



Communication Style in the Salesperson-Customer Dyad

Author(s): Kaylene C. Williams and Rosann L. Spiro

Source: *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Nov., 1985), pp. 434-442

Published by: American Marketing Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3151588>

Accessed: 03/03/2010 15:04

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ama>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Marketing Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Marketing Research*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The authors report a study designed to evaluate the use of communication style by salespeople and their customers. Using a paradigm suggested by Sheth in which the communication styles of customers and salespeople are categorized as task oriented, interaction oriented, or self oriented, they assess whether communication styles are related to sales. They first develop scales to measure these styles and then test whether the styles affect the sales outcome. The results suggest that communication styles are a determinant of the success of the sales interaction.

Communication Style in the Salesperson-Customer Dyad

In retail selling, exchange typically is initiated, maintained, and terminated on a person-to-person basis. The retail salesperson's most basic activity during this exchange is communication. Successful selling therefore depends on successful interpersonal communication. In spite of the importance of communication, it has received limited attention in personal selling research. As Capon, Holbrook, and Hulbert (1977) point out in their review of the customer-salesperson interaction literature, only a few studies have used a communication perspective to examine customer-salesperson interactions.

We will examine the customer-salesperson interaction from a communication perspective. Drawing on a paradigm suggested by Sheth (1976) whereby customers and salespeople can be categorized according to their communication styles as task oriented, interaction oriented, or self oriented, we assess whether the customer's and salesperson's communication styles are related to the results of the sales interaction. We first develop measures of these communication styles and then test whether they are related to sales results. Our study is a first step toward developing empirical measures of the communication style variable in personal selling. As such, the study's purpose is exploratory, providing an assessment

of the communication style variable for use in future research on the customer-salesperson dyad.

BACKGROUND

Most conceptualizations of the buyer-seller interaction process (Bearden 1969; Levy and Zaltman 1975; Willett and Pennington 1966) treat the actual communication between the buyer and seller in a general manner, labeling it with such terms as "interaction," "transaction," or "negotiation." Though these conceptualizations usually depict content as an inherent part of the buyer-seller communication, no recognition is given to the other generally accepted elements of communication—code, rules, and style (Anderson 1972).

Content consists of the ideas contained in the message (Anderson 1972). Code is the verbal and nonverbal form in which the content is relayed (Eisenberg and Smith 1971; Mortensen 1972). Communication rules are the discipline that binds the code with the content (e.g., grammar, social and/or cultural conventions, physical laws). The fourth element, communication style, encompasses the other three. Style is the synthesis of content, code, and communication rules into unique and infinite combinations. As such, communication style refers to an individual's particular pattern of communication (Barber 1978). For example, some individuals express themselves very flamboyantly whereas others are quiet and serious.

Sheth (1976) proposed a conceptualization of the buyer-seller interaction process which explicitly recognizes two of these elements, communication content and style. His definition of style as "representing the format, ritual or mannerism which the buyer and the seller adopt in their

*Kaylene C. Williams is Assistant Professor of Marketing, California State University, Stanislaus. Rosann L. Spiro is Associate Professor of Marketing, Indiana University.

The authors acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions offered by the Editor, three anonymous *JMR* reviewers, and Scott MacKenzie of Indiana University.

interaction" implicitly encompasses the elements of communication code and rules. The basic postulate underlying Sheth's conceptual framework is that the outcome of the buyer-seller interaction is a function of both communication content and style.

Most of the early empirical research related to personal selling focused on the personal characteristics of the salesperson. Later studies recognized that the characteristics of both the salesperson and customer are important determinants of communication. Several studies have considered the content of communication and a very limited number have examined code, rules, or style. Each of the areas is reviewed hereafter.

Salesperson/Customer Characteristics

Early studies found age (Kirchner, McElwain, and Dunnette 1960; Weaver 1969), education (Weaver 1969), intelligence (Ghiselli 1973; Miner 1962), and empathy (Greenberg and Mayer 1964) to be related significantly to salesperson performance. Evans (1963) hypothesized that similarity between the characteristics of the buyer and seller would lead to greater sales. Though his results were inconclusive, his work popularized the dyadic approach. Others (Busch and Wilson 1976; Churchill, Collins, and Strang 1975; Mathews, Wilson, and Monoky 1972) have since investigated the importance of similarity with mixed results. Several studies in social and educational psychology have demonstrated that social and psychological similarities between two people improve their ability to communicate with one another (Padgett and Wolosin 1980; Runkel 1956; Treandis 1960), but the relationship between similarity of buyer/seller characteristics and sales effectiveness has not been resolved.

Communication Content

Several studies have compared the persuasiveness of one type of sales message (or strategy) with that of another: a product versus a personal presentation (Farley and Swinth 1967), an expertise versus a "product-experience" similarity presentation (Brock 1965), a "product-experience" similarity versus nonsimilarity presentation, and an expertise versus non-expertise presentation (Woodside and Davenport 1974).

Content analysis also has been used to study customer-salesperson interactions. Willett and Pennington (1966) used Bales' (1950) interaction categories to analyze interactions between customers and salespeople in an appliance store. Three fourths of their communications were devoted to defining issues and problems. Pennington (1968) further analyzed the content and isolated types of "bargaining behavior" that appeared to affect the likelihood of purchase: frequency of direct offers, frequency of attempts to change concession limits, and frequency of commitment to concession limits. Using these same categories, Taylor and Woodside (1978) analyzed the interactions between insurance salespeople and their customers and also found that the use of these bargaining techniques increased the probability of a sale. "Content"

is the most explicit element of persuasive communication; as a result, several customer-salesperson studies have focused on this element. However, the relationship of "content" to the other elements has not been examined.

Communication Code

Though most language (code) research has been conducted in contexts other than personal selling settings, many of the issues are relevant to the personal sales presentation. For example, the questions of primacy/re-cency and two-sided versus one-sided arguments (Hovland 1957; Lund 1925) often are presented in personal selling texts as a consideration in sales presentation planning (Russell, Beach, and Buskirk 1982). Other relevant issues that have been examined are the use of mentioning versus refuting counterarguments (Ludlum 1958; Mortensen 1972) and the use of evidence in persuasive communication (McCroskey 1969, Mortensen 1972).

Nonverbal communication, including body movements (e.g., gestures, eye movements), voice qualities (e.g., pitch, rate, volume), and physical distance between communicators, is an important aspect of any kind of interpersonal communication. Mehrabian (1969) found that only 7% of a message effect is carried by words, the remainder being nonverbal. Hulbert and Capon (1972) also recognized the importance of nonverbal communication. They presented a 12-cell matrix of interpersonal communications in marketing, in which only one of the cells represents verbal behavior. These verbal and nonverbal aspects of communication are recognized as affecting the persuasiveness of the message but have not been studied in the personal selling context.

Communication Rules

"Except for occasional fleeting exchanges, all communication exchanges are governed by at least two kinds of interrelated rules: rules pertaining to communication structure and rules pertaining to communication content" (Steinberg and Miller 1975, p. 127). Simply stated, there are rules that guide what (content) we should say in a particular situation as well as when and how (structure) we should say it. Many of these rules have been determined by custom and tradition or by authority and power. However, many of the rules evolve from the interaction and are determined by the communicators themselves.

In an early study, Chapple and Donald (1947) used the Interaction Chronograph to measure the amount and frequency of verbal activity of salespeople and their customers. The "activity" and "interactive-dominance" measures correlated highly with sales success. Some of the results from the Willett and Pennington (1966) study of customer-salesperson interactions are also indicative of structural rules and relationships. Customers asked four times as many questions as salespeople and were more likely to give positive reactions, whereas salespeople were usually responsible for any disagreement and tension. Olshavsky's (1973) reanalysis of the same data determined that it is the salesperson who controls the extent

of the search and the evaluation of the alternatives. Apparently there are communication "rules" that characterize the sales interaction. These structural patterns need to be further identified and clarified.

Communication Style

In marketing, a limited number of studies have indirectly considered communication style. Pace (1962), in a study of door-to-door salespeople, rated them on their use of voice, language, eye contact, body movement, and quality of listening, as well as on their overall communication skills. Only the use of language and the overall index were related significantly to performance. The overall index reflects communication style. Stafford and Greer (1965) investigated preferences for salespeople and found that the person characterized as an "independent shopper" prefers a salesperson with an aggressive style, whereas the "dependent shopper" prefers a salesperson with a less aggressive style. "Style" frequently has been studied in the context of leadership. Studies have demonstrated that differences in leadership style are related to leadership effectiveness (Hare 1976; Lippett and White 1952).

Though no empirical sales studies have focused directly on "style," Sheth (1976) depicted "communication style" as one of the elements in his conceptual framework of the buyer-seller interaction. His depiction of "style" does not give explicit recognition to communication codes or rules, but his conceptualization does provide a framework for an empirical investigation of communication style. This framework is detailed in the next section.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Style Dimensions

We examine the relationship between customer-salesperson communication styles and sales. Drawing on Sheth's (1976) model of the buyer-seller interaction, we presume communication style to be three-dimensional, consisting of a task orientation, a self orientation, and an interaction orientation. The task-oriented style is highly goal oriented and purposeful. The salesperson (customer) using this style is concerned with efficiency and minimizing time, cost, and effort. The interaction-oriented salesperson (customer) is more personal and social even to the extent of ignoring the task at hand. The self-oriented salesperson (customer) is preoccupied with himself in an interaction, and thus more concerned about his own welfare and less empathetic toward the other person. It should be noted that our research does not examine communication content as a separate variable. Though the match between product-related utilities that the customer desires and the seller offers (Sheth 1976) is an important determinant of the sales outcome, the intent of our study is to focus on the style variable and its impact on sales.

Sheth's conceptualization of customer-salesperson

communication style is based on a framework of leadership style suggested by Bass (1960, 1967). According to this framework, leaders can be categorized according to the extent to which they are self, task, or interaction oriented. Bass (1960) describes the task-oriented leader as one who is goal oriented, who overcomes barriers preventing the successful completion of the group's tasks, and who persists at assignments. The interaction-oriented leader is one who is concerned with the group as a means for forming friendships, sharing things with others, providing the security of "belonging," and helping foster strong interpersonal relationships. The self-oriented leader is one who is more concerned about his own needs than those of others, more interested in extrinsic reward than intrinsic satisfaction of work, and will air his personal difficulties, gains in status, or esteem. Bass (1977; Bass et al. 1963) developed an inventory to measure an individual's task, self, and interaction orientation for use in leadership research. The inventory consists of 27 groups of statements (three in each group) reflecting different needs and values that characterize each orientation. Each respondent chooses the most preferred and the least preferred alternative in each group of three statements.

Whereas Bass focused on leadership styles, Sheth (1976) proposed that buyers and sellers also can be categorized according to their task, self, and interaction orientations. Drawing on a framework of leadership styles is conceptually consistent in that both leadership and personal selling are influence processes. Additionally, some theoretical support for these style dimensions is provided by the Blake and Mouton (1980) sales and customer grids. Both grids depict two orientations, concern for the sale and concern for the other person (customer or salesperson). Blake and Mouton represent each salesperson and customer on the respective grids according to the extent to which they are sale oriented and customer or salesperson oriented. They describe the salesperson who is only sale oriented as one who takes charge of the customer, puts on the hard sell, and applies whatever pressure it takes to get the sale. The salesperson with predominant concern for the customer is described as wanting to understand the customer and to respond to his or her feelings and interests so that the customer will like him. These dimensions parallel Bass' task and interaction orientations. Additionally, a salesperson who has low concern for the sale and low concern for the customer may be a person who is, in Bass' framework, self oriented.

Some empirical support for these dimensions is provided in a study of influence strategies used by salespeople (Spiro and Perreault 1979). The study found that some salespeople use primarily expertise and legitimate strategies, others rely on referent and ingratiation strategies, and some do not use any of these strategies. A task-oriented communication style would relate to expertise and legitimate influence attempts, whereas an interaction style would support referent and ingratiation in-

fluence attempts. The self orientation may be that of a salesperson who makes few influence attempts.

Style Interaction

The effectiveness of the sales interaction is not determined by the actions of the salesperson alone, but rather by the actions of both the salesperson and the customer. As recognized by Sheth (1976) and others (Blake and Mouton 1980), it is the combination of salesperson and customer behavior that brings about a sale. The basic idea is that sales effectiveness is dependent on behavior associated with the salesperson, the customer, and the dyad.

HYPOTHESES

Our research empirically tests whether or not different communication styles are related to sales effectiveness, and whether certain customer-salesperson interactions of style lead to greater sales effectiveness. Thus, the null hypotheses to be examined are:

- H₁: There are no significant differences in the amount of sales among salespeople perceived to exhibit different communication styles.
- H₂: There are no significant differences in the amount of purchases among customers perceived to exhibit different communication styles.
- H₃: There are no combinations (in terms of different communication styles) of salespeople and customers that are significantly more effective in terms of sales than others.

The expectation is that salespeople (H₁) with greater task and interaction orientations will have greater sales and that customers (H₂) with greater task orientations will have more purchases. Consistent with the Blake and Mouton (1980) sales grid, combinations (H₃) of interaction-oriented customers and interaction- or task-oriented salespeople are expected to lead to greater sales than other combinations. In fact, other combinations are expected to be ineffective and/or to detract from sales.

METHODS

Sample and Data Collection

Data for the study were collected from the sales transactions of all (13) of the sporting goods stores in a major city in the Southeast. The data were collected during the month of April on different days of the week and during different store hours. All of the salespeople for each store participated. The customer could approach any available salesperson and vice versa. An attempt was made to ask every customer who spoke with a salesperson to participate, and was successful except during a few very busy hours when it was necessary to omit a few customers randomly. The customer was approached just outside the store. Ninety percent of the customers who were asked agreed to participate. If the customer did not participate, the salesperson was not given the questionnaire for that particular transaction. If the customer agreed, the sales-

person completed a questionnaire before helping another customer. When the salesperson and the customer had completed their questionnaires, a different salesperson and corresponding customer became the next subjects. The sample consisted of a total of 251 customer-salesperson interactions, based on reports from 64 salespeople and 251 customers. Each salesperson typically completed questionnaires for a maximum of four different customer transactions. This limit was used to minimize the salesperson's learning effect as well as to ensure a variety of salespeople.

The salesperson's questionnaire consisted of Likert scale items on a 5-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, measuring his opinion of the customer's communication style and the dollar amount of the sale; the customer's questionnaire had similar scale items evaluating the salesperson's style. The items for the different styles were intermingled randomly on the questionnaire and some items were worded negatively to reduce acquiescence bias.

Scale Development and Reliability

The scale items developed to measure the three communication styles (see Appendix) directly reflect the dimensions of each orientation described by Bass (1960, 1967, 1977). These items were developed to be more specific to the sales interaction context than those from the more general Bass orientation inventory. Importantly, these items measure each person's perception of the other's style, whereas the orientation inventory is a self-perception measure. Most studies of salesperson and/or customer behavior have used self-report measures. However, it is the salesperson's and customer's perceptions of one another that shape their interaction; therefore, these perceptions of one another were measured.

The items for each scale (1) were significantly and positively intercorrelated, (2) were correlated significantly with the appropriate overall scale but not with other scales, and (3) increased the reliability (Cronbach's alpha, 1951) of that scale. Several items that did not meet these criteria were eliminated. The final scale reliabilities, means, and standard deviations are reported in Table 1. Factor analysis was used to confirm the intended

Table 1
SUMMARY INFORMATION FOR COMMUNICATION
STYLE MEASURES

<i>Style scale</i>	<i>No. of items</i>	<i>Scale mean</i>	<i>Scale S.D.</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>
<i>Salesperson</i>				
Task	4	3.80	.76	.76
Self	5	1.90	.53	.66
Interaction	7	4.12	.56	.85
<i>Customer</i>				
Task	5	3.53	.83	.86
Self	4	2.16	.51	.63
Interaction	7	3.29	.72	.89

Table 2
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR COMMUNICATION STYLE MEASURES

Scale	Salesperson			Customer		
	Task	Self	Interaction	Task	Self	Interaction
<i>Salesperson</i>						
Task	1.00					
Self	-.13	1.00				
Interaction	.51	-.36	1.00			
<i>Customer</i>						
Task	.18	-.12	.09	1.00		
Self	.03	.11	-.07	-.08	1.00	
Interaction	.13	-.16	.37	.09	-.37	1.00

scale structure. The factor loadings and item-scale correlations are reported in the Appendix. The composite scores were computed as the average of the responses to the statements associated with the scale.

Though the interactive nature of communication suggests that the salesperson's style should depend to some extent on the customer's style and vice versa, the communication style scales are designed to measure independent constructs. The correlations between the salesperson's and customer's style scale scores (Table 2) were examined to validate that the scales' measures are independent. As seen in Table 2, .18 is the highest correlation between a customer scale and salesperson scale. The correlations between the task, self, and interaction scales for both the salesperson and customer indicate that these are independent measures. Also, the average variability within the customers' perceptions of the same salesperson is less than the variability of the customers' perceptions across all salespeople. This finding suggests the scales are measuring individual differences in communication style. Finally, to examine post-interaction bias, the scale means for buying and nonbuying customers were examined. There are no significant differences in the buying and nonbuying customers' ratings of the salespeople and no significant differences in the salespeople's ratings of buying and nonbuying customers. This finding indicates that the measurement procedure is not biased by a satisfactory or less than satisfactory purchase, strengthening the validity of the scales for measuring communication style.

Statistical Procedures

The following regression model is estimated to explain the variance in sales that can be attributed to the salesperson's communication style, the customer's style, and the interaction of the two.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sales amount} = & B_0 + B_1 \times SOS_s + B_2 \times TOS_s \\ & + B_3 + IOS_s + B_4 \times SOS_c + B_5 \\ & \times TOS_c + B_6 + IOS_c + B_7 \times SOS_s \\ & \times SOS_c + B_8 \times SOS_s \times TOS_c + B_9 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times SOS_s \times IOS_c + B_{10} \times TOS_s \times SOS_c \\ & + B_{11} \times TOS_s \times TOS_c + B_{12} \times TOS_s \\ & \times IOS_c + B_{13} \times IOS_s \times SOS_c + B_{14} \\ & \times IOS_s \times TOS_c + B_{15} \times IOS_s \times IOS_c \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript *s* = salesperson and *c* = customer score. *SOS* is the measure on the self-oriented scale, *TOS* is the measure on the task-oriented scale, and *IOS* is the measure on the interaction orientation. The first two hypotheses are tested by estimating two reduced models of (1) salesperson scores and (2) customer scores, and testing whether the regression coefficients in each model are significantly different from zero. The test for H_1 is $B_1 = B_2 = B_3 = 0$; the test for H_2 is $B_4 = B_5 = B_6 = 0$. H_3 is tested by comparing a reduced model of salesperson and customer scores with the full model to determine whether the interactive terms add significantly to the explained variance. Additionally, to determine which model explains the greater sales variance, the other reduced models also are compared with the full model by testing the difference in variance explained.

RESULTS

The full and reduced regression models are presented in Table 3 and the tests for the difference in the explained variance between the full and reduced models are shown in Table 4. The equations for the reduced salesperson and customer models are significant and therefore the first two null hypotheses are rejected. There are significant differences in the amount of sales among salespeople and customers exhibiting different communication styles. However, as reflected in Table 4, the full model does not explain a significantly greater amount of the variance than the reduced salesperson and customer model. Therefore the third null hypothesis is accepted; the interactive terms, as a group, do not add to the explained sales variance. Additionally, neither the full model nor the reduced customer and salesperson model explains significantly more variance than the reduced model consisting of only customer orientation scores. The full model does explain significantly more variance than the reduced model based only on salesperson orientation

Table 3
REGRESSION OF COMMUNICATION STYLE SCORES ON SALES

Equation parameters	Full model	Reduced models		
		Salesperson	Customer	Salesperson & customer
Constant	6.14	2.06	-.36	.20
Coefficients				
SOS_s^d	-1.69	-.30 ^a		-.23
TOS_s	.79	.08		.02
IOS_s	-1.50	.10		-.03
SOS_c^d	-.48		.04	-.05
TOS_c	.35		.40 ^c	.39 ^c
IOS_c	-1.16		.32 ^b	.30 ^b
$SOS_s \times SOS_c$.30			
$SOS_s \times TOS_c$.19			
$SOS_s \times IOS_c$.05			
$TOS_s \times SOS_c$	-.01			
$TOS_s \times TOS_c$	-.01			
$TOS_s \times IOS_c$	-.21			
$IOS_s \times SOS_c$.00			
$IOS_s \times TOS_c$	-.07			
$IOS_s \times IOS_c$.52 ^a			
R^2	.170	.033	.127	.137
df	15,235	3,247	3,247	6,244
F	3.200	2.810	11.960	6.45
Significance	.001	.100	.001	.001

^a $p < .10$.

^b $p < .01$.

^c $p < .001$.

^d SOS_s is salesperson's score on the self-oriented scale; SOS_c is customer's score on the self-oriented scale.

scores. This finding is expected given the low R^2 of the reduced salesperson model. The conclusion is that the reduced model of only customer orientation scores is a better predictor of sales variations than either the sales-

Table 4
FULL AND REDUCED REGRESSION MODELS'
SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN EXPLAINED VARIANCE^a

Models	F	Significance level
Customer & salesperson model vs. full model	1.06	NS
Customer model vs. full model	1.02	NS
Salesperson model vs. full model	3.23	.001
Customer model vs. customer & salesperson model	.95	NS

^aThe F-test is to test whether the full model (with a greater number of variables) explains significantly more of the variance than the reduced model.

$$F = \frac{\text{sums of square error (R)} - \text{sums of square error (F)}}{\text{d.f. (R)} - \text{d.f. (F)}} \div \frac{\text{sums of square error (F)}}{\text{d.f. (F)}}$$

(Neter and Wasserman 1974.)

person orientation model, the customer and salesperson model, or the full model. It should be noted that when each interactive term is examined separately (by comparing the full model and the full model without the one interactive term), the $IOS_s \times IOS_c$ term does contribute marginally (.10) to explained variance of the full model. However, when this term is added to any of the reduced models, it does not contribute to explained variance.

Further insights can be gained by examining the coefficients of the variables that contribute to the explained variance in each of the models. In the reduced model of customer orientation scores, the task communication style leads to a purchase as expected, but so does the interactive style. Though the reduced model of salesperson orientation scores explains the least sales variance, it is interesting to note that the self-oriented style of communication hinders the sale. The task and interaction coefficients in this model, though positive, are not significant. As expected in the full model, the combination of a salesperson and customer who are both interaction oriented leads to a sale.

The remaining coefficients of the full model are not significant, but their direction is notable. Inconsistent with expectations, a task-oriented salesperson combined with an interaction-oriented customer does not lead to a sale. In fact the task-oriented salesperson does not do well

with any of the customer types. The combination of a task-oriented customer and an interaction-oriented salesperson also does not lead to a sale, but this finding is expected. In contrast, contrary to predictions, sales are increased if the customer is task or self oriented and the salesperson is self oriented.

DISCUSSION

Communication style is an individual's tendency to communicate via unique patterns or combinations of code, content, and communication rules. The purpose of our research is to further conceptualize and operationalize the concept of communication style and its role in personal selling. Several of the major findings warrant review. First, communication styles as measured by task, self, and interaction orientation scores are significant in terms of explaining sales variance. Though the amount of explained variance is low, this should be expected in that many other variable factors influence a sale. Thus communication style should be considered as one of the behavioral dimensions affecting sales outcomes in future research.

Second, our study highlights the overriding importance of the customer's orientation. Perhaps the successful salesperson is one who recognizes different customer styles and adapts his or her communication style appropriately to interact with the customer. As suggested by Weitz (1978) in his discussion of impression formation, "... the salesperson's perception of the customer will be related to ability to influence the custom-

er's decision" (p. 503). These conclusions suggest that sales managers and trainers need to teach their salespeople to recognize different communication styles and to be flexible in dealing with their customers.

We must note several reservations about the inferences that may be drawn from our study. Because the measurements were taken after the interaction, the results of the transaction may bias the respondents' answers. Also, there may have been other dimensions of communication style that were not tapped by the scales. Additionally, the sample frame used may not be representative of all retail salespersons, and thus the generalizability of the results may be limited to similar groups of salespeople.

Our study can provide direction for future research. The many personal and environmental variables that can affect communication style should be considered. For example, a person's age, education, experience, and training can affect his or her communication style and ability to adapt that style. Additionally, tracing style patterns across different retail settings and integrating style into the work on influence strategies could provide new insights. For example, is the use of an expert or legitimate influence strategy (Spiro and Perreault 1979) more effective when executed with a task- or an interaction-oriented communication style? Also future studies should examine the importance of content, code, and rules in relation to style. The customer-salesperson interaction is fundamental to all businesses and, as such, should continue to be of relevant and primary concern for managers as well as researchers.

APPENDIX

STYLE DIMENSIONS AND SCALE ITEMS: ITEM-SCALE CORRELATIONS AND FACTOR LOADINGS

<i>Dimensions</i> (Bass 1960, p. 67, 77)	<i>Item</i>	<i>Item-scale correlations^a</i>	<i>Factor loadings^b</i>
<i>Salesperson interaction</i>		<i>Scale 1</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>
Seeks and enjoys interaction	This SP genuinely enjoyed helping me	.76	.67
	This SP was easy to talk with	.73	.62
Concerned with executing and maintaining personal relationships	This SP likes to help customers	.74	.61
	This SP was a cooperative person	.68	.53
	This SP tried to establish a personal relationship	.61	.47
	This SP seemed interested in me not only as a customer, but also as a person	.78	.70
	This SP was friendly	.66	.52
<i>Salesperson task</i>		<i>Scale 2</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>
Persistent and hardworking	This SP worked hard to complete the sale	.80	.69
Interested in task completion	This SP wanted to complete the sale	.79	.71
	This SP's primary concern was to help me make a purchase	.72	.45
Concerned with effective and outstanding performance	This SP wanted to do the job well	.75	.61
<i>Salesperson self</i>		<i>Scale 3</i>	<i>Factor 3</i>
Concerned with self	This SP seemed more interested in himself than in me	.67	.50
	This SP was more interested in what he had to say than in what I had to say	.73	.61
Group participation as a vehicle to satisfy own needs	This SP talked about his own personal difficulties	.60	.65
Aggressive and dominating	This SP tried to dominate the conversation	.69	.58
Direct personal reward, recognition, and respect	This SP really wants to be admired by others	.55	.36

APPENDIX (continued)

Dimensions (Bass 1960, p. 67, 77)	Item	Item-scale correlations ^a	Factor loadings ^b
<i>Customer interaction</i>		<i>Scale 1</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>
Seeks and enjoys interaction	This C was easy to talk with	.78	.73
	This C genuinely enjoyed my helping him	.76	.71
	This C likes to talk to people	.82	.79
	This C was interested in socializing	.73	.69
Concerned with executing and maintaining personal relationships	This C was friendly	.74	.70
	This C tried to establish a personal relationship	.78	.74
	This C seemed interested in me not only as an SP, but also as a person	.83	.79
<i>Customer task</i>		<i>Scale 2</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>
Persistent and hardworking	This C tried hard to complete the shopping task	.82	.71
Interested in task completion	This C wanted to finish the shopping task	.84	.81
	This C's primary concern was to make the purchase	.74	.65
	This C's main concern was to finish his shopping	.81	.77
Concerned with effective and outstanding performance	This C wanted to complete his shopping as effectively as possible	.82	.80
<i>Customer self</i>		<i>Scale 3</i>	<i>Factor 3</i>
Concerned with self	This C seemed more interested in himself than in the product or what I had to say	.78	.53
	This C was primarily interested in what he had to say and not in what I had to say	.71	.37
Aggressive and dominating	This C tried to dominate the conversation	.56	.46
Direct personal reward and recognition	This C tried to impress me with himself	.68	.68

^aAll of the item-scale correlations are higher for the scale indicated than with the other scales.

^bPrincipal components analysis

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Kenneth E. (1972), *Introduction to Communication Theory and Practice*. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings Publishing Co.
- Bales, Robert F. (1950), "A Set of Categories for the Analysis of Small Group Interactions," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (April), 257-63.
- Barber, Larry L. (1978), *Communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bass, Bernard M. (1960), *Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- (1967), "Social Behavior and the Orientation Inventory: A Review," *Psychological Bulletin*, 68 (October), 260-92.
- (1977), *ORI-Manual for the Orientation Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- , G. Duntzman, R. Frye, R. Vidulich, and H. Wambach (1963), "Self Interaction, and Task Orientation Inventory Scores Associated with Overt Behavior and Personal Factors," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 23 (Spring), 101-292.
- Bearden, James H. (1969), "Decision Processes in Personal Selling," *Southern Journal of Business*, 4 (April), 187-99.
- Blake, Robert R. and J. S. Mouton (1980), *The Grid for Sales Excellence*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Brock, Timothy C. (1965), "Communicator-Recipient Similarity and Decision Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1 (June), 650-4.
- Busch, Paul and David T. Wilson (1976), "An Experimental Analysis of a Salesman's Expert and Referent Bases of Social Power in the Buyer-Seller Dyad," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13 (February), 3-11.
- Capon, Noel, Morris B. Holbrook, and James M. Hulbert (1977), "Selling Process and Buyer Behavior: Theoretical Implications of Recent Research," in *Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior*, Arch G. Woodside, Jagdish N. Sheth, and Peter D. Bennett, eds. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc.
- Chapple, Elliot D. and Gordon Donald, Jr. (1947), "An Evaluation of Department Store Sales People by the Interaction Chronograph," *Journal of Marketing*, 12 (October), 173-85.
- Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr., Robert H. Collins, and William A. Strang (1975), "Should Retail Salespersons be Similar to Their Customers?", *Journal of Retailing*, 51 (Fall), 29-42.
- Cronbach, Lee J. (1951), "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests," *Psychometrika*, 16 (September), 297-334.
- Eisenberg, A. M. and R. R. Smith, Jr. (1971), *Nonverbal Communication*. Indianapolis: Babbs-Merrill.
- Evans, Franklin B. (1963), "Selling as a Dyadic Relationship—A New Approach," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 6 (May), 76-9.
- Farley, John U. and Richard L. Swinth (1967), "Effects of Choice and Sales Message on Customer-Salesman Interaction," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51 (April), 107-10.
- Ghiselli, Edwin E. (1973), "The Validity of Aptitude Tests in Personnel Selection," *Personnel Psychology*, 26 (Winter), 461-77.
- Greenberg, Herbert and David Mayer (1964), "A New Approach to the Scientific Selection of Successful Salesmen," *Journal of Psychology*, 57 (January), 113-23.
- Hare, Alexander P. (1976), *Handbook of Small Group Research*, 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press.

- Hovland, Carl I. (1957), *The Order of Presentation in Persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hulbert, James and Noel Capon (1972), "Interpersonal Communication in Marketing: An Overview," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (February), 27-34.
- Kirchner, Wayne K., Carolyn S. McElwain, and Marvin D. Dunnette (1960), "A Note on the Relationship Between Age and Sales Effectiveness," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 44 (April), 92-3.
- Levy, Sidney J. and Gerald Zaltman (1975), *Marketing, Society and Conflict*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lippett, Ronald and Ralph K. White (1952), "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in *Readings in Social Psychology*, Swanson, Newcomb, and Hartley, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 349-55.
- Ludlum, Thomas (1958), "Effects of Certain Techniques of Credibility Upon Audience Attitudes," *Speech Monographs*, 25 (March), 278-84.
- Lund, Fredrick H. (1925), "The Psychology of Belief: IV. The Law of Primacy in Persuasion," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 20 (July), 183-91.
- Mathews, H. Lee, David T. Wilson, and John F. Monoky, Jr., (1972), "Bargaining Behavior in a Buyer-Seller Dyad," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (February), 103-5.
- McCroskey, James C. (1969), "A Summary of Experimental Research in the Effects of Evidence in Persuasive Communication," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 55 (April), 169-76.
- Mehrabian, Albert (1969), "Significance of Posture and Position in the Communication of Attitude and Status Relationships," *Psychological Bulletin*, 71 (May), 359-72.
- Miner, John B. (1962), "Personality and Ability Factors in Sales Performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46 (February), 6-13.
- Mortensen, David C. (1972), *Communication: The Study of Human Interaction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Neter, John and William Wasserman (1974), *Applied Linear Statistical Models*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Olshavsky, Richard W. (1973), "Customer-Salesman Interaction in Appliance Retailing," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10 (May), 208-12.
- Pace, Wayne R. (1962), "Oral Communication and Sales Effectiveness," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 44 (October), 487-8.
- Padgett, Valerie R. and Robert J. Wolosin (1980), "Cognitive Similarity in Dyadic Communication," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (Winter), 654-9.
- Pennington, Alan L. (1968), "Customer-Salesman Bargaining Behavior in Retail Transactions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5 (August), 255-62.
- Runkel, Phillip J. (1956), "Cognitive Similarity in Facilitating Communication," *Sociometry*, 19 (September), 178-87.
- Russell, Fredric A., Frank H. Beach, and Richard Buskirk (1982), *Selling Principles and Practices*, 11th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sheth, Jagdish M. (1976), "Buyer-Seller Interaction: A Conceptual Framework," *Proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research*. Cincinnati, OH: Association for Consumer Research, 382-6.
- Spiro, Rosann L. and William D. Perreault, Jr. (1979), "Influence Use by Industrial Salesmen: Influence-Strategy Mixes and Situational Determinants," *Journal of Business*, 52 (July), 435-55.
- Stafford, James and Thomas V. Greer (1965), "Consumer Preferences for Types of Salesmen: A Study of Independence-Dependence Characteristics," *Journal of Retailing*, 41 (Summer), 27-33.
- Steinberg, M. and G. R. Miller (1975), "Interpersonal Communication: A Sharing Process," in *Communication and Behavior*, Gerhard J. Hanneman and William J. McEwen, eds. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 126-48.
- Taylor, James L. and Arch G. Woodside (1978), "Exchange Behavior Among Salesmen and Customers in Natural Settings," in *Buyer-Seller Interactions: Empirical Research and Normative Issues*, Peter H. Reingen and Arch G. Woodside, eds. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 23-36.
- Treandis, Harry C. (1960), "Cognitive Similarity and Communication in a Dyad," *Human Relations*, 13 (May), 175-83.
- Weaver, Charles N. (1969), "An Empirical Study to Aid in the Selection of Retail Salesclerks," *Journal of Retailing*, 45 (Fall), 22-6.
- Weitz, Barton A. (1978), "Effectiveness in Sales Interactions: A Contingency Framework," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15 (November), 501-16.
- Willett, Ronald P. and Alan Pennington (1966), "Customer and Salesmen: The Anatomy of Choice and Influence in a Retailing Setting," in *Science, Technology and Marketing*, R. M. Hared, ed. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Woodside, Arch G. and William J. Davenport (1974), "The Effect of Salesmen Similarity and Expertise on Consumer Purchasing Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11 (May), 198-202.