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The success of any retail institution depends upon many factors including personal selling effectiveness. Traditional sales training has focused primarily on the selling process with emphasis on how to close a sale. The idea of using behavioral style awareness training with salespeople has emerged only recently when behavioral training began to be recognized in the literature as a tool for sales training as well as for management training.

The Social Style of Behavior concept developed by Dr. David Merrill was selected for use in this research study. Utilizing this concept, a behavioral style awareness training program was developed involving twenty hours of classroom training. Training methods used were lecture, role play, and videotaped materials with emphasis on behavioral identification and using versatility with applications to personal selling in a retail situation.

The research design required an experimental group and a control group with collection of sales data during
pre-training and post-training periods. The sales data indicated an overall decrease in sales for both groups during the post-training period. The difference in the mean sales for pre-training and post-training periods for the experimental group and the control group was evaluated using the t-test for mean differences. This test indicated that the decrease in sales for the experimental group was significantly less than the decrease for the control group. Therefore, the following hypothesis was accepted: the sales performance of the commission salespeople participating in the behavioral style awareness training program will be significantly better than the sales performance of commission salespeople not participating.

Conclusions drawn from this research are: 1) that behavioral style awareness training does increase the sales effectiveness of retail commission salespeople, and 2) that behavioral style awareness training can have application to all selling situations, both retail and industrial, because of the interpersonal relationships involved in the selling process.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The success of any retail institution depends upon many factors including location; physical facilities; type of merchandise and how it is packaged, displayed and priced; sales promotion and advertising campaigns; and personal selling effectiveness. It is this last factor, the interpersonal effectiveness of salespeople, which is the subject of this study.

There are several myths associated with the concept of effectiveness or successful salespeople. One of the more popular notions is that "a good salesperson is born, not made." This would imply that unless a person inherits salesmanship skills he can never succeed in selling. This is an idea that seems to have no foundation in research, yet it is one that finds surprisingly wide acceptance. A similar notion contends that success or failure as a salesperson depends upon certain characteristics or traits. Studies have indicated, however, that there is no significant relationship between sales success and characteristics such as age, intelligence, or education (Wotruba 1981).

Another more plausible notion, but also without scientific foundation, is that anyone can become a
successful salesperson just by following a simple "recipe" or "canned" presentation along with a few standard rules such as always dress neatly, know your product line, be able to answer objections, and manage your time well. While these rules may contribute to successful selling, it would be a gross over-simplification to suggest that these rules alone would make a person successful in selling (Buzzotta, 1972).

If a salesperson's success does not wholly depend upon what he is or what he does, then why are some salespeople more successful than others? Why are sales made to some prospects but not to others? The answers to these questions would appear to lie with the other half of the sales transaction—the prospective customer—and how the salesperson analyzes and responds to the behavior of the prospective customer. This analysis of and response to the behavior of prospective customers is the focus of this research study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of a behavioral-oriented training program utilizing the Social Style Model of Behavior on the sales performance of commission salespeople in a department store group in the Southwest.
Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was that the sales performance of the commission salespeople attending the behavioral style awareness training program will be significantly better than the sales performance of commission salespeople not attending the training program.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. All the participants were volunteers.
2. The training program was conducted on company premises.
3. Some attrition in the number of participants was inevitable due to the length of time of the study.
4. The research design permitted only twenty hours of classroom training.
5. There was no opportunity for upper levels of management to attend the training program.
6. There was no opportunity for reinforcement and follow-up after the training program.
7. The economic conditions were poor for retailing in general during the period covered by the research.
8. The extent to which the participants utilized the new concepts presented in the workshop during actual sales encounters could not be evaluated.
Significance of the Study

Barton Weitz (1981) has done extensive work in developing a conceptual framework for exploring which selling behaviors are most effective in customer interaction. In his article, "Effectiveness in Sales Interactions," he writes that "sales behaviors related to adapting to the customer . . . have not been investigated empirically even though practitioners view these behaviors as critical to sales effectiveness" (p. 100). And, more specifically, to the knowledge of this researcher there has been no empirical study undertaken to determine the effect of behavioral style training on commission retail sales.

Sales training programs in the past have primarily concentrated on product knowledge and selling skills. However, today more and more training programs and personal selling textbooks are including emphasis on behavioral concepts such as "body language," effective listening, transactional analysis, and other methods designed to aid salespersons in analyzing prospects (Futrell 1981). Manning and Reece (1980) indicate that providing a practical method of classifying people according to behavioral style will give the salesperson a distinct advantage in the marketplace. In addition, Weitz (1981) believes that research into sales behaviors and
related areas will greatly improve the understanding of personal selling effectiveness. Therefore, the significance of this study is apparent.

Description of Research Design

This study utilized a quasi-experimental research design with a treatment experimental group and a no-treatment control group. Both groups consisted of commission salespeople who were employed by a department store chain in the Southwest and who worked either in the major appliances or furniture division.

The experimental group participated in a behavioral training program based on the social style of behavior model developed by Dr. David Merrill and distributed through Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc., Denver, Colorado. This model can only be used in workshops which are conducted by trainers who have participated in an intensive training program and have been certified by Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc.

Sales data was collected for each participant in both the experimental and control groups for five months before and five months after the training program. This sales data was used to determine if the experimental group had significantly better sales performance than did the control group.
Description of Research Instrument

When David Merrill began his study of social style in the early 1960s, he and his research group were aware of earlier research which had been done in an effort to identify an effective style of leadership. This research on leadership style of behavior served as the basis of Merrill's research to define general descriptors of behavior--descriptors which could be used in a wider range of applications.

A structured adjective checklist concept which was used in Merrill's research was developed in the late 1950s by Dr. James W. Taylor, a staff psychologist with a large United States corporation. Using a list of 2331 adjectives selected from the dictionary, Taylor asked 1612 employees of his corporation to check off the adjectives which they saw as describing their own behavior. Eventually the list of adjectives was narrowed to a core group of 150 words which could be used to describe behavior precisely and which gave statistically reliable results.

Taylor went a step further and analyzed the responses of the 1612 employees utilizing factor analysis to see if an employee who felt that a certain adjective described his/her behavior would answer yes or no to certain other adjectives. In other words, would there be
a "clustering" of adjectives. "If there was a correlation of 0.35 or greater between two adjectives, these adjectives were considered to belong to one cluster . . ." (Merrill, p. 43). The clusters were then analyzed to determine if an overall word describing a person's behavior could be attached to them. Taylor named five clusters of human behavior based upon his research and referred to them as themes of behaviors: 1) self-confident; 2) considerate; 3) conforming; 4) thoughtful; and 5) rigid.

For his own research Merrill adopted (with Taylor's permission) Taylor's adjective list, but he used a different process in gathering information. Instead of asking each person to report on his own behavior, Merrill asked others to describe that person's behavior. The first group consisted of 600 employees of several life insurance companies. They were asked to have at least three and as many as five acquaintances complete the 150 word adjective checklist. The acquaintances were to fill out the checklist by marking the adjectives which they felt would most appropriately describe the person's behavior.

When factor analysis was performed for Merrill's research, the adjectives clustered differently than they had when a person reported on himself as in Taylor's
research. Three clusters were identified by Merrill, although he referred to them as dimensions of behavior: 1) assertiveness; 2) responsiveness; and 3) versatility. Assertiveness is that dimension of behavior which measures whether a person tends to tell or ask and the degree to which others perceive one as trying to influence their decisions. Responsiveness is that dimension of behavior which indicates whether a person tends to emote or to control feelings and the extent to which others perceive an individual who displays feelings or emotions openly in social situations. Versatility is that dimension of behavior which indicates the extent to which others see us a person as adaptable, resourceful, and competent; it is behavior that earns social endorsement because it accommodates other's preferences.

Merrill combined the assertiveness and responsiveness dimensions to form a grid for the Social Style Profile. The assertive dimension forms a scale from less assertive or "asking" to more assertive or "telling" and is the horizontal axis. The responsiveness dimension forms a scale from less responsive (controls emotions) to more responsive (emotes) and is the vertical axis. By combining these two dimensions, the social styles of behavior are identified. They are labeled as Driving, Expressive, Amiable, and Analytical as shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1
Schematic of Social Style of Behavior Profile
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A description of each behavior style is given below and is paraphrased from Merrill and Reid (1981).

**Driving** behavior is the term used to describe the upper right-hand quadrant and this behavior is characterized by "telling," but with "control" of feelings. People whose behavior causes them to fall into this category are primarily assertive, serious people who make an effort to tell people what they think and require. They appear severe because they do not display feelings or emotions readily.

**Expressive** behavior is the term used to describe the lower right-hand quadrant and this behavior is characterized by "telling" and "emoting." This style is also assertive, like the Driving style, but these individuals are generally much more willing to make their feelings public.

**Amiable** behavior is the term used to describe the lower left-hand quadrant and is characterized by "asking" and "emoting." Like the Expressive style, this style usually displays feelings openly; however, this person is less assertive and more interested in being agreeable and cooperative.

**Analytical** behavior is the term used to describe the upper left-hand quadrant of the profile and is characterized by "asking" but with "control" of feelings.
This style is low in assertiveness and high in control of emotions. Rather than being decisive or forceful like the Driving or the Expressive style, this style will tend to ask questions, gather facts, and study data seriously.

Merrill and Reid (1981) have determined in their research of some 100,000 individuals that there is no one best behavior style and that there is no correlation between style and occupation or style and success in any occupation. Rather, they have determined that each style has its strengths and weaknesses and all styles can be successful. The important aspects, according to Merrill and Reid, are to know your own style, to learn to recognize the styles of others and learn to adapt to those styles. This, then, becomes the third dimension of the Social Style Profile which is called Versatility.

The Social Style of Behavior concept is built upon the following two premises: One, that behavior style is rather stable over time and varies little as observed by others; and two, that success in interpersonal interactions requires each person to know his own style, be comfortable with it, and be able to recognize and adapt to the style of others. That is, a person should be versatile in interpersonal relationships.

In describing versatility, Merrill and Reid (1981) indicate that it is not simply the ability to get along
with others. Rather, it is dealing with others in such a way that they come away from interpersonal encounters feeling better about themselves in a way which increases the effectiveness and productivity of both parties. Fortunately for those who lack versatility, Merrill and Reid believe it can be learned. Skills such as the ability to listen well, handle confrontation, and resolve conflict can help to improve a person's versatility. Also, versatility is seen as growing out of competence and confidence in one's personal situation.

Selection of Research Instrument

The Social Style Model of behavior was chosen as the instrument for this research for two primary reasons. First, because this concept utilizes an instrument which is not self-administered but which is completed by five friends, co-workers, or supervisors and then computer scored. This aspect is critical to the identification of behavior style, because the conclusions people draw about a person are based on what they observe that person saying and doing and not on how that person feels about himself. And, these conclusions are the basis for interpersonal communication.

Secondly, the social style model of behavior incorporates a third dimension, versatility, which measures how well one adapts to the style of others; or,
in other words, how flexible one is in dealing with other behavior styles. This is a dimension which according to Merrill and Reid (1981) can be improved through training. The ability to adapt to another's style in no way changes a person's basic behavior style. It merely becomes an added dimension for successful interaction.

Summary

The success of any retail institution depends upon many factors including personal selling effectiveness. It was the purpose of this research study to determine if commission salespeople who participated in a behavioral training program have significantly better sales performance than those commission salespeople who did not attend.

The research instrument used in this study was the social style model of behavior. This particular concept was chosen because it utilizes an instrument which is not self-administered but which is completed by a reference group selected by the salesperson. It also incorporates a third dimension called versatility which measures how well the salesperson adapts to another's style of behavior.

Chapter II discusses related research and literature while Chapter III presents the research findings. Conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter IV.
FOOTNOTES

1 A pattern of actions that others can see and generally agree on for describing that person's actions.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Introduction

Sales effectiveness has through the years been viewed in several different ways with each view contributing to the evolution of the most current one. These views, the chemistry view, the traits view, the behavior view, and the dyadic view will be examined to determine exactly how each has contributed to the newest view, the behavior style view.

Chemistry View

In the past, sales effectiveness was thought to be a function of product knowledge and selling skills plus some undeterminable quality which made some salespersons more successful than others. In other words, a good salesperson is "born, not made." As Wotruba (1981) noted, "The true nature of this chemistry has always been vague and illusory, making it difficult to define" (p. 165). However, three elements have been determined to fit into the chemistry view--enthusiasm for job, motivation to succeed, and need for personal fulfillment. The chemistry view assumes that the ability to sell is locked up in the potentially successful salesperson just waiting to be set free through enthusiasm, motivation, and drive.
There is some research evidence to support the motivational interpretation of the chemistry view. Sweitzer and Pathek (1972) found that salespeople do perform better when they feel their job is important. Although this research is quite limited in scope, it does appear that the chemistry view is related to personal desire, drive, ambition, and motivation in general (Cotham 1969 and Oliver 1974).

Traits View

Those who subscribe to the traits view believe that a salesperson's success or failure depends on certain characteristics or traits which can be measured and which can be used to describe and differentiate among people. Once these traits were identified it was believed that a prediction could be made about which salespeople would be successful in selling. The following is a list of the common traits which have been studied along with the names of the researchers who explored their relationships to successful salesmanship:

1. Age (Schultz 1935; Kirkpatrick 1941; Mosel 1952; French 1960; Kirchner, McElwain, and Dunnette 1960; Cotham 1969; Weaver 1969);
2. Ability (Ghiselli 1973);
3. Education (Cotham 1969; Weaver 1969);
4. Height and Weight (Ohmann 1941; Mosel 1952; Guion 1965; Kurtz 1969; Lamont and Lundstrom 1977);

5. Dominance (Dunnette and Kirchner 1960 and Harrell 1960);

6. Endurance (Lamont and Lundstrom 1977);

7. Empathy (Mayer and Greenberg 1964);


Stevens (1958) in a summary of traits view research to that date indicates that no significant relationship exists between sales success and any one of the following: age, personality trait measures, intelligence test scores, character trait measures, level of education, or level of sales activity. A more recent review confirms these findings. Churchill (1981) summarizes and adapts from Weitz (1979) the results of 21 studies conducted since 1950 which investigate the relationship between the performance of salespeople and one or more of the following characteristics or traits: age, education, sales-related knowledge, intelligence, sociability, forcefulness, and empathy. Churchill's findings are (1) that the relationships between the general characteristics of salespeople and their sales performance are not very consistent across studies done in different industries and job settings; (2) that even in related selling jobs, findings were not consistent; and (3) that
even when studies have shown relationships between personal
attributes and sales success, those relationships have been
weak.

Behavior View

Because the traits view garnered such mixed
results, researchers turned to the salesperson's behavior,
both verbal and nonverbal, as a possible key to success in
selling. While verbal behavior has been studied more than
nonverbal, both types of behavior can have an impact on
sales results. Research to date shows no strong evidence
that one set of behaviors is suitable for all selling
situations (Pace 1962; Olshavsky 1973; Pasold 1975;
"there is no 'one best' approach because each encounter
between a salesperson and a customer is a brand new
experience . . . . Thus reliance on an old approach that
worked last time or the 'canned' approach that seems to
work . . . can only breed mediocrity at best" (p. 50).
Therefore, it must be determined which behaviors are
effective in a particular situation.

Those who subscribe to the chemistry, traits, and
behavior views believe that a salesperson's success depends
primarily on what the salesperson is or does. Yet, it is
common knowledge that a given salesperson is successful
with some customers but not with others. Therefore, sales
success must have something to do with the other elements of the sales transaction—the prospective customer and the situation. This explanation has as its foundation the situational nature of behavior previously discussed but adds the third dimension of the prospective customer. Success in the selling situation, then, must depend upon not only what the salesperson is or does but on the prospect and the particular situation. With this reasoning as a base, the dyadic view emerged.

Webster's dictionary (1961) defines a dyad as "two units treated as one." Wotruba (1981) translates this meaning in the sales situation as "a pair which is analyzed as a unit" (p. 174). Evans, as quoted in Davis and Silk (1972, p. 61), describes the dyadic relationship as follows: "... the sale (or no sale) is the result of ... the face-to-face contact of the given salesman and his prospect. The result of the contact depends not on the characteristics of either party alone but how the two parties view and react to each other." In other words, it would appear that the individual characteristics of each party do not matter, as in the traits and behavior views, but how these characteristics match or compare affects the success of the interaction.

A number of recent studies have taken a dyadic approach to try to explain variations in the performance of
salespeople. Most of the studies test a very simple hypothesis: salespeople are more likely to be successful when they are dealing with prospects who are similar to themselves in demographic characteristics, personality traits, and attitudes than when their prospects have characteristics different from their own. The rationale for this concept is that we tend to understand, have empathy for and be attracted to other people more when they are like us (Churchill 1981).

Evans (1963), in a study of life insurance agents and their prospects, found that sold prospects were more like their agents on a variety of characteristics (including age, height, education, income, religion, political affiliation, and smoking habits) than were the unsold prospects. In fact, perceived similarity for religion and political preference were of greater importance than actual similarity. Subsequent studies in other selling situations have produced mixed results with none supporting the similarity hypothesis as strongly as the original study by Evans (Gadel 1964; Brock 1965; Davis and Silk 1972; Woodside and Davenport 1974; Churchill, Strang and Collins 1975; Alessandra 1976; Busch and Wilson 1976; Rioradan, Oliver and Donnelly 1977). If the positive results of dyadic research in selling are accepted, the solution appears to be simple. Sales managers should hire
salespeople with characteristics which match customer characteristics. This solution, however seems to be neither reasonable nor realistic—especially for retail sales situations. In fact, according to Becker and Useem (1942), the retail transaction does not meet the generally defined criteria for a dyad. Their definition of a dyadic relationship includes the idea that it possesses a time frame sufficient to establish a relationship. And as Willet and Pennington (1966) point out, most retail and industrial transactions do not meet this criteria of time.

In Churchill's 1975 study which sought to examine the impact of salesperson-customer similarity on the purchase outcome, some slight evidence was found supporting the dyadic similarity concept. None of the obtained relationships was statistically significant, however. Churchill explained his results thusly. "Perhaps there is less opportunity for salesman-prospect similarity to affect a [retail] sales transaction . . . since the interaction is more temporal than when it occurs in other environments . . ." (pp. 40-41).

Behavioral Style View

The behavioral style view is similar to the dyadic view in that consideration must be given to both the customer's and salesperson's behaviors. However, it is not
the similarity of the parties either in traits or behaviors, whether real or perceived, that determines a successful encounter. It is, rather, how well the salesperson recognizes, classifies, and adapts his responses to the behavior style of the prospective customer.

Zemke (1976) indicates there are five underlying principles which go a long way toward defining behavioral style.

1. Individual differences exist and are important. Differences in individuals, whether in physical characteristics, actions, or verbalizations, are quite apparent; and everyone responds in some manner to these components of behavioral style in others. What a person says, how it is said, and the non-verbal factors involved (posture, gestures, facial expression, eye contact, body space and movement) are all important because together they determine a person's behavior style.

2. Individual style differences tend to be stable. Behavioral style is a reflection of one's background, both hereditary and environmental. Manning (1980) indicates that "our style is somewhat unique at the time of birth; it takes on additional uniqueness during the first three to five years of life. By the time we enter elementary school, the teacher should be able to
identify our [behavioral] style" (p. 93).

"Behavior style remains quite uniform throughout life. Each person has one style which he/she prefers and habitually uses" (106). Epstein (1979) believes that "... given an adequate sample of behavior to begin with, it should be possible to 'predict most of the people much of the time'" (p. 1124).

3. Style is an interactive behavioral process—not personality. What a person thinks or feels inside or how that person sees himself is personality—not behavioral style. Merrill and Reid (1981) define behavior as "only those things you say and do, which others can observe and report about you" (p. 1). Therefore, behavior style is manifest only in interactions with others.

4. There are a finite number of styles. Many descriptors can be used to identify behavior; however, in research by Dr. James W. Taylor in the early 1960's, there was "clustering" of descriptors into discernible patterns. By examining these patterns, particular behavior styles could be defined (Merrill and Reid 1981). Zemke (1976) indicates that though there is an infinite number of possible traits, you can expect to never see a workable system with more than seven categories. This is because seven is the mean digit span an adult can comfortably handle in a memory test.
5. Everyone makes judgments about people based on behavioral style. There is always a tendency to "label" the people we meet with adjectives such as serious, funny, quiet, loud, introverted, extroverted, warm or cold. If our first impression is correct, we can respond effectively to this person. However, to the extent we have misjudged this individual, our response is inappropriate and ineffective. It is important, therefore, that more than first impressions be utilized to determine a person's behavior style. It is only through interaction that a true behavior style can be recognized. Zemke (1976) believes that the best judgment of another's behavior style is made when one is aware of and comfortable with one's own style.

Defining behavioral style and learning to identify different behavioral styles is only one part of the behavior style view. The other part is learning to adapt one's style so as to respond appropriately to the other person's style of behavior. In other words, a successful salesperson must be flexible (Bursk 1947; Belasco 1966; Webster 1968; Karp 1974; Rhodabarger 1980; and Manning 1980). "In general, the salesperson who adapts his/her behavior to the specific interaction situation will be better at presenting a product as a solution to the customer's problem" (Weitz 1981, p. 94).
The objectives of the behavior style view can be summarized as follows: (1) become aware of one's own style; (2) learn its strengths and weaknesses; (3) work to improve weaknesses; (4) become aware of all styles; and (5) learn to respond appropriately to all styles.

Because this research study is based on the Behavioral Style View, it is important to understand when, where, and how this view began and evolved.

Development of the Behavioral Style View

This idea of differences in people is certainly nothing new. The Greek Hippocrates told of four temperaments: Sanguine, Choleric, Phlegmatic, and Melancholic. European psychologists Jung and Kretschmer spoke of different psychological types and temperaments, respectively, but were largely ignored in favor of those who spoke of "sameness" (Kiersey and Bates 1978).

Isabel Myers (1962) is credited with having brought Jung's psychological types to the forefront when she created the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. There are 70 indicator questions which deal with the way one likes to use perception and judgment, or the way one likes to look at things and the way one likes to go about deciding things. For each question, the respondent chooses between two answers that are diametrically opposed, and these answers are translated into preferences. There are four
preferences: 1) **Extraversion** or **Introversion**; 2) **Sensing** or **iNtuition**; 3) **Thinking** or **Feeling**; and 4) **Judging** or **Perceptive**. The meaning of these preferences is as follows: **Extraversion** means one relates more easily to the outer world of people and things than to the inner world of ideas; **Introversion** means just the opposite. **Sensing** means one would rather work with known facts than look for possibilities and relationships; **Intuition** means just the opposite. **Thinking** means one bases his judgments more on impersonal analysis and logic than personal values; **Feelings** means just the opposite. **Judging** attitude means you like a planned, decided, orderly way of life better than a flexible, spontaneous way; **Perceptive** means the opposite.

These four preferences are combined in 16 different ways: ISTJ, ISFJ, ISTP, ISFP; ESTP, ESFP, ESTJ, ESFJ; INFJ, INTJ, INFP, INTP; and ENFP, ENTP, ENFJ, ENTJ. Each combination of preferences has its own description which reflects a particular set of interests, values, and skills. With her invention, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Isabel Myers made possible the decades of research by Educational Testing Services and the gathering of vast amount of information regarding the behavior and attitudes of the types in a wide variety of enterprises and walks of life (Kiersey and Bates 1978).
Utilizing the preference types established by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator but referring to them as temperaments, Kiersey and Bates (1978) have applied this concept of preferences to leadership training, marriage counseling, and family interaction.

Another system derived directly from Jung’s system is The Management Tree concept (Gwaltney 1980). This concept has several branches beginning with self-motivated or other-motivated as the two major branches. Each of these is dividing into either thinking or feeling; then thinking or feeling divides into choosing and dreaming with these latter two culminating in a particular style. The eight style categories are communicator, counselor, presenter, manager, reformer, producer, innovator, and organizer. Because this program is rather new, no information could be gathered about how these style descriptions are utilized.

Other important behavior style concepts are discussed below. It appears that all of these are based on the works of behavioralists, most notably Jung and Myers. The relevance of these concepts to this research will become apparent as will the similarities and differences to the Social Style Model of Behavior developed by David Merrill, which is used as the basis of this research study.
Communicating Styles Technology

The work of Dr. Paul Mok (1975) of Paul Mok & Associates indicates ties to Jung in utilizing the concept of four personality types. Participants can determine what their particular communication style is by taking a self-scoring Survey of Communicating Styles developed by Mok. The four communicating styles are summarized by Lynch (1980) as follows: The person who displays the Intuitor style is aloof and impersonal and writes in intellectual but often abstract terms. He likes futuristic office furnishings and decor and often shows a mixed, unpredictable garb of clothing preferences. The Thinker is businesslike, ordered, and specific in speech. He writes in a well-organized, structured fashion. He prefers the work area to be correct, tasteful, and nondistracting and dresses conservatively and understated. The person displaying the Feeler style of communicating is warm and friendly. He writes highly personalized letters and memos; and his clothes are colorful, informal and tailored to his mood. He likes to personalize his surroundings with warm colors, momentos and snapshots. The Sensor is abrupt and to the point. He writes in briefest of terms with a sense of urgency. He wears informal, simple functional clothes. He is too busy to be neat, and his surroundings are often cluttered.
The Communication Styles Technology approach teaches that there is no one best style and that in order to communicate effectively with others Style-Flex is necessary. Style-Flex is defined as the ability to temporarily modify one's own dominant style so as to be able to communicate with someone of a different style (Peterson 1981).

Influencing Styles Technology

This approach to communication was developed specifically for data processing professionals by Harvard Human Resources. Rhodabarger (1980) describes four categories of "influencing" styles that communicators use: Procedural, Opportunistic, Innovative, and Supportive.

The person exhibiting the **Procedural** influencing style works well with facts and details and wants all loose ends tied up. He makes decisions based on logical, rational reasoning and takes extra time to be sure he is right. The **Opportunistic** style is characterized by an action-oriented person who wants quick results. He speaks in short sentences, gets to the point quickly, and may even seem abrupt to some people. The person displaying the **Innovative** influencing style is conceptually oriented. He can easily interrelate different creative ideas and his interests are long range. The **Supportive** style person speaks with emotion, with enthusiasm and is very people-oriented and helpful.
Harvard Human Resources has developed a profile which helps individuals determine their own preferred influencing style. This profile is self-administered and the participant responds to groups of self-descriptive statements by ranking them 6, 4, 3, or 1. Rhodabarger (1980) indicates that sometimes there is a need to temporarily adapt one's style to the other person's style when trying to get that person to accept new ideas.

The TDF System

This system, designed by David Farr (1980), is based on personality theory and involves a self-administered personality styles instrument. The TDF System is based upon the idea that all persons utilize three ways, or modes, of responding to their environment. The three modes are Thinking, Deciding, and Feeling. Each mode is used continually by persons who are healthy and functional; however, each person chooses one of these as his/her primary mode of behavior.

The TDF instrument is a group of positive adjectives which describe behavior associated with each of the behavior patterns. From the assignment of rank order by an individual to each set of adjectives, it is possible to identify the behavioral pattern of that individual.

The Thinking Style is described as the process of gathering information, arranging information into
meaningful categories, and analyzing the information for its meanings. The Thinking response is described by such words as logical, rational, practical, analytical, and interpretive. The Thinking response constantly processes information, sorts it out, understands it, and stores it away for future use.

The Deciding Style is described as that internal process which sorts through information, includes and excludes, affirms and denies, and comes up with a response that is a decision, an opinion, or a judgment. It is important to distinguish between the internal Decide response and the behavioral action which may result from the decision. The response is definite, clear-cut, and either/or in nature. It rules in something and rules out something.

The Feeling Style is described as that internal process which responds at the emotional level in the environment. There is no component of rationality or decision, but a strong rush of physical reaction to the stimulus. The person experiences sensations which must be expressed behaviorally. There are very clear physical manifestations to Feeling response, such as tears, laughter, elevated skin temperature, increases in heart beat, respiration, and hormone production. These physical sensations are clustered together and assigned meanings by the individual and by society.
Bi-Polar

The Bi-Polar concept developed by J. W. Thomas (1978) centers around the idea that each person has strengths and weaknesses and that the main focus should be on strengths. The focus of Bi-Polar is on three pairs of human strengths which the author feels contribute equally to human existence. The basic pair is Thinking and Risking, and these two basic strengths together create human life. Each requires the other for its own creative fulfillment. Creative risking requires reason and judgment. Neither can be creative without the other, but in becoming too polarized either can be destructive.

The two additional pairs are derived from the basic pair--practical thinking/theoretical thinking and dependent risking/independent risking. Thomas believes that everyone has natural "lead" strength either in Thinking or Risking with neither of these being better or worse than the other. Those who lead in thinking approach life mostly on an intellectual basis--things have to make sense. They make their decisions primarily through rational analysis and learn best by thinking about things. Those who lead in risking approach life mostly on a feeling basis--things have to feel right. They make their own decisions primarily on intuitive feel and learn most efficiently through experience--actually doing it.
The three major strengths combine to make eight possible combinations as follows: Thinking/Practical Dependent, Thinking/Practical/Independent, Thinking/Theoretical/Dependent, Thinking/Theoretical/Independent, Risking/Dependent/Practical, Risking/Dependent/Theoretical, Risking/Independent/Practical, Risking/Independent/Theoretical.

An individual's major strengths combination is determined by how five people assess his strengths and weaknesses on a Bi-Polar Inventory of Strengths. In addition, the individual rates himself. The goals of Bi-Polar are

1. A better understanding and more acceptance of self;
2. A better understanding and more positive feelings toward others;
3. A better understanding of your relationships with others.

Personal Profile System

This self-administered instrument designed by John Geier (1977) is described as a communication tool which opens the door to greater understanding of self and others in order to build and maintain a sense of personal worth or self-esteem. The Personal Profile System utilizes 24 groups of four descriptive words each. The respondent
chooses the word that most describes himself and the word that least describes himself. These choices are translated into a numerical score for each of four areas. These areas are named and defined as follows: **dominance**—emphasis is on shaping the environment by overcoming opposition to accomplish results; **influencing of others**—emphasis is on shaping the environment by bringing others into alliance to accomplish results; **steadiness**—emphasis is on cooperating with others to carry out the task; **compliance**—emphasis is on working with existing circumstances to promote quality in products or service. The combination of scores in these four areas is used to determine the specific behavior pattern of the respondent. These patterns include: achiever, agent, appraiser, counselor, creative, developer, inspirational, investigator, objective thinker, overshift, perfectionist, and persuader.

**Lifescripts**

This Inventory of Personal Strengths was developed by Christensen, Felten, and Murray (1980). The self-administered instrument has the respondent imagine he is writing a book about his life; then he is making a movie about his life; and then he is reviewing both of these efforts as a critic would. For each of these imaginings there are six questions which each have four possible
answers. The respondent ranks each of the four answers from MOST (4) to LEAST (1) like himself. The answers are then scored in such a manner as to produce a preferred style of behavior under favorable conditions and a preferred style under adverse conditions.

Lifescipts is intended to help the respondent explore the characteristic style with which he, and others, respond each day. According to Christensen et al (1980), no one has just a single, unchangeable behavior style; but they do believe it is possible to observe a preference toward one end or the other of a continuum between such opposite behaviors as "extrovert" and "introvert" and between people-centered and task-centered. The intersection of these continua produces a conceptual model of four quadrants, each of which can be said to represent a broad category of behavior styles. The four categories are promoter, supporter, controller, and analyzer.

**Promoters** get involved with people in active, rapidly-changing situations. They are seen as gregarious, outgoing, and enthusiastic people who like novelty and change. Faced with a difficult task a promoter can generate creative ideas for accomplishing the work but may not follow through to see that the task is completed.

**Supporters** are people-oriented, non-aggressive and will work hard to please others. They are good
listeners and try to put others at ease. Supporters will rely on others to provide direction for how tasks are to be done. While they are generally felt to be valuable group members, their attempt to keep conflict low and to maintain harmony can work to the detriment of their own interests.

Controllers are very task-oriented and want to make sure the job gets done. They often believe that the best way to get things done is to do it themselves. Controllers like to be in charge and because they are confident in their own abilities they are willing to take risks. Controllers like new challenges and new opportunities. They know what they want, say so, and fight to get it.

Analyzers are rational, logical, and factual. They like to get all the data before making a decision, and they rely heavily on systematic approaches for weighing alternatives and ensuring predictability. Analyzers make maximum use of procedures and policies; therefore, in interpersonal situations they may strike others as cool and aloof.

Christensen et al (1980) believe that a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses inherent in one's own behavioral style, and the styles of others, can lead to more productive and satisfying interaction between individuals and among groups.
Developed by Stuart Atkins (1973), this program is designed to help "you to more effectively deal with people and problems in any of the three basic human situations—with yourself, with another person, or with groups" (p. 1). The training program begins with the discovery experience which according to Atkins (1973, p. 1) includes: "identifying your personal strengths and orientations; confirming who you are and what you have going for you; discovering your triggers for stress; capitalizing on your strengths to be more effective; understanding who and what motivates you on and off the job." The program then continues to include communications with another or communications in a group, whichever the respondent chooses.

The instrument utilized in this program consists of four endings for each of 72 questions. For each ending the respondent is to mark, 4, 3, 2, or 1 depending on the degree of appropriateness from 4 being the most appropriate and to 1 being the least appropriate.

According to Atkins (1973), everyone has a guiding philosophy of life, or a life orientation, and there are four categories—supporting/giving, controlling/taking, conserving/holding, and
adapting/dealing. The following is a brief description of each (p. 8):

**Supporting/Giving** - "If I prove my worth by working hard and pursuing excellence, the good things of life will come to me. Goals: prove worth, be helpful. Outer actions: principled, cooperative, dedicated, pursues excellence."

**Controlling/Taking** - "If I get results by being competent and seizing opportunity, the good things in life will be there for the taking. Goals: be competent, get results. Outer actions: persistent, initiating, urgent, directing."

**Conserving/Holding** - "If I think before I act and make the most of what I've got, I can build up my supply of the good things in life. Goals: Go slow, be sure. Outer actions: systematic, analytical, maintaining, tenacious."

**Adapting/Dealing** - "If I please other people and fill their needs first, then I can get the good things in life that I've wanted all along. Goals: Be popular, fit in. Outer actions: Harmonious, tactful, flexible, aware."

With regard to communication, the philosophy of Lifo is that better communication is possible by modifying one's approach to others in ways that are more consistent
with the other person's orientation and style preferences (Atkins 1973).

The Dimensional Model of Salesperson Behavior

This model was developed to help sales managers and trainers make sense of the varieties of sales behaviors they see in the real world of selling and to enable them to use that information in the selection of salespeople. According to Buzzotta and Lefton (1981) this model is not based on hunch or intuition but on solid empirical behavioral research. The Dimensional Model of Sales Behavior is based on two basic dimensions of behavior: Hostility-Warmth, as the vertical axis, and Dominance-Submission, as the horizontal axis. When the two dimensions intersect, four types of sales behavior are depicted with Q1 being dominant-hostile and located in the upper left-hand corner; Q2 is submissive-hostile and located in the lower left-hand quadrant; Q3 is submissive-warm and is located in the lower right-hand corner; and Q4 is dominant-warm and is located in the upper right-hand quadrant.

Q1 behavior is based on the premise that heavy-handed control of the customer is the road to sales. Jumping to conclusions about customer needs, Q1 makes exaggerated and lavish claims about how these needs can be satisfied. This behavior is fast paced and argumentative,
giving little space for the customer's feelings and concerns.

Q2 behavior follows from the assumption that the salesperson can do nothing to move customers toward a sale and that the initiative to a sale lies entirely with the customer, not with the salesperson. Thus, Q2 is colorless and apathetic, superficial and mechanical, merely going through the paces and taking orders.

Q3 behavior takes the attitude that if customers can be made to like them they will eventually make the sale. This attitude holds that business flows from sociability and acceptance. Wishing to please, Q3 becomes weak and compliant. Negatives are ignored and concentration is on areas of agreements, thus the salesperson becomes more superficial and unsystematic.

Q4 behavior follows from the belief that to make a sale, salespeople must prove their product or service will pay off for the customer. Q4 behavior focuses on a "give and take" of information about the customer's needs and about how the product or service can fill them. This salesperson tries to understand the customer's feelings, needs, and concerns, and tries to address these realistically when designing, presenting, and closing a sales proposal.
The level of behavior, either Q1, Q2, Q3, or Q4, for each salesperson is determined by having each one fill out a number of questionnaires which ask them to evaluate and record their own selling strategies as they see them. Buzzotta and Lefton (1981) believe that the Q4 skills can be taught to new salespeople or to those already on the job and that Q1 behavior can be eliminated through training. This training includes development of skills in diagnosing the behavior of others, skills in communication, and specialized skills in selling (Buzzotta, Lefton and Sherberg 1972).

Communication Style Model

Manning and Reece (1980) have developed a Communication Style Model which is based on two important dimensions of human behavior—dominance and sociability. This model utilizes research done in the past by such people as Martson, Johnson, LaForge and Suczek, Merrill and Taylor, Mok, and the Thurstones who developed the Thurstone Temperament Schedule which provides an assessment of the "sociable factor."

The Communication Style Model combines dominance (as the horizontal axis) and sociability (as the vertical axis) to produce four styles of communication. Each person's style is determined by a self-administered instrument and results either in the emotive style, the
director style, the reflective style, or the supportive style. Each of these styles is discussed briefly below.

**Emotive Style** - This is the label given to the upper right-hand quadrant which combines high sociability and high dominance. Emotive people are expressive, outspoken, enthusiastic, and very stimulating. They want to create a social relationship quickly and usually feel most comfortable in an informal atmosphere.

**Director Style** - This is the term applied to the lower right-hand quadrant which combines high dominance and low sociability. Just as the label implies, this type of person "takes charge." The person who displays the director style of communication gives orders, takes charge, and lets everyone know he is in charge.

**Reflective Style** - The lower left-hand quadrant of the Communication Style Model combines low dominance and low sociability to produce the reflective style. The reflective person wants to gather all available information and examine this information carefully before making any decisions. This communication style, due to the low dominance and low sociability, tends to be classified as reserve and cautious.

**Supportive Style** - This is the term applied to the upper left-hand quadrant which features a combination
of low dominance and high sociability. These people find it easy to listen and usually don't express their views in a forceful manner. They rank low on assertiveness and often do not state their opinions because they want to avoid conflict.

Manning and Reece (1980) believe that each person has one communication style which he or she most prefers and habitually uses, although at various times behavior characteristics of the other styles may be displayed. They also believe that "communication style bias is a barrier to success in selling" (p. 106) and since it is impossible to choose customers who are like the salesperson they will encounter, the salespersons must be able to develop rapport and communication with people from each of the four quadrants.

The point is also made quite clear by the authors of this model that there is no one best place to be on the Communication Style Model. Successful salespeople come from all four quadrants. It is style flexing, or the deliberate attempt to accommodate the needs of the other person, which is important in communicating with others. In a selling situation one should try to determine the customer's most preferred style as quickly as possible then adjust your own style accordingly, according to Manning and Reece (1980).
Communication and Control Concept

Preston and Nelson (1981) have developed a two-dimensional model of personality based on communication and control, which is specifically developed for personal selling. They believe that communication is a large part of every selling situation. The customer communicates needs, desires, feelings, attitudes and so forth to the seller and the seller communicates information about products and services, and an understanding of customer needs and wants. How customers respond to the communication from sellers and how they communicate to sellers can be measured on a sliding scale from "open" to "closed." The control part of the selling situation can be measured on a sliding scale from "dominant" to "passive." In some situations the seller takes control and completely dominates the customer. In other situations the seller merely responds to the control of the buyers.

There are four major combinations of the control and communication dimensions, with gradations in between. Each of the four combinations will be briefly described below.

Closed-dominant customers like to take control and are not willing to listen to your presentation. Closed-submissive customers are unwilling to listen to information, to communicate about needs and information, or
to express their needs and attitudes, yet they remain submissive. This submissive part indicates a willingness to respond to facts and to evidence. Open-submissive customers offer little sales resistance; yet they are open to both you and your persuasive presentation. They tend to listen actively, making your task of selling much easier. These buyers like to operate on a personal basis rather than on a logical level. Because they are submissive, they require the leadership of someone in authority. Open-dominant customers are very open and communicative. Their approach to any sales situation is matter-of-fact, practical, and systematic. They usually do not waste time, and they reject any attempt to use time in a way that seems wasteful.

Preston and Nelson (1981) indicate that because of the number of variations possible in this communication system, a salesperson must be ready and willing to change strategy any time the customer's behavior changes or any time a particular approach is clearly not working.

Social Style Behavior Model

Developed by Dr. David Merrill (1981), the Social Style of Behavior Model utilizes three dimensions: assertiveness, responsiveness, and versatility. Assertiveness measures whether a person tends to tell or ask; responsiveness measures whether a person tends to
emote or to control feelings; and versatility measures the extent to which a person adapts to others.

The assertiveness and responsiveness scales are combined to form the Social Style Profile. The assertive scale from less assertive or "asking" to more assertive or "telling" forms the horizontal axis. The responsiveness scale from less responsive (controls emotions) to more responsive (emotes) forms the vertical axis. By combining these two dimensions, the social style quadrants are formed. These quadrants are labeled Driving, Expressive, Amiable, and Analytical, and each will be discussed briefly below. (See Figure 1, p. )

Driving behavior is the term used to describe the upper right-hand quadrant and this behavior is usually characterized by "telling," but with "control" of feelings. People who fall into this category are primarily assertive, serious people who make an effort to tell people what they think and require. They appear severe because they don't display feelings or emotions readily.

Expressive behavior is the term used to describe the lower right-hand quadrant and this behavior is usually characterized by "telling" and "emoting." This style is also assertive, like the Driving style, but these individuals are generally much more willing to make their feelings public. Rather than trying to control emotions,
the person with this style will show both positive and negative feelings.

Amiable behavior is the term used to describe the lower left-hand quadrant and is usually characterized by "asking" and "emoting." Like the person with an Expressive style, this individual usually displays feelings openly; however, this person is less assertive and more interested in being agreeable and cooperative.

Analytical behavior is the term used to describe the upper left-hand quadrant of the profile and is usually characterized by "asking" and with "control" on feelings. This style is low in assertiveness and high in control of emotions. Rather than being decisive or forceful, like the Driving or the Expressive style, this individual will tend to ask questions, gather facts, and study data seriously.

A person's Behavior Style is determined by how five friends, co-workers, or supervisors check-off a 150 word adjective checklist. The checklists are computer analyzed and the result is one of the above Behavior Styles.

The third dimension, Versatility, is determined independently. The ratings for this dimension are low, balanced, and high. Low versatility indicates that a person is not skillful at developing comfortable,
productive relationships. Balanced versatility indicates that a person is able to develop comfortable, productive relationships in most situations. High versatility indicates that a person is concerned with creating productive relationships with everyone. High versatility can lead to inconsistencies and questions about the sincerity of that person.

Table 1 summarizes the salient aspects of the behavioral style concepts which were reviewed for this research study. There are many similarities in these concepts; yet upon closer examination and study the Social Style Model of Behavior was considered to be superior and was chosen as the concept to be used in this study on the effectiveness of retail commission salespeople.

Summary

Effective salespeople are an important component of any successful retail institution, and over the years there have been many attempts to identify and predict who would become effective salespeople. Researchers have tried to link successful salespeople with certain traits or behaviors or similarities to their customers but have not been successful.

The concept of behavior style and of adapting to the other person's style in order to communicate more effectively as was noted in many of the behavior style
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Style Concept</th>
<th>Number of Dimensions/Elements Identified</th>
<th>Number of Styles Identified</th>
<th>Self-Administered Instrument</th>
<th>Includes Adapting as A Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiersey/Bates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing Style Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Polar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Profile System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Scripts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional Sales Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Style Model Of Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Many of these concepts are proprietary and in some cases specific information is not available.*
concepts reviewed, has direct implications for the sales profession. If a salesperson can better understand the customer and relate to the customer's needs, then there is increased opportunity to complete the sales transactions.

The Social Style Model of Behavior was chosen as the concept to be used in this research because it utilizes an instrument which is not self-administered but which is completed by others who observe the salesperson's behavior. It also incorporates a third dimension called Versatility which measures how well the salesperson adapts to another's style of behavior.

Chapter III presents the methodology used in this research study. In addition, it also presents the data findings from this research project which was based on a training program utilizing the Social Style Model of Behavior. The analysis of data concludes Chapter III.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the hypothesis that the sales performance of the commission salespeople completing the behavioral style awareness training program will be significantly better than the sales performance of other commission salespeople. This chapter describes the methodology used in this study, presents the findings from the collection of monthly sales data for the subjects, divisions, and stores involved in the study, and analyzes those findings.

Research Design

A quasi-experimental research design was used in this research project because of the nature of the study. More specifically, a treatment experimental group and a no-treatment control group design was chosen for the following reasons.

1. The impact of changes in the economy upon data collected could be observed.

2. The longitudinal aspects of data collection would be more meaningful.
3. The ability to use the most appropriate and accurate statistical procedures available for the amount and type of data collected.

Monthly sales data were collected for five months before the introduction of a behavioral training program and for five months after the training program for the experimental group. Sales data were collected in an identical manner for the control group which received no training.

Company Selection

The department store chain used in this study was selected for the following reasons.

1. The chief executive officer was receptive to the idea of research in the area of sales performance for commission salespeople and extended complete cooperation in arranging the training program and in collecting the sales data.

2. The size of the organization made available an adequate number of participants to make feasible an appropriate research design which included a control group.

3. The store chain has locations through the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex. All sales and promotions are coordinated simultaneously by corporate headquarters. This permitted the selection of experimental and control groups.
from all stores without adjustment for "special sales or local conditions."

Experimental Group Selection

Participants were all commission salespeople from the major appliances and furniture divisions of nine stores from the department store chain. In order to minimize the "Hawthorne effect", there were no stores which had both experimental and control subjects as employees. The only criterion for selecting participants was that they must have been employed by the organization and worked in the store for six months prior to the training program. This longevity criterion was an essential requirement in this study due to the experimental design.

All employees who met the longevity criterion and were employed in the major appliances or furniture divisions of the nine stores selected for the study had a choice as to whether or not they would participate in the training program. Of those eligible and willing to participate, twenty-six were chosen for the program. Of these twenty-six, seven did not participate in the training program due to scheduling problems created by illness of participants or co-workers and due to transfers to other divisions. Due to the length of time required to complete the Behavior Style Profiles for each participant in the training program, replacement of these seven was impossible.
Therefore, there were nineteen participants who completed the training program. Complete post-training sales data could be collected for only thirteen due to the attrition of six participants for the following reasons:

- early retirement - 1
- started own business - 1
- changed division - 2
- changed stores - 2

Control Group Selection

Participants in the control group were randomly selected from stores which did not have participants in the experimental group. Again, the single criterion was that the salesperson had been employed in the major appliances or furniture division for at least six months. Sales data and biographical data were also collected for participants in the control group.

Training Program

A training program utilizing the Social Style of Behavior Model which was discussed in Chapter I was presented by an experienced trainer certified by Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc., of Denver, Colorado, to conduct Behavioral Style Awareness Workshops. The program was conducted in the training facility of one of the centrally located stores in the company and consisted of lecture, role play, and videotaped materials with emphasis on application to personal selling in the retail situation.
Materials used in the training program are presented in the Appendix. Included are an outline of the Style Awareness training Workshop and copies of all handouts distributed during the training program. In addition to these materials, the book *Personal Styles and Effective Performance* by David W. Merrill and Roger H. Reid was furnished to each participant at the beginning of the program. Also included in the Appendix is Table A-1 which shows demographic data for each participant in the experimental group.

The Social Style of Behavior Profile was completed for each participant in the experimental group prior to the program. As discussed in Chapter I this requires that five references, selected from friends, co-workers, or supervisors, independently check-off which of 150 adjectives on the checklist describe the behavior of the person being measured. The checklists were mailed by the references directly to Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc., in Denver, Colorado, where they are computer processed. Complete anonymity of individual replies is assured with only a Composite Behavior Profile reported back to the participant as a multi-dimensional "snapshot" description of how the reference group perceives that person's style of behavior. This behavior profile, then, enables the
participant to see his/her behavior as described by others.

Limitations of the Study

This study utilizes an operating department store chain; therefore, it was necessary to integrate all aspects of the research into the normal operations of the organization. As a result, there were certain limitations imposed on this study.

1. All the participants were volunteers. This was a requirement imposed by the store organization since participants had to be away from their jobs during working hours. The company did, however, pay them their average hourly rate during the workshop and their travel to and from the training center was reimbursed.

2. The training program was conducted on company premises. As such there were numerous opportunities for interruptions and distractions.

3. Some attrition in the number of participants was inevitable due to the high turnover of retail salespeople as well as the relocation to other stores of those involved in the study.

4. The research design permitted only twenty hours of training.

5. There was no opportunity for upper levels of management to attend the Behavior Style Awareness training program.
6. There was no opportunity for reinforcement and follow-up after the training program.

7. The poor economic conditions for retailing in general during this period of time did not provide the most conducive atmosphere for improving sales effectiveness.

8. The extent to which the participants utilized the new concepts presented in the workshop during actual sales encounters could not be evaluated.

Collection of Data

Monthly sales data in dollars were collected for each participant in both the experimental and control groups for five months prior to the training program and for five months after the program. The sales figures were taken directly from payroll sheets in the company's home office. In addition, for the same period of time noted above, sales data in dollars were collected for the divisions and stores where all participants were located. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the monthly sales data for the groups, divisions, and stores respectively included in the study.

Treatment of Data

The treatment effect of the data is

\[(Y_2 - Y_1) - (X_2 - X_1)\]

where \(Y\) is experimental group sales and \(X\) is control group sales, and the subscripts 1 and 2 denote before and after measurements respectively.
Differences in sales for the experimental group are attributable to both the treatment variable (training program) and to the effect of extraneous factors. Differences in sales in the control group are attributable only to the effect of extraneous factors. If the equivalent assumption is made for extraneous variables in the control and experimental groups, then subtracting the control difference from the experimental difference leaves the net effect of the treatment variable. That is, the difference between pre- and post-training sales in the experimental group includes both difference due to extraneous factors and difference due to the training program. After the adjustment for differences due to extraneous factors, as measured by the control group, the remaining difference is attributable to participation in the training program. This remaining difference was tested statistically for significance at the .10 level.

Data Presentation

The hypothesis tested in this study was: the sales performance of the commission salespeople attending the training program would be significantly better than the sales performance of other commission salespeople.

The average monthly sales for pre-training and post-training periods for the experimental and control
groups as shown in Table 2 were used in the drawing of Figure 2. Figure 2 indicates that for the pre-training period the plot of the average monthly sales for the experimental and control groups is very similar. However, in the post-training period the experimental group clearly had a lesser decrease in sales than did the control group. (See Table 2, Figure 2)

Figure 3 shows the plots of average monthly sales for the pre- and post-training periods for experimental and control divisions as presented in Table 3. The plots for the pre-period are, again, very similar for both the experimental and control divisions; however, the post-period plots vary slightly. (See Table 3, Figure 3)

Average monthly sales for the stores involved in the study are shown in Table 4 and are plotted in Figure 4. It is again apparent upon examination of this graph that the shape and trend of the re-training period data is similar for both the experimental and control stores. The post-training period data, however, indicates that control stores had a slight increase in sales, while the experimental stores did not. (See Table 4, Figure 4)

In comparing the average monthly sales data in Figures 2, 3, and 4, it is apparent from Figure 2 that in the post-experimental period the experimental group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,187</td>
<td>$13,410</td>
<td>$24,571</td>
<td>$25,455</td>
<td>$19,294</td>
<td>$27,017</td>
<td>$23,635</td>
<td>$20,827</td>
<td>$26,465</td>
<td>$24,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,140</td>
<td>$14,092</td>
<td>$11,026</td>
<td>$21,099</td>
<td>$15,423</td>
<td>$11,461</td>
<td>$11,348</td>
<td>$15,171</td>
<td>$18,283</td>
<td>$11,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$22,216</td>
<td>$20,797</td>
<td>$51,733</td>
<td>$31,992</td>
<td>$23,545</td>
<td>$19,526</td>
<td>$33,934</td>
<td>$39,267</td>
<td>$26,485</td>
<td>$30,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,007</td>
<td>$26,391</td>
<td>$86,840</td>
<td>$19,792</td>
<td>$22,197</td>
<td>$22,579</td>
<td>$19,227</td>
<td>$32,214</td>
<td>$20,564</td>
<td>$21,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$27,301</td>
<td>$25,239</td>
<td>$50,953</td>
<td>$31,669</td>
<td>$26,482</td>
<td>$16,248</td>
<td>$25,836</td>
<td>$17,916</td>
<td>$32,590</td>
<td>$27,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$17,113</td>
<td>$16,561</td>
<td>$39,972</td>
<td>$23,340</td>
<td>$23,682</td>
<td>$16,086</td>
<td>$25,288</td>
<td>$26,738</td>
<td>$25,569</td>
<td>$29,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$19,792</td>
<td>$50,953</td>
<td>$39,794</td>
<td>$40,133</td>
<td>$35,404</td>
<td>$15,444</td>
<td>$14,788</td>
<td>$40,922</td>
<td>$23,763</td>
<td>$51,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$32,640</td>
<td>$29,284</td>
<td>$40,627</td>
<td>$48,710</td>
<td>$34,142</td>
<td>$24,953</td>
<td>$35,940</td>
<td>$44,180</td>
<td>$90,727</td>
<td>$57,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$26,193</td>
<td>$39,207</td>
<td>$61,401</td>
<td>$46,046</td>
<td>$29,961</td>
<td>$25,497</td>
<td>$34,307</td>
<td>$42,214</td>
<td>$43,769</td>
<td>$36,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$43,707</td>
<td>$27,142</td>
<td>$74,664</td>
<td>$55,055</td>
<td>$35,609</td>
<td>$33,401</td>
<td>$41,591</td>
<td>$70,335</td>
<td>$49,006</td>
<td>$54,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$12,215</td>
<td>$17,683</td>
<td>$21,181</td>
<td>$26,733</td>
<td>$33,601</td>
<td>$13,666</td>
<td>$31,958</td>
<td>$18,716</td>
<td>$32,623</td>
<td>$35,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$26,613</td>
<td>$35,564</td>
<td>$21,052</td>
<td>$24,803</td>
<td>$21,259</td>
<td>$19,055</td>
<td>$16,144</td>
<td>$30,034</td>
<td>$30,284</td>
<td>$31,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$24,220</td>
<td>$24,377</td>
<td>$44,985</td>
<td>$33,478</td>
<td>$28,687</td>
<td>$22,552</td>
<td>$28,911</td>
<td>$35,265</td>
<td>$35,039</td>
<td>$34,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Pre-training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,174</td>
<td>$28,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$39,576</td>
<td>$27,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$17,373</td>
<td>$27,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$22,748</td>
<td>$21,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$16,045</td>
<td>$24,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$27,301</td>
<td>$43,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$35,144</td>
<td>$37,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$16,544</td>
<td>$39,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$22,789</td>
<td>$21,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$24,267</td>
<td>$31,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$31,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$15,299</td>
<td>$26,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$22,242</td>
<td>$25,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$25,292</td>
<td>$30,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Average Monthly Sales Data for Experimental and Control Groups for Pre-training and Post-training Periods

- - Experimental Group
- - Control Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td>Month 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$113,100</td>
<td>$101,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>102,100</td>
<td>697,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>212,800</td>
<td>249,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>574,700</td>
<td>714,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>872,900</td>
<td>077,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$215,160</td>
<td>$248,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Training</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td>Month 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>192,500</td>
<td>213,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>215,900</td>
<td>150,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>243,700</td>
<td>326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>086,800</td>
<td>119,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$179,575</td>
<td>$204,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3

Average Monthly Sales Data for Experimental and Control Divisions for Pre-training and Post-training Periods

--- Experimental Divisions
--- Control Divisions
### TABLE 4

**Monthly Sales Data and Averages for Experimental and Control Stores by Pre-training and Post-training Periods**

| Score | Pre-training | | | | | | Post-training | | | |
|-------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|       | Month 1   | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 | Month 1   | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 |
| 1.    | $1,216,000 | $2,236,000 | $1,402,000 | $1,498,000 | $1,799,000 | $1,908,000 | $1,886,000 | $1,584,000 | $1,475,000 | $1,724,000 |
| 2.    | $1,964,000 | $2,352,000 | $3,134,000 | $2,544,000 | $3,125,000 | $2,174,000 | $2,252,000 | $2,791,000 | $2,573,000 | $3,020,000 |
| 3.    | $1,361,000 | $1,887,000 | $2,196,000 | $1,846,000 | $2,432,000 | $1,426,000 | $2,315,000 | $1,966,000 | $1,927,000 | $2,307,000 |
| 4.    | $1,425,000 | $4,913,000 | $5,398,000 | $4,089,000 | $5,200,000 | $3,631,000 | $4,949,000 | $4,490,000 | $3,940,000 | $4,618,000 |
| 5.    | $0,980,000 | $1,516,000 | $1,856,000 | $1,464,000 | $1,686,000 | $1,197,000 | $1,613,000 | $1,640,000 | $1,495,000 | $1,853,000 |
| Average | $1,824,600 | $2,201,200 | $2,971,600 | $2,288,200 | $2,097,600 | $1,925,200 | $2,847,600 | $2,494,200 | $2,282,000 | $2,716,000 |

**Control Group**

| Score | Pre-training | | | | | | Post-training | | | |
|-------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|       | Month 1   | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 | Month 1   | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 |
| 1.    | $1,424,000 | $1,688,000 | $2,059,000 | $1,632,000 | $2,009,000 | $1,398,000 | $2,089,000 | $1,811,000 | $1,804,000 | $2,149,000 |
| 2.    | $2,287,000 | $1,428,000 | $1,796,000 | $1,468,000 | $1,823,000 | $1,174,000 | $1,785,000 | $1,581,000 | $1,561,000 | $1,850,000 |
| 3.    | $1,670,000 | $2,041,000 | $2,787,000 | $2,014,000 | $2,727,000 | $1,818,000 | $2,628,000 | $2,343,000 | $2,166,000 | $2,615,000 |
| 4.    | $1,936,000 | $1,225,000 | $1,598,000 | $1,268,000 | $1,673,000 | $1,197,000 | $1,631,000 | $1,466,000 | $1,169,000 | $1,632,000 |
| Average | $1,354,250 | $1,595,500 | $2,040,000 | $1,595,500 | $2,058,000 | $1,371,750 | $2,034,000 | $1,805,250 | $1,725,000 | $2,071,250 |
Figure 4

Average Monthly Sales Data for Experimental and Control Stores for Pre-training and Post-training Periods

SALES ($000)

1100 1300 1500 1700 1900 2100 2300 2500 2700 2900 3100

MONTHS

1 2 3 4 5 (Pre-training Period) 1 2 3 4 5 (Post-training Period)

-- Experimental Stores
--- Control Stores
differed greatly from the control group. Figure 3 indicates that this difference was carried over into the division data causing the post-experimental period for the division to be slightly different from the control group. This difference, however, was confounded in the store data as shown in Figure 4, due to the fact that the division data is such a small part of the total store sales data.

The sales data presented in Table 5 shows that in comparing pre- and post-training sales data there was a decrease in average sales for both the experimental and control groups during the post-training period. The decrease in mean monthly sales for the control group was significant at the .05 level. The decrease in sales for the experimental group, however, was not significant.

**TABLE 5**

Comparison of Sales Data Means for Experimental and Control Groups by Pre-Training and Post-Training Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Training Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Training SD</th>
<th>Post-Training Mean</th>
<th>Post-Training SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>$159,757</td>
<td>$49,636</td>
<td>$156,432</td>
<td>$52,598</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>$161,191</td>
<td>$26,079</td>
<td>$140,752</td>
<td>$36,526</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2.83*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

Table 6 indicates, by the significance of the F test, that the variance of the experimental and control
groups are equal. Table 6 also shows that the difference in the mean differences for the experimental and control groups is significant at approximately the .06 level. That is, that the lesser decrease in sales for the experimental group as compared to the control group was significant. Therefore, the hypothesis: the sales performance of the commission salespeople attending the behavioral style awareness training program would be significantly better than the sales performance of other commission salespeople is accepted. In accepting this hypothesis, the results of this study can be attributed to the behavior style awareness training program.

**TABLE 6**

Test for Significance Between the Mean Differences in Sales for Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Table t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>-3,325</td>
<td>28,373</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
<td>1.78 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-20,438</td>
<td>26,079</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant
**Significant at .10 level

The analysis of sales data for divisions as shown in Table 7 indicates that both the experimental and control
divisions showed a significant decrease in sales during the post-training period. However, the difference in mean differences was not significant as shown in Table 8.

**TABLE 7**

Comparison of Sales Data Means for Experimental and Control Divisions by Pre-Training and Post-Training Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>$1,465,440</td>
<td>$1,383,848</td>
<td>$1,300,060</td>
<td>$1,263,441</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>$1,200,425</td>
<td>$537,039</td>
<td>$1,073,925</td>
<td>$549,183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

**TABLE 8**

Test for Significance Between the Mean Differences in Sales for Experimental and Control Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Table t 05</th>
<th>Table t 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>-$165,380</td>
<td>$168,740</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>5.0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-$126,500</td>
<td>$61,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of pre- and post-training sales data for experimental and control stores as shown in Table 9 indicates that both the control and experimental stores
showed an increase in sales during the post-training period. The increase for experimental stores, however, was not significant. The difference in mean differences between the experimental and control stores as shown in Table 10 also was not significant.

**TABLE 9**

Comparison of Sales Data Means for Experimental and Control Stores by PRE-Training and Post-Training Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post-Training Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>$12,188,200</td>
<td>$603,038</td>
<td>$12,259,200</td>
<td>$571,460</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>$8,463,250</td>
<td>$1,867,507</td>
<td>$9,007,250</td>
<td>$1,922,618</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

**TABLE 10**

Test for Significance Between the Mean Differences in Sales for Experimental and Control Stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Table f Value</th>
<th>Table t df</th>
<th>Table t Value 0.05</th>
<th>0.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$404,155</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>$364,000</td>
<td>$138,624</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data

The hypothesis presented in this study concerns the possibility that sales results would be better for participants in the sales training program than for those who did not participate. In analyzing the sales data presented earlier in this chapter, it is apparent that the behavior style training program presented to commission salespeople was effective. Even though there was a decrease in sales for both the control group and the experimental groups in the post-period due to poor economic conditions, the decrease was significantly less for the experimental group which received the behavioral style training.

It seems reasonable to assume that if there had been any type of reinforcement or follow-up after training the difference between control group and experimental group sales would have been even greater. The fact that immediate supervisors and upper management had not participated in the training program and therefore could not reinforce the concepts would seem logically to diminish the effectiveness of the training program. Informal follow-up discussions with the salespeople who had participated in the program may also have proven effective in improving sales effectiveness; however, there was no opportunity for such follow-up.

The sales data which was collected for both the experimental and control divisions involved in the study indicate a significant decrease in sales during the post-
training period. It is reasonable to assume that this decrease can be attributed to the poor economic conditions.

The comparison of sales data for the experimental and control stores involved in this study indicates a significant increase in sales during the post-training period for the control stores only. Because of the significant decrease in sales for both the experimental and control divisions involved in this study, it is not apparent why sales for the control stores increased significantly. It can only be assumed that other divisions within the control stores contributed to this increase in sales.

It would be appropriate at this point in the discussion to analyze the data collected in this research study in light of previous research in behavioral style training for sales effectiveness; however, this is not possible. As stated in Chapter I, this researcher found no evidence in the literature of any research in this area. A previous quote from Weitz (1981) in Chapter I supports these findings and bears repeating. "Sales behaviors related to adapting to the customer and controlling the sales interaction have not been investigated empirically, even though practitioners view these behaviors as critical to sales effectiveness" (p. 100).
Summary

This chapter has described the methodology used in this research study and has presented the findings from the collection of data. The next chapter, Chapter IV, presents a summary of this research. Conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data as well as recommendations for further study in the area of behavioral style awareness training for increased sales effectiveness are also included.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The success of any retail institution depends upon many factors including personal selling effectiveness. It was the purpose of this research study to determine if commission salespeople who have participated in a behavioral style awareness program would have significantly better sales performance than those commission salespeople who did not attend the training program.

Sales training in the past has focused primarily on the selling process with emphasis on how to close a sale. The idea of using behavioral training with sales people emerged when behavioral training began to be recognized in the literature as a tool for sales training as well as for management training.

The Social Style of Behavior concept developed by Dr. David Merrill, Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc. of Denver, Colorado, was selected for use in this study for the following reasons:

1. The theoretical basis on which it is established;
2. The amount of data which has been collected over an extended period of time, and the norms which have been established using this data;

3. The utilization of an instrument which is not self-administered but which is completed by others who observe the salesperson's behavior;

4. The incorporation of a third dimension, versatility, which allows a more specific description of individual behavior.

The chief executive officer of a large department store group in the Southwest was contacted with the proposal for this study. He agreed to give his commission salespeople the opportunity to participate in this study and to provide facilities and support for this project. In addition, he extended complete cooperation during the collection of the required sales data.

The objectives of the style awareness behavioral training program utilized in this study included:

1. To understand one's own behavior patterns and style;

2. To learn how to recognize the behavior patterns and styles of others;

3. To learn how to adapt to the behavior styles of others for more meaningful interpersonal relationships.
In order to reach these objectives, a behavior style awareness training program was developed which required twenty hours of classroom training including lecture, role play, and videotaped materials with emphasis on application to personal selling in a retail situation. The program was conducted by an experienced trainer who is certified by Personnel Predictions & Research, Inc. to present workshops using the Social Style of Behavior Model and concept.

Several limitations were imposed on this research study because the organization was a real, functioning group of retail stores. Limitations included the following.

1. Volunteers for this project were taken away from their assigned departments during normal working hours.

2. Follow-up after the program was not feasible.

3. Management did not participate in this training program; therefore, a valuable follow-up tool was not available.

The hypothesis of this study was that the sales performance of the commission salespeople attending the training program will be significantly better than the sales performance of commission salespeople not attending the training program. The quasi-experimental research design which was used in this study required a treatment experimental group and a no-treatment control group.
Monthly sales data was collected for the experimental group for five months before and five months after the treatment (training) was given. Data was collected in an identical manner for the control group, except they received no training.

Sales data collected for both the experimental and control groups indicated that there was an overall decrease in sales for both groups for the period of time covered by this research study. However, the decrease in sales was significantly less for the experimental group. Therefore, the training program was successful, and the hypothesis was accepted. A more detailed discussion of the methodology and data collection and analysis used in this study is included in Chapter III.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the data presented in Chapter III.

1. Behavioral style awareness training increases the sales effectiveness of retail commission salespeople.

2. Behavioral style awareness training is appropriate for selling situations in addition to its design intent which was to improve interpersonal relationships.

3. Behavioral style awareness training can have application to all selling situations, both retail and
application to all selling situations, both retail and industrial, because of the interpersonal relationships involved in the selling process.

Recommendations

Based upon the methods and procedures used and the results obtained in this research study, it is recommended

1. That a research study be designed which would include in the experimental group all members of store management as well as commission salespeople in order to facilitate group understanding and foster reinforcement;

2. That in all similar behavioral research designs frequent follow-up be required both on a formal as well as informal basis for reinforcement of concepts presented in the training program;

3. That a research study be designed to study the effect of versatility and changing versatility on sales performance;

4. That a research study be designed to analyze all aspects of salesforce management related to behavior style and versatility including recruitment, selection, absenteeism, sales effectiveness, retention, and upward mobility;

5. That the concept of behavioral style awareness training be studied as it applies to other selling groups
such as industrial sales where time permits an interpersonal relationship to be established and maintained over a period of time;

6. That this study be replicated and enlarged to allow for a larger sample and for collection of more longitudinal data, thus making it possible to use more sophisticated statistical procedures.

The conclusions and recommendations set forth in this study indicate a need for further research in the area of behavioral style awareness and its impact on sales effectiveness. The lack of existing empirical research in this area serves to strengthen this conclusion.
APPENDIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years with Store Group</th>
<th>Years in Sales</th>
<th>Behavior Style</th>
<th>Versatility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STYLE AWARENESS WORKSHOP

PROGRAM CONTENT

Introductions
Behavior--Analysis and Discussion
Behavior Compared with Personality
Dimensions of Behavior
Styles of Behavior
Exercise--Banner Slogans
Versatility
  Need for Versatility
  How to control Versatility
Motivation and Behavior
Tension and Productivity
Unproductive Behavior Styles
Priorities of Behavior Styles
Exercise--Likes and Dislikes of Behavior Styles
Potential for Conflict Between Behavior Styles
Strategies for Improving Relationships
Action Exercises--Applying Versatility
  Negotiating and Accommodating for Successful Interaction
**YOUR PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

* You will leave the program with a positive attitude about your learning experience,

* You will develop an awareness of the social style profile for describing human behavior,

* You will develop an understanding of your own behavior,

* You will develop a better awareness of how others view your behavior and the impact your behavior can have on customers and others,

* You will develop a better understanding of your natural style strengths so you can capitalize on them during sales interactions and other interpersonal relationships,

* You will learn skills for accurately identifying the behavior of others in order to control your own behavior in the sales interaction as well as in other interpersonal relationships,
ASSERTIVENESS

We define ASSERTIVENESS as the effort a person makes to influence the thinking and actions of others. It is a measure of the amount of control he is trying to exert over others or put another way, a measure of whether a person tends to TELL or ASK others.

The assertive scale has four quartiles (A,B,C,D) with "A" the highest Assertiveness and "D" the lowest. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the adult population is in each quartile. Fifty adjectives compose the scale. On one side (A,B) there are words such as bold, talkative, and aggressive. On the other side there are words such as shy, unassuming, and reserved.

There is no best place to be on the Assertive scale. Each place has its unique strengths and weaknesses. The scale is wholly independent of maturity. We tend to think of ourselves as being all over a scale, but others tend to see us principally in one position. We are creatures of habit and although we do change in varied situations, more often than not most people will agree that each individual tends to either TELL or ASK most of the time. We don't vary from our habitual ways of acting with others as much as we think we do.

EXAMPLES OF ASSERTIVE BEHAVIOR

ASK

Reserved, unaggressive and/or easygoing; avoids appearing dominant and tends to keep his thoughts to himself.

Easygoing, likes to avoid imposing upon others; may not communicate unless he has a specific need to do so.

Supportive; likes to listen and looks for a chance to support the ideas and attitudes of others.

TELL

Active, confident, and/or aggressive; makes his presence known; tends to tell others what is on his mind.

Ambitious; likes to know what is going on; initiates social contacts and communicates with others even when not desirable to do so.

Challenging; likes to confront others about their ideas and attitudes.

ACTIONS

ASK

-Silent
-Moderate opinions
-Thoughful decisions
-Go along attitude
-Likeable first impression
-Supportive
-Tends to avoid use of power
-Lets others take social initiative
-Asks questions

TELL

-Talkative
-Strong opinions
-Quick decisions
-Take charge attitude
-Overwhelming first impression
-Directive
-Tends to use power
-Takes social initiative
-Makes statements
The second dimension of the profile is RESPONSIVENESS. RESPONSIVENESS refers to the amount of emotion and feeling an individual expresses in his relationships with others. It is a measure of the amount of control an individual does, or does not, exert over himself—over his emotional expressiveness. Put another way, responsiveness measures whether a person tends to CONTROL his feelings or to EMOTE. The responsiveness scale has four quartiles (labeled 1, 2, 3, 4) with "1" denoting the least responsiveness and "4" the most. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the adult population falls in each quartile. Eighty-three adjectives compose this scale. On the unresponsive side of the scale (1, 2) one finds such words as stern, guarded, and tough; on the responsive side (3, 4) examples are emotional, impulsive, and relaxed.

Examples of Responsive Behavior

CONTROL

Self-sufficient, independent, and/or indifferent to the feelings of others; tends to be concerned with what others think about the reasoning and/or logic behind relationships and actions.

Formal, proper, and/or stiff in social relationships; tends to keep his distance and avoid personal involvements with others.

Precise, specific, and/or critical with a no-nonsense attitude; concerned with getting things done efficiently.

EMOTE

Self-indulging, attention seeking, and/or involved with the feelings of others; tends to be concerned with how others feel about relationships and actions.

Informal, casual, and/or playful in social relationships; tends to get involved with others on a personal basis.

Imprecise, general, and/or permissive with a fun-loving attitude; can appear unconcerned about the efficiency of actions.

ACTIONS

CONTROL

-Formal dress and/or speech
-Secrecive communicator
-Measured opinions and actions
-Strict, disciplined attitudes
-One-sided decision making
-Seems difficult to get to know
-Self-disciplined, guarded
- Requireing of himself & others
-Impersonal and businesslike

EMOTE

-Informal dress and/or speech
-Open, impulsive communicator
-Dramatic opinions and actions
-Permissive, fluid attitudes
-Emotional decision making
-Seems easy to get to know
-Emotionally expressive, open
-Easy-going with self & others
-Personal and friendly
### Shorthand Descriptions of the Basic Social Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asks</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Tells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Industrious</td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisive</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Strong Willed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuffy</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picky</td>
<td>Exacting</td>
<td>Tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>Orderly</td>
<td>Dominating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Manipulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiating</td>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>Excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Undisciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward</td>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>Reacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reckless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egotistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE BASIC THEME

You should now have a good understanding of the most common patterns of action found in each of the four basic social styles. To summarize, the major thrust of each style can be described as:

Driving----Action Oriented
Expressive----Intuition Oriented
Amiable----Relationship Oriented
Analytical----Thinking Oriented

As you have read, these four styles can be used to characterize the observable behavior of most human beings. Of course, you shouldn't expect to find a pure social style in any one person. Most people will combine the actions of several, or all, of the social styles. However, a person's basic social style represents his system for coping easily and comfortably with the varied social situations encountered in the course of a day. Thus, once you know a person's social style, you can anticipate that person's behavior and work more effectively and comfortably with him.

The figure below lists some generalizations about each style theme. By reading these you should gain a better grasp of each style—and you should be better able to identify them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR TYPICAL OF STYLE THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANALYTICAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effort to organize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum concern for relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to reject involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRIVER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effort to control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum concern for caution in relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to reject inaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMIABLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhurried reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effort to relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum concern for effecting change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to reject conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESSIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum effort to involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum concern for routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to reject isolation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-RESPONSIVE (Control)

Reserved, unresponsive
Poker face
Actions cautious or careful
Wants facts and details
Eye contact infrequent while listening
Eyes harsh, severe or serious
Limited use of hands, clenched tightly, folded or pointed
Limited personal feelings, story telling or small talk
Preoccupied or vigilant

NON-ASSERTIVE (Ask)

Few uses of voice to emphasize ideas
Expressions and posture quiet and submissive
Deliberate, studied or slow in speech
Indifferent handshake
Asked questions more often than made statements
Vague, unclear about what was wanted
Tended to lean backwards

ASSERTIVE (Tell)

Emphasizes ideas by tone change
Expressions aggressive or dominant
Quick, clear or fast paced speech
Firm handshake
Made statements more often than asked questions
Let one know what was wanted
Tended to lean forward to make a point

RESPONSIVE (Emote)

Animated, uses facial expressions
Smiles, nods, frowns
Actions open or eager
Little effort to push for facts
Eye contact frequent while listening
Friendly gaze
Hands free, palms up, open
Friendly gestures
Shared personal feelings
Attentive, responsive, enjoyed the relationship
STYLE DEFINITIONS

DRIVING STYLE—Action Oriented

People who display a Driving style seem to know what they want, where they are going and tend to become impatient with delays. In fact, "Let's get it done now and get it done right" is an appropriate slogan for many Drivers. Drivers tend to focus mainly on the immediate time frame. Thus, they tend to deal with the present situation rapidly and appear to have little concern for the past or the future. In addition, their responses appear swift, efficient, and to the point. Drivers are often quick to express their conclusions about anything that concerns them. And, when a Driver encounters an obstacle between himself and a perceived objective, he will often seek to control the immediate situation, and get past the obstacle, through the use of power. In their dealings with other people, Drivers appear to show little concern for the feelings of others or for personal relationships. This may not in fact be true, but because of their less responsive actions, Drivers do not show "people"-orientation. Because Drivers seem to give such limited attention to relationships, some consider their actions harsh, severe or critical. However, others may consider this behavior as efficient and decisive since the Driver's actions may provide the direction they seek or need.

EXPRESSIVE STYLE—Intuition Oriented

People who show Expressive actions frequently seem to spend their time and efforts moving toward some dream for the future. This tendency causes some people to feel that Expressives act in flighty, impractical or unrealistic ways. Expressives tend to focus attention on the future, with little apparent concern for practical details. It's easy for Expressives to skip from one idea or activity to another, seeming impatient to find the most exciting vision of the moment for themselves and others—and they are able to spin a web of excitement around others as they do this. Expressives tend to appear more imaginative and creative with their ideas than other styles; however, it's also easy for Expressives to make many mistakes because they act on opinions, hunches, and intuitions rather than harsh reality or hard facts. Expressives may become completely involved in and committed to an idea, which they then might discard within a short time if it loses shine, luster, and excitement for them.
AMIABLE STYLE--RELATIONSHIP ORIENTED

People seen as acting in an Amiable manner appear to interpret the world on a personal basis and they often get involved in the feelings and relationships between people, frequently speculating on "who did what to whom and why." People with an Amiable style look for personal motives in the actions of others. They focus on what is happening right now and how the actions of others may influence their lives. Because Amiables are concerned about how others feel and about relationships between people, they can often lend joy, warmth, and freshness to a social situation. Folklore, tradition and even sentimentality can capture their attention. People with an Amiable social style can also appear slow or reluctant to change opinions that hold personal meaning for them. In fact, Amiables frequently stick with the comfortable and known and tend to avoid activities that involve risk with the unknown--especially risks that involve personal relationships.

ANALYTICAL STYLE--THINKING ORIENTED

People described as acting as Analyticals seem to live life according to the facts, principles, logic, and consistency one can find in reality. Analyticals tend to behave in ways that fit into their overall theory and ideas about the world. As such, others may view them as lacking enthusiasm and/or appearing cold or detached. They tend to focus on what has happened in the past. Analyticals often project the image of great planners, organizers, and administrators with the ability to work tasks systematically from beginning to end. Analyticals have the desire to be "right" and so many appear to be overly concerned with fact and logical organization of thought. Thus, they may seem reluctant to declare a decision. Analyticals need to analyze all significant possibilities to assure that they avoid any chance of making an illogical or inconsistent decision. Facts, logic, and faith in principles appear to assume greater importance to Analyticals than personal friendships or personal gratification.
AVOIDER (Analytical)

An individual who acts as though he must protect himself from the possibility of making a mistake or having someone find fault with him. He is orderly, precise and tends to be a perfectionist. His primary need seems to be a need to feel safe. He feels too weak to fight but too proud to give in; his solution is to run away. He makes a frantic effort to be independent of others, not to be under obligation, not to be influenced, not to be involved. He worries over responsibilities and over relative trifles. He can be overly moralistic and critical of others. He rarely expresses feelings and puts his faith in rational thinking instead. He is unfulfilled as a person, not growing and immature.

AUTOCRAT (Driving)

An individual who acts as though he has absolute power to control others. He attempts to dominate others by asserting himself and by using facts to get his own way. He resists any display of feelings or emotions as he believes emotionalism is a sign of weakness or inferiority. He will be kind to persons who are subservient, but he does not encourage them to grow into mature creative individuals. He is essentially very selfish, fearful and weak but cannot admit to any weaknesses. If he acknowledged weakness of any kind that would give someone else power over him and he cannot tolerate being subordinate. He is unfulfilled as a person, not growing and immature.

ACQUIESCER (Amiable)

An individual who acts as though he must be accepted, approved, loved by others and is convinced he can attain this objective by appeasement. He submits, consents and agrees with, but this is a shallow kind of cooperation as he is only interested in meeting his own needs for acceptance. He has trouble taking an independent stand and does not assert himself for fear that others will disapprove and or withhold their affection. He thinks of himself as gentle, kind and obedient, but he is quietly hostile, a prisoner of his dependency on others. He can’t help others grow as he is propped up by others and can’t express real self-confidence and self-respect. He is unfulfilled as a person, not growing and immature.

ATTACKER (Expressive)

An individual who acts as though he must prove he can win in any competition with anyone. He fights hard and expresses a good deal of emotion. In his efforts to win his feelings are expressed as aggression or hostility toward the object of his competitive struggle. However, with those who indulge him or support his efforts he is responsive, appealing, outgoing and often warm. He needs to act out his impulses and does so with little concern for the consequences. He plays to the grandstand and his behavior is predominantly attention-seeking. Even though he can prove himself in independent, competitive challenges, he has difficulty sustaining consistent effort to achieve beyond short-sighted goals. He shifts goals and attention too rapidly. He proves himself daily but loses the battle of achieving on an annual basis. He is too self-centered to help others grow. He is unfulfilled as a person, not growing and immature.
VERSATILITY

There is one dimension which is independent of style and which can be a determining factor in a person's career. It is called

VERSATILITY means different things to different people; however for the purposes of this course we will use the following as our definition.

Versatility is defined as acting in ways that earn a social endorsement. A person is seen as having versatility if he:

1) exercises interpersonal skills
2) has a natural bent for satisfying others
3) tries to meet the needs of others

(The difference between 2 and 3 is the effort one has to make to meet the needs of another.)

VERSATILITY GROWS OUT OF COMPETENCE

All versatility grows out of competence. Versatility has ability as its base. In other words, if we wish to be seen as versatile, we must be good at something. We must be able to share our competence with others, and we must use our competence to help others meet their needs. This is not limited exclusively to job skills. True job skills contribute to versatility, but they are incomplete without the interpersonal skills necessary to share competence with others. For example, the most skillful surgeon will not be seen as versatile if he fails to meet the needs of others.

Versatility is something we do to ourselves, not something we do to others. The versatile person recognizes that he can control only his half of the relationship and that he can modify himself more easily than he can modify others. The versatile person asks himself, "What can I do to make it easier for the other person to relate to me?"

Like Assertiveness and Responsiveness, versatility also has a four-part scale. (The middle two have been combined for descriptive purposes.)

| CONCERN | BALANCED | CONCERN |
| ME | CONCERN | OTHERS |
| low | w | x | y | z | high |

Effort to Earn Social Endorsement

Versatility, as summarized from the reference surveys, indicates the degree to which an individual impresses his references with his social skills. High versatility suggests that references are impressed by the individual's skill and flexibility in meeting a wide variety of interpersonal situations. Low versatility suggests that references are unimpressed by the individual's effectiveness.
EXAMPLES OF VERSATILE BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMIT</th>
<th>EXCEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stipulates a relationship</td>
<td>Negotiates a relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid opinions and actions</td>
<td>Changeable opinions and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible attitudes</td>
<td>Adaptive attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mindedness</td>
<td>Resourcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow, traditional interests</td>
<td>Broad, unusual interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks certainty and clear rules</td>
<td>Accepts uncertainty and enjoys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom from strict rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be a specialist and</td>
<td>Tends to be a generalist, or a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relies on specialty</td>
<td>resourceful specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent about his impression</td>
<td>Tries to manage his impression,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;How can I best relate?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a clear stand, &quot;This I</td>
<td>Takes a variable stand, &quot;It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe.&quot;</td>
<td>depends.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt, straightforward</td>
<td>Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses position power to influence</td>
<td>Uses personal power to influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable, consistent</td>
<td>Unpredictable, may appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believable</td>
<td>inconsistent; therefore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unbelievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks and maintains personal</td>
<td>Tries to meet the needs of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantages</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BALANCE

Balanced versatility indicates a person in the moderate range between the extremes of low (Limit) and high (Excel).
Model For Anticipating Behavior

(A) Uncommunicative, Cool, Independent
(B) Disciplined About Time

ANALYTICAL
(C) Uses Facts

DRIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support Principles &amp; Thinking</th>
<th>Support Conclusions &amp; Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Cooperative</td>
<td>Use Time To Be Accurate</td>
<td>Use Time To Be Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Slow Actions</td>
<td>Provide Evidence With Service</td>
<td>Provide Options With Probabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Avoids Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support Feelings &amp; Relationships</th>
<th>Support Dreams &amp; Intuitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Competitive</td>
<td>Use Time To Be Agreeable</td>
<td>Use Time To Be Stimulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Fast Actions</td>
<td>Provide Guarantees With Assurance</td>
<td>Provide Testimony With Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Takes Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMIABLE
(A) Communicative, Warm, Approachable
(B) Undisciplined About Time
(C) Uses Opinions

EXPRESSIVE
IN SUPPORT OF OTHERS

If YOU are described by others as an Analytical...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>They see you as:</strong> Thinking oriented, wanting more facts, conservative, quiet, critical, logical, cool towards others, thorough, cooperative, distant, reserved, stern, austere, dependable, accurate.</td>
<td><strong>Relate to:</strong> Logic, data base, your accuracy, dependability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overabundance of facts, your lack of decisiveness and risk taking.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To work better with fellow Analyticals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>To work better with them:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the need for setting timetables and for reaching decisions. Reinforcing each other’s desire for more information may form a self-perpetuating loop that doesn’t bring results.</td>
<td>1. Summarize facts with various outcomes; let them decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognize results with monetary rewards.</td>
<td>3. Recognize results with monetary rewards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amiable</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relate to:</strong> Cooperative, conservative nature, accuracy, patience</td>
<td><strong>Relate to:</strong> Cooperativeness, your dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dependence on facts, your critical, stuffy nature, impersonal approach, lack of fun.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To work better with them:</strong></td>
<td><strong>To work better with them:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Show your interest in them as people rather than as numbers.</td>
<td>1. Spend “informal” time with them—coffee, lunch, beer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use their skills as mediators to build relationships inside the organization.</td>
<td>2. Recognize their need for package sales, incentives, contests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help them ask for bigger numbers and upgrade their prospects.</td>
<td>3. Ask for their opinions, input on a noncritical, accepting basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Working with this style will require you to exercise your versatility."
If YOU are described by others as an Amiable . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amiable</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Driver*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relate to your:</td>
<td>Cooperative, careful, quiet, thoughtful and willing ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question your:</td>
<td>Soft-hearted, easy going nature, emotional responses and compliance with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work better with them:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stress the need for facts and data rather than emotion to build a case, but let them do the workup with a time limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide added opportunities for class work and study in return for meeting activity standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Build confidence in the relationship through demonstrated technical competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| They see you as:             | Supportive, quiet, friendly, shy, retiring, team oriented, helpful, kind, thoughtful, slow to act, nonthreatening, soft-hearted, easy going, complying, responsive, open, willing, careful, cooperative |
| To work better with fellow Amiables: Being narrow-minded, insistent and directive is an uncomfortable role but a necessary one in this situation. Otherwise, it is likely that no one will take the necessary initiative and the end result will be unsatisfactory |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amiable</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relate to your:</td>
<td>Supportive, friendly, responsive, helpful characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question your:</td>
<td>Slowness to act, careful, complying, non-competitive stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work better with them:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Try to bring them definite opinions, backed by third party endorsement—don’t waver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Publicly recognize and praise their accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stand your ground when challenged on rules, previously established procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Working with this style will require you to exercise your versatility.*
If YOU are described by others as a Driver . . .

**Analytical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relate to</th>
<th>Efficiency, logic, data and task orientation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Haste, bossiness, decisiveness, competitiveness, risk-taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To work better with them:
1. Bring them detailed facts and logic in writing.
2. Be patient while they evaluate and check the accuracy of the data.
3. Help them come to conclusions by getting them to set deadlines after you have provided time for review.

**Driver**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They see</th>
<th>Action oriented, in a hurry, bossy, commanding, efficient, stubborn, disciplined, tough, independent, secretive, logical, demanding, non-listening, quick, decisive, unfeeling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To work better with fellow Drivers:</td>
<td>Agree in advance to specific goals and provide freedom to work within these limits. An unproductive deadlock can occur when there is too much dominance and no allowance for independence and individuality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ammicable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relate to</th>
<th>Efficiency, discipline.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Lack of feeling, tough-mindedness, bottom line orientation, impatience, secretiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To work better with them:
1. Show concern for them and their family, interests, etc.
2. Slow down and provide detail and specifics on how to accomplish objectives.
3. Support with personal attention, efforts and accomplishments.

*Working with this style will require you to exercise your versatility.

**Expressive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relate to</th>
<th>Accomplishments, independence, decisiveness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Coldness, lack of playfulness, critical nature, discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To work better with them:
1. Be more open about self, feelings, gossip, opinions.
2. Relax time constraints within structure, give incentives.
3. Provide public recognition for accomplishments—let them win in front of others.
If **YOU** are described by others as an **Expressive** . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical*</th>
<th>Driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relate to</strong></td>
<td>Imaginative, stimulating, your: thought-provoking nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Ability to perform as your: stated, follow-through, logical, flashy, emotional side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Working with this style will require you to exercise your versatility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>To work better with them:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Talk facts, not opinions, and break down component parts, preferably in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Back up your facts with proof from authoritative sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Be quietly patient while they discover for themselves what you already know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Relate to** | Outgoing, imaginative, your: competitive and personable aspects. |
| **Question** | Rah-rah, demonstrative, your: impulsive, emotional side. |

**To work better with them:**

1. Back up your enthusiasm with actual results; demonstrate that your ideas work.
2. Be on time and keep within agreed upon limits, provide materials etc.—promptly.
3. Provide choices of action where possible and let the Driver select course of action.

| **They see** | Outgoing, enthusiastic, you as: warm, opinionated, talkative, intuitive, emotional, stimulating, imaginative, impulsive, excitable, loud, flashy, dramatic, personable, competitive, caring. |

**To work better with fellow Expressives:**

Provide the discipline in this relationship or all the fun and creativity may accomplish nothing. Keep on track and with the basics, allowing carefully limited experimentation as a reward for results.

| **Relate to** | Warmth, enthusiasm and your: stimulating and personable nature. |
| **Question** | Outgoing, loud, dramatic, your: impulsive side. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>To work better with them:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Slow down the pace and volume, allow time to build a relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Work on one item at a time, in detail; avoid the confusion of too many tasks and/or ideas at one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Encourage suggestions, participation on team activities supportive roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **They see** | Outgoing, enthusiastic, you as: warm, opinionated, talkative, intuitive, emotional, stimulating, imaginative, impulsive, excitable, loud, flashy, dramatic, personable, competitive, caring. |

**To work better with fellow Expressives:**

Provide the discipline in this relationship or all the fun and creativity may accomplish nothing. Keep on track and with the basics, allowing carefully limited experimentation as a reward for results.
ANALYTICAL Style

Controlled body movement, few signs of nervousness. Speaks slowly about things, ideas, facts. Seems almost indifferent if not asked. Cautious, appears unconcerned about your agreement.


Support:
- Principles & thinking to establish rapport
Use time:
- To be accurate to build credibility
Provide:
- Evidence with service to influence decision making

Typical benefit priorities:
- How → What → Why → Who

CONTROLS

DRIVING Style

Controlled body movement, in charge, eager to communicate his point. Speaks quickly about things, ideas, facts with measured comments. Wants you to accept his logic.

Hi TELL, Lo EMOTE: Action oriented, independent, cool, "do it my way." Competitive, disciplined about time. Moves quickly and takes risks based on facts — makes his decisions that way.

Support:
- Conclusions & action to establish rapport
Use time:
- To be efficient to build credibility
Provide:
- Options with probabilities to influence decision making

Typical benefit priorities:
- What → How → Who → Why

TELLS

EXPRESSIVE Style

Uses facial expressions and body movements for emphasis. Displays excitable, discernible reactions. Speaks quickly and easily about people, feelings, relationships. Wants you to accept his opinions.

Hi TELL, Hi EMOTE: Intuition oriented, stimulating, personable, impulsive. Warm, approachable and competitive. Fast to act while undisciplined about time. Takes risks, with many decisions based on opinions.

Support:
- Dreams and intuitions to establish rapport
Use time:
- To be stimulating to build credibility
Provide:
- Testimony with incentives to influence decision making

Typical benefit priorities:
- Who → Why → What → How

AMIABLE Style

Not determined, tends to sit back, usually indecisive in social interactions. Displays reactions and emotions you can readily observe. Likes to talk about people, relationships, and feelings.

Lo TELL, Hi EMOTE: Relationship oriented, supportive, likeable, reserved. Warm, approachable and cooperative. Slow to act and undisciplined about time. Avoids risks; actions based on opinions more than facts.

Support:
- Feelings and relationships to establish rapport
Use time:
- To be agreeable to build credibility
Provide:
- Guarantees with assurances to influence decision making

Typical benefit priorities:
- Why → Who → How → What
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