson
Monopolized the Conversation" in the
Precise x Friendly Interaction

Friendly	Precise	
	low	high
low	3.78	1.85
high	2.96	2.59

Table 12

Cell Means for the Measure of " The Interaction
was Strained" in the Precise x Friendly Interaction

Friendly	Precise	
	low	high
low	3.62	2.15
high	2.65	3.06

Table 13

Cell Means for the Measure of " The Salesperson
in the Tape is the Type I Like to do Business With"
in the Precise x Friendly Interaction

Friendly	Precise	
	low	high
low	5.35	6.78
high	6.39	6.34

Table 14

Cell Means for the Measure of "The Likelihood that
I Would have Bought this Product from This
Salesperson in the Precise x Friendly Interaction.

Friendly	Precise	
	low	high
low	5.22	6.63
high	5.91	5.97

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. (1960). Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper Bros.
- Bass, B.M. (1967). Social behavior and the orientation inventory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 68, 260-92.
- Bednar, D.A. (1982). Relationships between communicator style and managerial performance in complex organizations: a field study. Journal of Business Communicantion, 19, 51-75.
- Capon, N., Holbrook, M.B., & Hulbert, J.M. (1977). Selling process and buyer behavior: Theoretical implications of recent research. In A.G. Woodside, J.N. Sheth & P.D. Bennett (eds), Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc.
- Churchill, G., Ford, N., & Walker, O. (1985). Sales Force Management. Homewood, IL.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Churchill, G., Ford, N., Hartley, S. & Walker, O. (1985). The determinants of salesperson performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 22, 103-18.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24(4), 349-54.
- Emery, D., Norton, R., & Plain, H. (1980). Relaxed as a style of communicating. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.
- Friedman, M., & Churchill, G.A., (1987). Using consumer perspectives and a contingency approach to improve health care delivery. Journal of Consumer Research, 13, 492-510.
- Graetz, H.G. (1974). Verbal Behavior and Managerial Effectiveness of Supermarket Store Managers. Unpublished D.B.A. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Ma.
- Norton, R. (1977). Teacher effectiveness as a function of communicator style. In B.D. Ruben (ed.), Communication Yearbook I. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

- Norton, R. (1983). Communicator Style: Theory, application and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Norton, R., Baker, N., Bednar, D., Sayler, R., & McGough, T. (1978). Impressions of interpersonal dramatic style. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, Mi.
- Norton, R. & Bednar, D.A., (1979). Ideal communicator style for the interviewee. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Norton, R., & Miller, L. (1975). Dyadic perception of communication style. Communication Research, 2 50-67.
- Norton, R., & Montgomery, B. (1979). An integration of style, content, and target in defining and measuring openness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Norton, R., & Nussbaum, J. (1980). Dramatic behaviors of the effective teacher. In Nimmo, D. (ed.) Communication Yearbook. 4 New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Norton, R., & Pettegrew, L.S. (1977). Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction. Communication Research, 4, 257-82.
- Norton, R., & Robinson, D. Communicator style in career decisions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. New York.
- Norton, R., Syphner, H., Clarke, C., & Brady. (1977). Dimensions of a dramatic communicator style. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.
- Notarantonio, E.M. & Cohen, J.L. (1988). The effects of open and dominant communication styles on perceptions of the sales interaction. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management. Under editorial review.
- Pace, W.R. (1962). Oral communication and sales effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44, 487-8.

- Sheth, J.M. (1976). Buyer-seller interaction: A conceptual framework. Proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research. Cincinnati, OH: Association for Consumer Research, 382-6.
- Staley, C.C., & Cohen, J.L. (1988). Communicator style and social style: similarities and differences between the sexes. Communication Quarterly. 36, 192-202.
- Szymanski, David M. (1988). Determinants of selling effectiveness: The importance of declarative knowledge to the personal selling concept. Journal of Marketing, 52, 64-77.
- Ward, J. H. (1963). Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. Journal of American Statistical Association, 58, 236-244.
- Weitz, Barton A. (1981). Effectiveness in sales interactions: a contingency framework. Journal of Marketing, 45, 85-103..
- Weitz, B., Sujan, H., & Sujan, M. (1986). Knowledge, motivation, and adaptive behavior: A framework for improving selling effectiveness. Journal of Marketing, 50, 174-191.
- Weitz, B.A., & Wright, P. (1978). The salesperson as a marketing strategist: The relationship between field sales performance and insights about one's customers. MSI Working Paper No. 78-120, Marketing Science Institute.
- Williams, K.C. & Spiro, R.L. (1985). Communication style in the salesperson-customer dyad. Journal of Marketing Research. 22.434-42.

APPENDIX A
COMMUNICATOR STYLE DESCRIPTIONS

COMMUNICATOR STYLE DESCRIPTIONS

Dominant

Tends to come on strong in most situations
Generally speaks very frequently
Tries to take charge of things when with people

Friendly

Readily expresses admiration for others
Habitually acknowledges verbally other's contributions
Tends to be encouraging to people

Attentive

Likes to listen very carefully to people
Can always repeat back to a person exactly what was meant
Deliberately reacts in such a way that people know s/he is listening

Relaxed

Doesn't have nervous mannerisms in speech
Under pressure comes across as a relaxed speaker
Rhythm or flow of speech not affected by nervousness

Contentious

When disagreeing with someone is very quick to challenge them
Won't drop an argument that is not resolved

Dramatic

Regularly tells jokes, anecdotes, and stories
Physically and vocally acts out what s/he wants to say
Verbally exaggerates to emphasize a point

Animated

Constantly gestures while communicating
Actively uses a lot of facial expressions
Is very expressive nonverbally

Open

Openly expresses feelings and emotions
Readily reveals personal things about self
Usually tells people a lot about him/herself

Impression-leaving

What is said usually leaves an impression on others
Leaves people with an impression which they remember
The way something is said leaves an impression

Precise

Insists that other people document what they are saying
Likes to be strictly accurate when communicating
Insists upon very precise definitions

APPENDIX B

FIELD STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMED CONSENT OF EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS

The investigators of this study are attempting to examine variables that are associated with sales performance. In order to do this your supervisor has agreed, with your permission, to provide the investigators with information about your performance. Once this information has been obtained it will be summarized and statistically analyzed and will be reported as such. IN NO WAY WILL YOU BE IDENTIFIED IN THE STUDY. If you agree to participate please sign the form.

The Nature of this study has been explained to me. I consent to having information about my sales performance disclosed to the investigators. In doing so I understand that the information will be summarized, statistically analyzed and then destroyed.

NAME (please print)

SIGNATURE

signature

PART I

Directions: Please read the following descriptions of communicator style. On the scale following each capsule description indicate the degree to which you feel that you demonstrate that communication style.

1. Dominant:

In most social situations I tend to come on strong.
In most social situations I generally speak very frequently.
I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
I am dominant in social situations.

I AM A DOMINANT COMMUNICATOR.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

2. Friendly:

I readily express admiration for others.
To be friendly, I habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions.
Whenever I communicate, I tend to be very encouraging to people.
I am always an extremely friendly communicator.

I AM A FRIENDLY COMMUNICATOR.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

3. Attentive:

I really like to listen very carefully to people.
I can always repeat back to a person exactly what was meant.
Usually, I deliberately react in such a way that people know that I am listening.
I am an extremely attentive communicator.

I AM AN ATTENTIVE COMMUNICATOR.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

4. Relaxed:

I do not have nervous mannerisms in my speech.
Under pressure I come across as a relaxed speaker.
The rhythm or flow of my speech is not affected by nervousness.
I am a very relaxed communicator.

I AM A RELAXED COMMUNICATOR.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

5. Contentious:

When I disagree with somebody I am very quick to challenge them.
Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I have a hard time stopping myself.
It bothers me to drop an argument that is not resolved.
I am very argumentative.

I AM A CONTENTIOUS COMMUNICATOR.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

6. Dramatic:

Regularly I tell jokes, anecdotes, and stories when I communicate.
Often I physically and vocally act out what I want to communicate.
I very frequently verbally exaggerate to emphasize a point.
I dramatize a lot.

I AM A DRAMATIC COMMUNICATOR.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

7. Animated:

My eyes reflect exactly what I am feeling when I communicate.
I tend to constantly gesture when I communicate.
I actively use a lot of facial expressions when I communicate.
I am very expressive nonverbally in social situations.

I AM AN ANIMATED COMMUNICATOR.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

8. Open:

As a rule, I openly express my feelings and emotions.
I readily reveal personal things about myself.
Usually I tell people a lot about myself even if I do not know them well.
I am an extremely open communicator.

I AM AN OPEN COMMUNICATOR.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

9. Impression-leaving:

What I say usually leaves an impression on people.
I leave people with an impression of me which they definitely try to remember.
The way I say something usually leaves an impression on people.
I leave a definite impression on people.

I AM AN IMPRESSION-LEAVING COMMUNICATOR.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

10. Precise:

Very often I insist that other people document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing.
I like to be strictly accurate when I communicate.
In arguments I insist upon very precise definitions.
I am a very precise communicator.

I AM A PRECISE COMMUNICATOR.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

11. Communicator Image:

I am a very good communicator.
I always find it very easy to communicate on a one-to-one basis with strangers.
In a small group of strangers I am a very good communicator.
I find it extremely easy to maintain a conversation with a member of the opposite sex whom I have just met.

I HAVE A GOOD COMMUNICATOR IMAGE.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

PART II

Directions: Please indicate on the following scales the point which best describes yourself and/or your reactions.

12. I am a persuasive communicator.

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

13. Communication style is something that can be deliberately manipulated by the communicator.

<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------

14. The role of communicator style is important in making a sale?

<u>STRONGLY</u> AGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> AGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> AGREE	<u>NEITHER AGREE</u> NOR DISAGREE	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> DISAGREE	<u>MODERATELY</u> DISAGREE	<u>STRONGLY</u> DISAGREE
--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

15. Where would you rate yourself in terms of sales performance within your company?

<u>TOP</u> PERFORMER	<u>MODERATELY</u> ABOVE AVG.	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> ABOVE AVG.	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>SLIGHTLY</u> BELOW AVG.	<u>MODERATELY</u> BELOW AVG.	<u>POOR</u> PERFORMER
-------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------

16. When you interact with a client, is your communication style different from what it usually is, on a general basis?

<u>ALWAYS</u>	<u>MOST OF</u> THE TIME	<u>SOME OF THE</u> TIME	<u>HALF OF</u> THE TIME	<u>INFREQUENTLY</u>	<u>SELDOM</u>	<u>NEVER</u>
---------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------

17. Do you change your communication style when interacting with different clients?

<u>ALWAYS</u>	<u>MOST OF</u> THE TIME	<u>SOME OF THE</u> TIME	<u>HALF OF</u> THE TIME	<u>INFREQUENTLY</u>	<u>SELDOM</u>	<u>NEVER</u>
---------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------

18. To what extent has your sales training included an understanding of communication style? (Please answer on a scale of 1 to 7)

<u>1</u> (EXTENSIVE)	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u> (NO TRAINING)
-------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	---------------------------

19. What is the average length of time it has taken you to enter into a sales agreement with a client.

<u>LESS THAN</u> 1 MONTH	<u>1 TO 3</u> MONTHS	<u>4 TO 6</u> MONTHS	<u>7 TO 9</u> MONTHS	<u>10 TO 12</u> MONTHS	<u>13 TO 15</u> MONTHS	<u>GREATER THAN</u> 15 MONTHS
-----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------

20. Do you work full-time or part-time? full-time part-time

21. What is the average number of hours per week that you work?

<u>Less than 10</u> hours	<u>10-15</u> hours	<u>16-20</u> hours	<u>21-30</u> hours	<u>31-40</u> hours	<u>41-50</u> hours	<u>More than 50</u> hours
------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

22. How long have you been working for your present company?

<u>Less than</u> 3 months	<u>3 to 6</u> months	<u>7 to 9</u> months	<u>10 to 18</u> months	<u>19 to 24</u> months	<u>24 to 48</u> months	<u>More than</u> 48 months
------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------

23. How many units would you estimate that you have sold within the past year?

<u>0 to 2</u> units	<u>3 to 5</u> units	<u>6 to 8</u> units	<u>7 to 10</u> units	<u>11 to 15</u> units	<u>16 to 22</u> units	<u>more than 22</u> units
------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

24. What is the geographical territory that you are responsible for? (please describe)

YOU WILL NOW BE ASKED SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PERSONAL REACTIONS IN GENERAL.
PLEASE BE HONEST ABOUT YOUR RESPONSES. TURN THE PAGE AND DECIDE WHETHER EACH
STATEMENT IS TRUE OR FALSE AS IT PERTAINS TO YOU.

Personal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally and circle the corresponding letter at the right.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.	T	F
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.	T	F
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	T	F
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.	T	F
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.	T	F
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	T	F
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.	T	F
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.	T	F
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.	T	F
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.	T	F
11. I like to gossip at times.	T	F
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	T	F
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	T	F
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.	T	F
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	T	F
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	T	F
17. I always try to practice what I preach.	T	F
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.	T	F
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	T	F
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.	T	F
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	T	F
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.	T	F
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.	T	F
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.	T	F
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.	T	F
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	T	F
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.	T	F
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	T	F
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.	T	F
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	T	F
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.	T	F
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.	T	F
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	T	F

APPENDIX C
SCRIPTS FOR SALES INTERACTION VIDEOTAPES

HIGH PRECISE/LOW FRIENDLY

The precise communicator insists that other people document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing. They like to be strictly accurate when they communicate. In arguments they insist upon very precise definitions.

The low friendly communicator does not readily express admiration for others. They do not habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions.

Scenario: Salesperson (S) and customer (C) enter the picture and sit across from each other at a desk. They have just left the showroom floor where the salesperson has shown the customer a particular automobile.

S: (as he walks in and takes his seat) WELL, YOU'VE SEEN THE NEW FORD TAURUS 2 DOOR SPORT COUPE, YOU'VE DRIVEN IT AND NOW YOU'RE THE JUDGE. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF STYLE AND PERFORMANCE.

C: I REALLY LIKE THE STYLE BUT I'M NOT QUITE SURE ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE.

S: JUST WHAT IS IT ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE THAT YOU'RE NOT COMFORTABLE WITH? YOU'VE TOLD ME THAT YOU HAVE A VERY BUSY SCHEDULE AND YOU DO ALOT OF DRIVING. IT SEEMS THAT IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE CAR YOU DECIDE TO PURCHASE PERFORM WELL.

C: IT SEEMED TO BE JUST A LITTLE TOO SLUGGISH ON THE HIGHWAY.

S: IF YOU SAY SO. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PARTICULAR CAR THAT YOU DROVE TODAY HAS A 2300 CUBIC CENTIMETER, 4 CYLINDER ENGINE. WHAT MAY SUIT YOUR NEEDS BETTER WOULD BE THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE WHICH IS AVAILABLE IN EITHER THE 200 OR 250 CUBIC INCH SIZE.

C: HOW MUCH BETTER ON GAS MILEAGE IS THE SMALLER ENGINE?

S: THE 4 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES 25 MILES PER GALLON AS TESTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES 21 MILES PER GALLON. A 4 MILE PER GALLON DIFFERENCE ISN'T A LOT IF YOU DON'T DO MUCH DRIVING ON A DAILY BASIS. BUT YOU HAVE TO KEEP IN MIND THAT YOU'VE INDICATED THAT ON SOME DAYS YOU DRIVE UP TO 200 MILES. THAT'S 50 GALLONS MORE A DAY THAT YOU WOULD CONSUME WITH THE 6 CYLINDER. ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU INDICATE THAT YOUR TIME IS VERY VALUABLE. IF THAT IS THE CASE THEN YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO DRIVE A SLUGGISH VEHICLE.

C: I GUESS YOU'RE RIGHT.

S: I KNOW I'M RIGHT. NOW, IF WE WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL I WILL HAVE IT AVAILABLE HERE IN SIX WEEKS.

C: IF I DO DECIDE TO ORDER RATHER THAN TO GO WITH THE SHOWROOM MODEL WOULD I HAVE MY CHOICE OF INTERIORS?

S: YES, THAT'S ANOTHER ADVANTAGE TO ORDERING ! YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM STANDARD INTERIORS OF VINYL OR CLOTH; OR FROM

OPTIONAL INTERIORS OF LEATHER OR VELOUR. THE LEATHER OR VELOUR WILL COST AN ADDITIONAL \$375. HERE IS A COLOR CHART. BOTH THE STANDARD AND THE OPTIONAL TRIMS ARE AVAILABLE IN ANY OF THESE COLORS. SPEAKING OF COLORS, YOU CAN ALSO CHOOSE YOUR EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR FROM THIS CHART. THE WHITE, RED, BLUE AND GREEN ARE AVAILABLE IN A METALLIC AS WELL AS A FLAT COLOR.

C: I'M RATHER INDIFFERENT TO COLOR SO I'M NOT TOO CONCERNED ABOUT THAT NOW.

S: RIGHT, WE CAN TAKE CARE OF THAT LATER. AS I TOLD YOU EARLIER, THE PRICE OF THE FLOOR MODEL IS \$11,000. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, THE FINAL PRICE WOULD BE... (salesperson pauses to calculate some figures) \$11,387. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE OPTIONAL INTERIOR \$375. EXTRA FOR THE INTERIOR AND THE ADDITIONAL \$12. REFLECTS AN INCREASE IN TRANSPORTATION CHARGES. HOW WOULD YOU WANT TO PAY FOR THIS ?

C: I'D PROBABLY FINANCE AT LEAST SOME OF IT.

S: I'D NEED TO KNOW EXACTLY HOW MUCH YOU'D WANT TO FINANCE BUT IF YOU WERE TO DO IT THROUGH OUR COMPANY WE WOULD OFFER YOU AN ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF 11% WITH A 20% DOWN PAYMENT SO THIS RATE WOULD REQUIRE A DOWN PAYMENT OF \$2200.00. IF YOU WERE TO PLACE A DEPOSIT OF LESS THAN THIS AMOUNT, THE PERCENTAGE RATE WOULD BE 12%.

C: (as he takes notes) IT SOUNDS REASONABLE TO ME, I'LL NEED A FEW DAYS TO THINK THIS OVER AND I'LL GET BACK TO YOU.

S: WELL, IF I DON'T HEAR FROM YOU WITHIN A WEEK, I'LL GIVE YOU A CALL. SHOULD I CALL DURING THE DAY OR AT NIGHT?

C: (standing up to leave and shaking hands with S) I'LL BE HOME AFTER 6:00. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

LOW PRECISE/LOW FRIENDLY

Scenario: Salesperson (S) and customer (C) enter the picture and sit across from each other at a desk. They have just left the showroom floor where the salesperson has shown the customer a particular automobile.

S: WELL JOHN, YOU'VE SEEN THE CAR, YOU'VE DRIVEN IT AND NOW YOU'RE THE JUDGE. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF STYLE AND PERFORMANCE?

C: I REALLY LIKE THE STYLE BUT I'M NOT QUITE SURE ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE.

S: I SEE. WHAT IS IT ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE THAT YOU DIDN'T LIKE?

C: IT SEEMED TO BE JUST A LITTLE TOO SLUGGISH ON THE HIGHWAY.

S: YOU KNOW WHAT YOUR NEEDS ARE BETTER THAN I DO AND YOU'RE THE ONE WHO WILL BE DRIVING THE CAR. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PARTICULAR CAR THAT YOU DROVE TODAY HAS SMALL ENGINE. WHAT MAY SUIT YOUR NEEDS BETTER WOULD BE THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE.

C: HOW MUCH BETTER ON GAS MILEAGE IS THE SMALLER ENGINE?

S: I THINK THAT THE 4 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES ABOUT 4 MILES PER GALLON MORE THAN THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE. BUT YOU HAVE TOLD ME THAT ON SOME DAYS YOU DO A LOT OF DRIVING. ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU SAY THAT YOUR TIME IS SO VALUABLE THAT YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO DRIVE A SLUGGISH VEHICLE.

C: I GUESS YOU'RE RIGHT.

S: I KNOW I'M RIGHT, FROM WHAT YOU'VE TOLD ME, YOU HAVE DONE SO MUCH FOR YOUR COMPANY THAT NO ONE ELSE COULD EVEN COME CLOSE TO REACHING YOUR PRODUCTIVITY LEVEL.

C: IF I WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, WHEN WOULD IT BE IN?

S: I THINK IT SHOULD BE HERE IN SIX TO EIGHT WEEKS.

C: IF I DO DECIDE TO ORDER RATHER THAN TO GO WITH THE SHOWROOM MODEL WOULD I HAVE MY CHOICE OF INTERIORS?

S: YES, THERE'S ANOTHER ADVANTAGE TO ORDERING ! YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM THREE OR FOUR INTERIORS, SOME OF WHICH COST EXTRA. HERE IS A COLOR CHART.

C: I'M RATHER INDIFFERENT TO COLOR SO I'M NOT TOO CONCERNED ABOUT THAT NOW.

S: RIGHT, WE CAN TAKE CARE OF THAT LATER. AS I TOLD YOU EARLIER, THE PRICE OF THE CAR IS ABOUT \$11,000. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, THE FINAL PRICE WOULD BE HIGHER. HOW WOULD YOU WANT TO PAY FOR THIS ?

C: I'D PROBABLY FINANCE AT LEAST SOME OF IT.

S: IF YOU WERE TO DO IT THROUGH OUR COMPANY WE WOULD OFFER YOU A LOWER ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE WITH A 20% DOWN PAYMENT THAN IF YOUR DOWN PAYMENT WERE LOWER.

C: (as he takes notes) IT SOUNDS REASONABLE TO ME, I'LL NEED A FEW DAYS TO THINK THIS OVER AND I'LL GET BACK TO YOU.

S: OF COURSE, YOU CAN GIVE ME A CALL IF YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.

C: IF I DECIDED TO FINANCE THROUGH MY OWN BANK, WOULD THAT BE A PROBLEM?

S: NO, THAT SHOULDN'T BE A PROBLEM. JUST HAVE THE BANK CALL ME SO THAT WE CAN INITIATE THE PAPERWORK.

C: (standing up to leave and shaking hands with S) THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

LOW PRECISE/HIGH FRIENDLY

The friendly communicator readily expresses admiration for others. They habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions. Whenever they communicate they tend to be very encouraging to people.

Scenario: Salesperson (S) and customer (C) enter the picture and sit across from each other at a desk. They have just left the showroom floor where the salesperson has shown the customer a particular automobile.

S: (as he walks in, he pats C on back and takes his seat) WELL JOHN, YOU'VE SEEN THE CAR, YOU'VE DRIVEN IT AND NOW YOU'RE THE JUDGE. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF STYLE AND PERFORMANCE?

C: I REALLY LIKE THE STYLE BUT I'M NOT QUITE SURE ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE.

S: I SEE. WITH YOUR BUSY SCHEDULE AND THE AMOUNT OF DRIVING THAT YOU DO, IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE CAR YOU DECIDE TO PURCHASE PERFORM WELL.

C: IT SEEMED TO BE JUST A LITTLE TOO SLUGGISH ON THE HIGHWAY.

S: YOU KNOW WHAT YOUR NEEDS ARE BETTER THAN I DO AND YOU CAN EVALUATE WHAT'S AVAILABLE AS WELL AS I CAN. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PARTICULAR CAR THAT YOU DROVE TODAY HAS SMALL ENGINE. WHAT MAY SUIT YOUR NEEDS BETTER WOULD BE THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE.

C: HOW MUCH BETTER ON GAS MILEAGE IS THE SMALLER ENGINE?

S: I THINK THAT THE 4 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES ABOUT 4 MILES PER GALLON MORE THAN THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE. BUT YOU HAVE TO KEEP IN MIND, JOHN, THAT YOU'VE INDICATED THAT ON SOME DAYS YOU DO A LOT OF DRIVING. ON THE OTHER HAND, YOUR TIME IS SO VALUABLE THAT YOU..OR I SHOULD SAY YOUR COMPANY CAN'T AFFORD FOR YOU TO DRIVE A SLUGGISH VEHICLE.

C: (half-smiling) I GUESS YOU'RE RIGHT.

S: I KNOW I'M RIGHT, FROM WHAT YOU'VE TOLD ME, YOU HAVE DONE SO MUCH FOR YOUR COMPANY THAT NO ONE ELSE COULD EVEN COME CLOSE TO REACHING YOUR PRODUCTIVITY LEVEL. YOU DESERVE TO BE PROUD OF YOURSELF, JOHN.

C: THANKS. IF I WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, WHEN WOULD IT BE IN?

S: I THINK IT SHOULD BE HERE IN SIX TO EIGHT WEEKS.

C: IF I DO DECIDE TO ORDER RATHER THAN TO GO WITH THE SHOWROOM MODEL WOULD I HAVE MY CHOICE OF INTERIORS?

S: YES, THERE'S ANOTHER ADVANTAGE TO ORDERING ! I KNOW

THAT YOUR CARS ARE ALWAYS AS WELL-COORDINATED AS YOU ARE. YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM THREE OR FOUR INTERIORS, SOME OF WHICH COST EXTRA. HERE IS A COLOR CHART.

C: I'M RATHER INDIFFERENT TO COLOR SO I'M NOT TOO CONCERNED ABOUT THAT NOW.

S: RIGHT, WE CAN TAKE CARE OF THAT LATER. AS I TOLD YOU EARLIER, THE PRICE OF THE CAR IS ABOUT \$11,000. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, THE FINAL PRICE WOULD BE HIGHER. HOW WOULD YOU WANT TO PAY FOR THIS JOHN?

C: I'D PROBABLY FINANCE AT LEAST SOME OF IT.

S: IF YOU WERE TO DO IT THROUGH OUR COMPANY WE WOULD OFFER YOU A LOWER ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE WITH A 20% DOWN PAYMENT THAN IF YOUR DOWN PAYMENT WERE LOWER. YOU KNOW I'LL DO MY WHAT I CAN, JOHN, TO GET YOU THE BEST RATE I CAN.

C: (as he takes notes) IT SOUNDS REASONABLE TO ME, I'LL NEED A FEW DAYS TO THINK THIS OVER AND I'LL GET BACK TO YOU.

S: OF COURSE, YOU SHOULD THINK ABOUT IT. IT'S IMPORTANT THAT YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THE DECISION. DON'T HESITATE TO CALL IF YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS. ALSO, IF YOU DECIDE NOT TO FINANCE THROUGH US, I'D BE HAPPY TO MAKE THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR YOU THROUGH THE BANK OF YOUR CHOICE.

C: (standing up to leave and shaking hands with S) THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

HIGH PRECISE/HIGH FRIENDLY

The precise communicator insists that other people document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing. They like to be strictly accurate when they communicate. In arguments they insist upon very precise definitions.

The friendly communicator readily expresses admiration for others. They habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions. Whenever they communicate they tend to be very encouraging to people.

Scenario: Salesperson (S) and customer (C) enter the picture and sit across from each other at a desk. They have just left the showroom floor where the salesperson has shown the customer a particular automobile.

S: (as he walks in, he pats C on back and takes his seat)
WELL JOHN, YOU'VE SEEN THE NEW FORD TAURUS 2 DOOR SPORT COUPE, YOU'VE DRIVEN IT AND NOW YOU'RE THE JUDGE. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF STYLE AND PERFORMANCE.

C: I REALLY LIKE THE STYLE BUT I'M NOT QUITE SURE ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE.

S: JUST WHAT IS IT ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE THAT YOU'RE NOT COMFORTABLE WITH? WITH YOUR BUSY SCHEDULE AND THE AMOUNT OF DRIVING THAT YOU DO, IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE CAR YOU DECIDE TO PURCHASE PERFORM WELL.

C: IT SEEMED TO BE JUST A LITTLE TOO SLUGGISH ON THE HIGHWAY.

S: YOU KNOW WHAT YOUR NEEDS ARE BETTER THAN I DO AND YOU CAN EVALUATE WHAT'S AVAILABLE AS WELL AS I CAN. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PARTICULAR CAR THAT YOU DROVE TODAY HAS A 2300 CUBIC CENTIMETER, 4 CYLINDER ENGINE. WHAT MAY SUIT YOUR NEEDS BETTER WOULD BE THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE WHICH IS AVAILABLE IN EITHER THE 200 OR 250 CUBIC INCH SIZE.

C: HOW MUCH BETTER ON GAS MILEAGE IS THE SMALLER ENGINE?

S: THE 4 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES 25 MILES PER GALLON AS TESTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND THE 6 CYLINDER ENGINE AVERAGES 21 MILES PER GALLON. A 4 MILE PER GALLON DIFFERENCE ISN'T A LOT IF YOU DON'T DO MUCH DRIVING ON A DAILY BASIS. BUT YOU HAVE TO KEEP IN MIND, JOHN, THAT YOU'VE INDICATED THAT ON SOME DAYS YOU DRIVE UP TO 200 MILES. THAT'S 50 GALLONS MORE A DAY THAT YOU WOULD CONSUME WITH THE 6 CYLINDER. ON THE OTHER HAND, YOUR TIME IS SO VALUABLE THAT YOU..OR I SHOULD SAY YOUR COMPANY CAN'T AFFORD FOR YOU TO DRIVE A SLUGGISH VEHICLE.

C: (half-smiling) I GUESS YOU'RE RIGHT.

S: I KNOW I'M RIGHT, FROM WHAT YOU'VE TOLD ME, YOU HAVE DONE SO MUCH FOR YOUR COMPANY THAT NO ONE ELSE COULD EVEN COME CLOSE TO REACHING YOUR PRODUCTIVITY LEVEL. YOU DESERVE TO BE PROUD OF YOURSELF, JOHN.

C: THANKS.

S: NOW, IF WE WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL I WILL HAVE IT AVAILABLE HERE IN SIX WEEKS.

C: IF I DO DECIDE TO ORDER RATHER THAN TO GO WITH THE SHOWROOM MODEL WOULD I HAVE MY CHOICE OF INTERIORS?

S: YES, THERE'S ANOTHER ADVANTAGE TO ORDERING ! I KNOW THAT YOUR CARS ARE ALWAYS AS WELL-COORDINATED AS YOU ARE. YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM STANDARD INTERIORS OF VINYL OR CLOTH; OR FROM OPTIONAL INTERIORS OF LEATHER OR VELOUR. THE LEATHER OR VELOUR WILL COST AN ADDITIONAL \$375. HERE IS A COLOR CHART. BOTH THE STANDARD AND THE OPTIONAL TRIMS ARE AVAILABLE IN ANY OF THESE COLORS. SPEAKING OF COLORS, YOU CAN ALSO CHOOSE YOUR EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR FROM THIS CHART. THE WHITE, RED, BLUE AND GREEN ARE AVAILABLE IN A METALLIC AS WELL AS A FLAT COLOR.

C: I'M RATHER INDIFFERENT TO COLOR SO I'M NOT TOO CONCERNED ABOUT THAT NOW.

S: RIGHT, WE CAN TAKE CARE OF THAT LATER. AS I TOLD YOU EARLIER, THE PRICE OF THE FLOOR MODEL IS \$11,000. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE 6 CYLINDER MODEL, THE FINAL PRICE WOULD BE... (salesperson pauses to calculate some figures) \$11,387. IF YOU WERE TO ORDER THE OPTIONAL INTERIOR \$375. EXTRA FOR THE INTERIOR AND THE ADDITIONAL \$12. REFLECTS AN INCREASE IN TRANSPORTATION CHARGES. HOW WOULD YOU WANT TO PAY FOR THIS JOHN?

C: I'D PROBABLY FINANCE AT LEAST SOME OF IT.

S: I'D NEED TO KNOW EXACTLY HOW MUCH YOU'D WANT TO FINANCE BUT IF YOU WERE TO DO IT THROUGH OUR COMPANY WE WOULD OFFER YOU AN ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF 11% WITH A 20% DOWN PAYMENT SO THIS RATE WOULD REQUIRE A DOWN PAYMENT OF \$2200.00. IF YOU WERE TO PLACE A DEPOSIT OF LESS THAN THIS AMOUNT, THE PERCENTAGE RATE WOULD BE 12%.

C: (as he takes notes) IT SOUNDS REASONABLE TO ME, I'LL NEED A FEW DAYS TO THINK THIS OVER AND I'LL GET BACK TO YOU.

S: OF COURSE, YOU SHOULD THINK ABOUT IT. IF I DON'T HEAR FROM YOU WITHIN A WEEK, I'LL GIVE YOU A CALL TO ANSWER ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS WHICH YOU MIGHT HAVE ABOUT THE CAR OR ABOUT THE FINANCE PROGRAM. IF YOU DECIDE NOT TO FINANCE THROUGH US, I'D BE HAPPY TO MAKE THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR YOU THROUGH THE BANK OF YOUR CHOICE.

C: (standing up to leave and shaking hands with S) THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

APPENDIX D
LAB STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Age: _____

Sex: M F (circle one)

Year: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior (circle one)

Major: _____

How many cars have you purchased on your own? _____

Have you ever held a position in sales? yes no (circle one)

YOU HAVE JUST BEEN SHOWN A VIDEOTAPE DEPICTING AN INTERACTION BETWEEN A SALESPERSON AND A CUSTOMER. IN WHAT FOLLOWS, WE ARE TRYING TO OBTAIN YOUR TRUE REACTIONS TO WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SEEN. PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY BEFORE CHECKING THE CATEGORY THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR REACTIONS.

PLEASE PLACE A CHECKMARK ON EACH OF THE SCALES BELOW AT THAT PLACE WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR REACTIONS.

1. Salespeople are basically deceptive.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

2. This salesperson was animated.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

3. This salesperson was honest.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

4. This salesperson was an effective communicator.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	AGREE	AGREE	AGREE

5. The interaction between the salesperson and the customer was friendly.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

6. This salesperson was relaxed.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

7. This salesperson was dramatic.

STRONGLY	Moderately	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	Moderately	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

8. This salesperson was precise.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	AGREE	AGREE	AGREE

9. This salesperson was friendly.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

10. This salesperson was open.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

11. This salesperson was contentious.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

12. This salesperson was dominant.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

13. The salesperson in the tape was impression leaving.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

14. This salesperson was attentive.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

15. The salesperson in the tape had a good communicator image.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

16. The salesperson in the tape was a strong communicator.

STRONGLY	MODERATELY	SLIGHTLY	NEITHER	AGREE	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
AGREE	AGREE	AGREE	NOR	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE

17. The salesperson in the tape had a gentle approach

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

18. Salespeople are usually helpful.

STRONGLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
----------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------

19. I always shop for the lowest price product available.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

20. When purchasing high ticket items, I value a salesperson's opinion.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

21. I like a salesperson who tells me a lot about a product even if I don't ask for the information.

STRONGLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
----------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------

22. I like a salesperson who engages in general conversation.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

23. This salesperson tended to monopolize the conversation.

STRONGLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
----------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------

24. The liklihood that the customer in the tape bought the product is.

VERY HIGH	MODERATELY HIGH	SLIGHTLY HIGH	NEITHER HIGH NOR LOW	SLIGHTLY LOW	MODERATELY LOW	VER LOW
--------------	--------------------	------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------

25. The interaction between the salesperson and the customer was strained.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

26. The interaction between the salesperson and the customer in the tape was relaxed.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

27. This salesperson was nervous.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

28. The salesperson in the tape is usually the type that I like to do business with.

STRONGLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
----------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	----------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------

29. The liklihood that I would have bought this product from this salesperson is:

VERY LOW	MODERATELY LOW	SLIGHTLY LOW	NEITHER NOR LOW	HIGH HIGH	SLIGHTLY HIGH	MODERATELY HIGH	VERY HIGH
-------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------	--------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------

30. The salesperson in the tape was direct in answering the customer's questions.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

31. This salesperson was competent.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

32. This salesperson was intelligent.

STRONGLY AGREE	MODERATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODERATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

33. I like when a salesperson takes a personal interest in me.

STRONGLY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER AGREE SLIGHTLY MODERATELY STRONGLY
AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE

34. I prefer not to have a salesperson help me in evaluating a product.

STRONGLY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER AGREE SLIGHTLY MODERATELY STRONGLY
DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE NOR DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE

35. The salesperson in the tape was exact.

STRONGLY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER AGREE SLIGHTLY MODERATELY STRONGLY
AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE

36. I like when a salesperson pays me compliments.

STRONGLY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER AGREE SLIGHTLY MODERATELY STRONGLY
AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE

37. The sales activity involved between selling a car and selling a house are:

EXTREMELY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER SIMILAR SLIGHTLY MODERATELY EXTREMELY
SIMILAR SIMILAR SIMILAR NOR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR

38. The sales activity involved between selling a car and selling a diamond ring are:

EXTREMELY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER SIMILAR SLIGHTLY MODERATELY EXTREMELY
DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR NOR DISSIMILAR SIMILAR SIMILAR SIMILAR

39. The sales activity involved between selling a house and selling a boat are:

EXTREMELY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER SIMILAR SLIGHTLY MODERATELY EXTREMELY
SIMILAR SIMILAR SIMILAR NOR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR

40. The sales activity involved between selling a car and selling a boat are:

EXTREMELY MODERATELY SLIGHTLY NEITHER SIMILAR SLIGHTLY MODERATELY EXTREMELY
SIMILAR SIMILAR SIMILAR NOR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR DISSIMILAR

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, B.M. (1960). Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper Bros.
- Bass, B.M. (1967). Social behavior and the orientation inventory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 68, 260-92.
- Bednar, D.A. (1982). Relationships between communicator style and managerial performance in complex organizations: a field study. Journal of Business Communicantion, 19, 51-75.
- Capon, N., Holbrook, M.B., & Hulbert, J.M. (1977). Selling process and buyer behavior: Theoretical implications of recent research. In A.G. Woodside, J.N. Sheth & P.D. Bennett (eds), Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc.
- Churchill, G., Ford, N., & Walker, O. (1985). Sales Force Management. Homewood, IL.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Churchill, G., Ford, N., Hartley, S. & Walker, O. (1985). The determinants of salesperson performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 22, 103-18.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24(4), 349-54.
- Emery, D., Norton, R., & Plain, H. (1980). Relaxed as a style of communicating. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.
- Friedman, M., & Churchill, G.A., (1987). Using consumer perspectives and a contingency approach to improve health care delivery. Journal of Consumer Research, 13, 492-510.
- Graetz, H.G. (1974). Verbal Behavior and Managerial Effectiveness of Supermarket Store Managers. Unpublished D.B.A. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Ma.
- Norton, R. (1977). Teacher effectiveness as a function of communicator style. In B.D. Ruben (ed.), Communication Yearbook I. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

- Norton, R. (1983). Communicator Style: Theory, application and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Norton, R., Baker, N., Bednar, D., Sayler, R., & McGough, T. (1978). Impressions of interpersonal dramatic style. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, Mi.
- Norton, R. & Bednar, D.A., (1979). Ideal communicator style for the interviewee. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Norton, R., & Miller, L. (1975). Dyadic perception of communication style. Communication Research, 2 50-67.
- Norton, R., & Montgomery, B. (1979). An integration of style, content, and target in defining and measuring openness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Norton, R., & Nussbaum, J. (1980). Dramatic behaviors of the effective teacher. In Nimmo, D. (ed.) Communication Yearbook. 4 New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Norton, R., & Pettegrew, L.S. (1977). Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction. Communication Research, 4, 257-82.
- Norton, R., & Robinson, D. Communicator style in career decisions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. New York.
- Norton, R., Syphner, H., Clarke, C., & Brady. (1977). Dimensions of a dramatic communicator style. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.
- Notarantonio, E.M. & Cohen, J.L. (1988). The effects of open and dominant communication styles on perceptions of the sales interaction. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management. Under editorial review.
- Pace, W.R. (1962). Oral communication and sales effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44, 487-8.

- Sheth, J.M. (1976). Buyer-seller interaction: A conceptual framework. Proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research. Cincinnati, OH: Association for Consumer Research, 382-6.
- Staley, C.C., & Cohen, J.L. (1988). Communicator style and social style: similarities and differences between the sexes. Communication Quarterly. 36, 192-202.
- Szymanski, David M. (1988). Determinants of selling effectiveness: The importance of declarative knowledge to the personal selling concept. Journal of Marketing, 52, 64-77.
- Ward, J. H. (1963). Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. Journal of American Statistical Association, 58, 236-244.
- Weitz, Barton A. (1981). Effectiveness in sales interactions: a contingency framework. Journal of Marketing, 45, 85-103..
- Weitz, B., Sujan, H., & Sujan, M. (1986). Knowledge, motivation, and adaptive behavior: A framework for improving selling effectiveness. Journal of Marketing, 50, 174-191.
- Weitz, B.A., & Wright, P. (1978). The salesperson as a marketing strategist: The relationship between field sales performance and insights about one's customers. MSI Working Paper No. 78-120, Marketing Science Institute.
- Williams, K.C. & Spiro, R.L. (1985). Communication style in the salesperson-customer dyad. Journal of Marketing Research. 22.434-42.