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The Role of Self-Monitoring in Sales Performance

Robert B. Anderson
Louisiana State University

Abstract

Three groups of salesman were administered Snyder's Self-Monitoring scale in an effort to determine the importance of SM to a salesman's performance. Previous literature has indicated that it is important to a salesman's success for him to possess, (1) effective communication skills, (2) the ability to create a climate of perceived similarity or trust, (3) the ability to accurately sense and interpret the prospect's affective or attitudinal responses, and (4) the ability to adapt oneself appropriately to a variety of situations and prospect responses. Moreover, the research on SM has indicated that self-monitoring individuals possess or should possess these attributes.

A review of the sales literature and an interpretation of the sales situation led to the formulation of three hypotheses concerning the relationship between SM and sales performance. First, SM would be positively related to performance for all groups of salesmen. Second, the relationship between SM and measures of performance would be greatest for life insurance agents, less for real estate agents, and least for automobile salesmen. Finally, that SM would be more strongly related to subjective measures of performance than to objective measures of performance.

The results of the study failed to support the hypotheses. Although there were significant differences on salesmen's SM scores ac-
cording to the type of sales sold, there were no significant correlations between SM scores and the measures of performance used.

Recent research on the SM scale has indicated that it may actually consist of three distinct subscales (factors). Consequently, the data were reanalyzed using subscale scores. There were significant differences among groups of salesmen on two of the three subscale scores, however, the difference was opposite that assumed by the rationale underlying the hypotheses. Furthermore, most of the relevant correlations between SM and performance were again nonsignificant, the one exception being attributable to chance.

It was concluded that although the study found very little evidence of a relationship between SM and measures of performance, it cannot be taken to signify that such a relationship is nonexistent. The role of SM could well be moderated by such other aspects of the sales interaction process as product tangibility and price negotiability.
This study is concerned with people who hold the job of "salesman." More specifically, it is concerned with men and women in those occupations which involve creative or persuasive selling. As such, it excludes the jobs of sales clerks, sales managers, and other related jobs which are not primarily concerned with direct persuasive selling.

Cleveland (1948) has pointed out that the job of salesman involves a pattern of characteristics or activities and that the degree to which these characteristics or activities are involved largely depends upon the nature of the product or service. These activities are: (1) social contact, which includes locating and meeting the prospective customer, (2) persuasion, (3) trade knowledge, and (4) clerical knowledge.

One method for increasing the effectiveness of a sales force is to hire only those applicants who are likely to make good salesmen. In order to do this, a business must know what attributes are necessary and to what degree they are necessary in order for a person to have a good chance of succeeding as a salesman.

A great deal of research has been done in attempts to answer this question. Although this research has not been overly successful, some general findings have emerged. Based on his study of a more effective sales group compared to a less effective sales group, Pace (1962) has concluded that oral communication skills and generalized
communication skills differentiate between more and less effective salesmen. In a review of the literature on personality traits and success in selling, Hampton states that "the most indicative personality traits for success in selling are Dominance and Extraversion (Hampton, 1949, p. 108). In a later review, Husband (1953) points out that personality tests have been repeatedly tried in attempts to select better salesmen but have met with less success than expected. He states that:

...What has been found is a general but not very pronounced tendency for successful salesmen, as compared with the general public, to be, (1) a little more extraverted, (2) a little more aggressive, (3) more socially inclined, and (4) less neurotic... (Husband, 1953, p. 246).

Flemming and Flemming (1946) believe that there may be no such thing as a sales personality. They reported that "there is no single composite of qualities, each in specified strength, making up a complex entity called general sales ability (Flemming and Flemming, 1949, p. 128). Cotham (1970) cites Flemming and Flemming and concludes that the evidence since then indicates that the situation has changed very little.

One possible explanation for this limited success is that various studies have used different criteria. Since "success" in selling has been so diversely defined, it is not surprising that investigators have failed to find personality traits that consistently predict success. For example, Rush (1953) attempted to
discover the basic factors of sales success in a specific selling situation. He examined the predictive value of a trial set of predictors for 100 salesmen working for a firm engaged in producing, marketing, and maintaining office machinery. A factor analysis of the various criterion measures resulted in four criterion factors. These were; (1) Objective achievement, which included the average number of sales per month, the average monthly value of the sales, and the per cent of quota achieved, (2) Learning aptitude, (3) General reputation, and (4) Sales techniques and achievement. The predictors used were tests of verbal ability, arithmetic ability, and personality. He found that although personality factors predicted general reputation (which was determined by supervisors' ratings), they did not predict objective achievement. He also found that supervisors' ratings of performance were not highly correlated with measures of actual sales.

Another plausible explanation for the failure to find consistent predictors is that the job varies widely from one situation to another. Husband, as early as 1949, concluded that "all selling is not alike" (Husband, 1949, p. 145). Dunette and Kirchner (1960) found that even in the same company, there were differences in the interests and personality traits of industrial and retail salesmen. They found that industrial salesmen showed slightly greater interests in scientific and technical pursuits, more interests in computational activities, and possessed more masculine interests than did retail salesmen. On the other hand, retail salesmen showed greater interests in independent business pursuits and actual persuasive
activities. Moreover, Dunette and Kirchner found that although "dominance" appeared to be related to success in selling for both groups, retail salesmen scored lower on "affiliation" and higher on "orderliness" than did industrial salesmen. The authors concluded that the industrial salesman relies on ingenuity, inventiveness, and the use of his wits on the job whereas the retail salesman relies primarily on planning, hard work, and persuading other people on his point of view.

These studies indicate that a salesman's job varies widely from company to company and even within a particular company. Thus it is not surprising that there has been so little success in finding consistent predictors of sales success.

Since sales jobs vary so widely, it seems likely that in order to find personality traits or other attributes that will predict success in a variety of sales situations it would be necessary to examine those components of sales work that are common and/or necessary to most sales jobs. It may then be possible to determine what traits or attributes are necessary to perform these functions.

One factor that is consistent to all sales jobs is that they all involve some kind of social contact with other people. Cleveland (1948) has pointed out that one of the consequences of the limited success of earlier work was a shift away from the earlier concern with identifying "sales ability" towards the process of "salesmanship." According to Cotham,

"... This emerging methodology puts the sales transaction into a social behavior context with the outcome
hinging, in part, on the customer-salesman interaction. The situational environment (firm, product, experiences, attitudes, prior relationships, and so forth) serves as a frame of reference for the actions of both customer and salesman (Cotham, 1970, p. 64).

It is quite possible that social interaction is the only element that is common to all sales jobs. Therefore, it seems that examination of the salesman's social behavior would be the most likely method of finding relatively consistent predictors of sales performance.

Evans (1963) was the first to consider the social nature of sales. He began by specifically defining the selling process as a social situation. Evans stated that:

The two parties meet in a highly structured situation, and the outcome of the meeting depends upon the resulting interaction. In this sense the "sale is a social situation involving two persons. The interaction of the two persons, in turn, depends upon the economic, social, physical, and personality characteristics of each of them (Evans, 1963, p. 76).

Evans studied life insurance agents and customers as dyads. He found that the successful dyads were more alike than were the unsuccessful dyads. He concluded that the more alike the salesman and his prospect were, the more probable was a sale. This relationship between similarity and "success" was true for physical characteristics, demographic characteristics, and personality factors. He also noted that the perceived similarity of religion and politics was much
higher and of greater importance to making sales than was the true similarity.

Other investigators have also approached the sales transaction as a social situation. Busch and Wilson (1976) studied the effects of different levels of a salesman's expert and referent power in the buyer-seller dyad. Expert power was defined as power "based on the influencee's perception that the influencer has valuable knowledge, information, or skills in a relevant area." In contrast, referent power was defined as power "based on the perceived attraction of members in the dyad to one another" (Busch and Wilson, 1976, p. 4.). Referent power may come from friendship, modeling, or feelings of shared identity. The authors found that high referent power salesmen (1) were perceived as more trustworthy by the influencee, and were more persuasive than low referent salesmen, (2) had a more favorable influence on the behavior of the influencee, and (3) exerted influence across a broader range of behavior than did low referent salesmen. They concluded that referent power was more important than expert power in establishing a customer's trust and that the development of referent power would be of particular importance for a salesman selling many different products or services.

Referent power is based on perceived similarity and/or trust. These two studies indicate that the ability to convince the customer that he is similar to the salesman and/or that he should trust him may be an important social skill for the salesman to possess.

Another approach to sales as a social situation is to examine the respective roles of the salesman and/or the customer. Belasco
(1966) has taken this approach. He claims that sales jobs make three types of demands on the salesman. These are intellectual, emotional, and interactional demands. In his discussion of the interactional demands placed on the salesman, Belasco says:

First the job demands a person with a wide range of behaviors and flexibility in adapting his behaviors, . . . his role requires him to adapt to a large number of differing personalities with a wide range of possible behaviors (Belasco, 1966), p. 8).

Webster (1968) holds a similar viewpoint. He presented a theoretical model of selling as an interaction between how the salesman and the prospect play their respective roles. He concluded that:

The prospect's perception of the salesman is an important determinant of the salesman's effectiveness . . . Because of the importance of the prospect's behavior in determining the success of the sales call, the salesman's ability to infer the prospect's role expectations of him is a vitally important (Webster, 1968, p. 12).

Webster refers to this ability to determine cues as empathy. What these two authors have emphasized is that, in order to be successful, the salesman must be able to determine the appropriate role based on relevant cues of the customer's expectations of what is appropriate behavior. Furthermore, once he has determined what behavior is appropriate, the salesman must adapt his behavior accordingly.
There is some support for this view. Tosi (1968) studied the effects of expectation levels and role consensus in wholesale drug salesmen and druggists dyads. He believed that the salesman's ability to adapt his selling behavior to the customer should result in a more effective selling relationship. However, contrary to his predictions and prior research he did not find that role consensus between buyer and seller was related to his criteria of salesman's effectiveness. Tosi concluded that role consensus is probably a necessary by not sufficient condition for sales effectiveness. He believes that role consensus is necessary for the sales interaction to take place but that the actual sale depends more on other factors such as perceived similarity.

Stronger evidence comes from Riordin, Oliver, and Darnely, (1977). They compared life insurance agents' "sold" prospects and "unsold" prospects on attitudes towards the product and its use, towards salespeople in general, and actual and ideal perceptions of a salesman's role characteristics. They found that sold prospects and salesmen differed significantly from unsold prospects on all variables and that the degree of role congruence was the major discriminator of unsold prospects. The authors concluded "that sales success in a dyadic encounter may be a function of the degree to which the prospect perceives the salesperson as fulfilling his attitudinal and behavioral expectations" (Riordin, Oliver, and Darnely, 1977, p. 536). Riordin, et. al. suggest that:

Sales managers may wish to train their salespersons in various methods of sharpening interactive perception
that the sending of negative role cues is more readily detected. . . (and the results of their study suggest) training salespersons to respond in a manner more appropriate to the prospect's perceptions of the ideal salesperson as opposed to the company or industrywide stereotype, and efforts to increase perceived similarity through an improvement in communication skills (Riordin, et. al., 1977, p. 536).

Although Riordin's suggestion has merit, it may be easier and more efficient for companies to select applicants who already have such skills.

Other investigators have explored other attributes that would improve a salesman's interactional skills. One of these attributes is the rather old concept of social intelligence. Hunt (1928) defined social intelligence as "the ability to deal with people." She claimed that people who have been termed socially intelligent show keen insight into problems of human relationships and possess superior judgement in determining their solutions.

Hunt notes that social intelligence includes a sensitivity to social cues. She states that;

People find it more difficult to determine the Mental State of a Person from his words than from his facial expression. In general, those who are most adept at recognition of emotional states from the face are adept at recognizing them also from the word. In actual life we most often find the two combined with an addition of tone
of voice and bodily movement; but nevertheless, the two are quite separate factors (Hunt, 1928, p. 322).

Stanton and Buskirk (1964) define social intelligence as "the facility for recognizing and applying psychological principles dealing with human relationships." They claim that social intelligence is more important to the salesman than either abstract or mechanical intelligence. They believe that:

The salesman must possess a far greater degree of tact, diplomacy, and social poise than other employees on his same level in the organization. Many sales jobs require the man to entertain and otherwise mix socially with his customers who are frequently people of considerable status in the community. Even in actual day-to-day selling the salesperson must constantly display considerable social intelligence in handling balky buyers (Stanton and Buskirk, p. 261.).

There is some empirical support for the importance of social intelligence to effective sales performance. Hunt (1928) reported that salesmen score relatively high on tests of social intelligence. Harrel (1960) conducted a study to examine the relationship between the test scores of 21 petroleum salesmen and measures of their performance. The measures of performance used quota production records, a company appraisal form, and scores on a field review appraisal interview. He found that "tact and diplomacy" differentiated high and low salesmen classified as such on the basis of the field interview. "Sense of humor" differentiated for the field
interview but not for quota or company appraisal. An important finding for this study is that although quota production was more predictable than either of the other two criteria, salesmen rated higher on the company appraisal were not significantly higher in their sales. Apparently social intelligence is important to success for at least some jobs and may be important in maintaining a satisfactory relationship with one's employer.

Empathy is another attribute that is considered to be a salesman's interpersonal behavior. Empathy is "the imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling, and acting of another and so structuring the world as he does" (Dymond, 1940, p. 127.).

Tobolski and Kerr (1952) studied the relationship between empathy and performance of automobile salesmen. They administered the Kerr-Speroff Empathy test to 11 new-car salesmen and 21 used-car salesmen in two companies. They found that the test correlated with both sales records and rankings by managers for all salesmen combined. Empathy was found to be a more efficient predictor of rankings ($r = .71$) than of sales records ($r = .44$). However, the test did not accurately predict either measure for used-car salesmen alone.

In a series of studies, Greenberg and Mayer (1964) found empathy and ego drive to be an accurate predictor of successful selling in three different industries. They used a composite battery derived from several personality tests to measure the empathy and ego drive of salesmen in the life insurance, mutual fund, and automobile industries. These scores were correlated with gross average monthly
sales and average gross profit per sale. They found highly significant correlations for all three industries, i.e., .72, .73, and .69 respectively. Further predictive studies in all three industries showed that the test scores accurately predicted both the actual sales performance and the dropout rate of the salesmen. Dropout rate and sales performance were also accurately predicted in a final predictive study of the automobile industry where the data were controlled by an objective party.

These studies are important in that, unlike previous research, the investigators found a variable that accurately and similarly predicted sales performance across sales situations. The authors concluded that there are "what might be termed basic sales dynamics, which permit an individual to sell successfully, regardless of what he is selling. . . (and that) sales ability is fundamental not the product being sold" (Greenberg and Mayer, 1964, p. 122). The success of these authors in predicting sales performance in diverse situations may be because the predictor used was relevant to a salesman's social skills.

In a separate but similar article, the authors again emphasize the importance of empathy to the salesman. They believe that the salesman with good empathy

. . . senses the reactions of his customer and is able to adjust to these reactions. He is not simply bound by a prepared sales track, but he functions in terms of the real interaction between himself and the customer. Sensing what the customer is feeling, he is able to change pace, double
back on his track, and make whatever creative modifications might be necessary to home in on the target and close the sale (Mayer and Greenberg, 1964, p. 120).

These authors have provided strong evidence for the importance of empathy to successful sales performance. Apparently empathy increases the salesman's sensitivity to interpersonal cues. However, by stressing the importance of empathy they may have underemphasized an important point. As the previous quotation implies, empathy by itself is not enough. What is important, and what the possession of empathic ability facilitates, is the changing of one's sales presentation in order to adjust to the reactions of the customer. A salesman could have good empathic ability which would allow him to know when his approach is ineffective. However, if he is unable or unwilling to change his behaviour accordingly, empathic ability may not help him.

Some evidence for this comes from Lamont and Lundstrom (1977). These authors conducted a study to examine the value of personality traits and personal characteristics for predicting success as industrial salesmen. They studied 71 industrial salesmen performing selling activities involving emphasis on technical knowledge and creative selling ability. The criteria used were managerial rankings and objective measures such as sales value, quota, and number of calls made. They found that; (1) personality variables are more efficient predictors of managerial rankings whereas objective criterion measures were better predicted by personal characteristics, and (2) salesmen classified as successful on the basis of managerial rankings
score high on scales of endurance and low on scales of empathy and ego strength.

With reference to the latter finding, Lamont and Lundstrom offer two possible explanations: (1) The traits may be undesirable for this type of sales job because of its technical nature and the demanding number of sales calls required. (2) There may be an interaction between the personality traits of the salesman and those of the rater since salesmen with high levels of these traits are not highly rated by their managers. Another explanation is that empathy alone is not sufficient for sales success.

One final ability seems necessary for a salesman to function effectively in social situations. This is flexibility. As previously cited, Mayer and Greenberg (1964) and Belasco (1966) have noted the importance of adapting one's behavior to the responses of the prospect. Miller (1964) is in agreement with these authors on the importance of flexibility. In a descriptive study of the behavior of automobile salesmen he found that:

The salesman attempts to develop an understanding of the attitudes and the feelings of the particular customer, an understanding from which he can evolve hypothesis about customer reactions to the sales "pitch" and which allows him to modify his sales behavior to increase his control of the situation and the chances of a favorable outcome. The attitudes of the customer constitute a stimulus, the understanding of which and adjustment to necessitate role taking (Miller, 1964, p. 18).
In summary, previous literature has indicated that the following abilities are important to a salesman's effectiveness; (1) effective communication skills, (2) the ability to create a perceived similarity and/or trust between the salesman and the prospect, (3) the ability to accurately sense and interpret the prospects affective or attitudinal responses towards the salesman and/or the product, and (4) the ability to adapt oneself appropriately to a variety of situations and prospect responses.

Since these abilities are important to sales effectiveness, it seems reasonable to expect that those persons who are high in these abilities would perform better as salesmen than would those persons who are low or lacking in these abilities. Alternatively, it seems reasonable that good salesmen would be higher in these abilities than would poor salesmen. The question now arises as to whether there are people who have these abilities, and if so, can they be tested for them? According to Mark Snyder, the answer is "yes."

Snyder (1974) has developed a scale to measure the social psychological construct he has termed self-monitoring of expressive behavior and self-presentation (SM). According to Snyder, SM is self-observation and self-control guided by situational cues to social appropriateness. He believes that the goals of SM may be:

(a) to communicate accurately one's true emotional state by means of an intensified expressive presentation; (b) to communicate accurately an arbitrary emotional state which need not be congruent with actual emotional experience; (c) to conceal adaptively an inappropriate emotional state and
appear unresponsive and unexpressive; (d) to conceal adaptively an inappropriate emotional state and appear to be experiencing an appropriate one; (e) to appear to be experiencing some emotion when one experiences nothing and a nonresponse is inappropriate (Snyder, 1974, p. 527).

Snyder claims that the self-monitoring individual is one who is concerned about social appropriateness and consequently is particularly sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of others in social situations. Moreover, he uses these cues as guidelines for monitoring his own self-presentation. Whereas the behavior of the non-self-monitor is presumably consistent across situations, the behavior of the self-monitor exhibits cross situational variability and largely depends upon cues emitted by other people.

The description of the self-monitoring individual indicates that he or she can (1) accurately communicate expressive behavior such as feelings of friendship or trust, (2) can accurately sense and interpret the affective responses of others, and (3) can adapt his or her behavior appropriately to a variety of situations. Since the self-monitoring individual has these abilities, he or she should, if so desired, be able to create a perceived similarity between himself and another person by responding appropriately to the relevant cues emitted by that person. In other words, the self-monitoring individual possesses those abilities similar to or the same abilities as those that are important to a salesman's effectiveness. Therefore, high self-monitoring individuals should make good salesmen.

It seems as though SM should be positively related to perform-
ance in most sales positions. However, as discussed earlier, sales jobs vary widely and the requisite abilities to perform them vary accordingly. It is therefore probable that the relationship between SM and sales performance will also vary accordingly.

The most obvious manner in which sales jobs differ is in reference to the products or services sold. It would seem that differences in product attributes would be the most likely factor to influence the relationship between SM and measures of sales performance.

This is particularly true for the differences between the selling of physical products (goods) and the selling of services. A physical product can be defined as "an object with an economic value attached to its quality" whereas a service can be defined as a "social interaction with an economic value attached to its performance" (Robinson and Stidsen, 1967, p. 107).

Previous authors have emphasized the differences between selling goods and selling services. Canfield has pointed out that a customer should be the sort that a salesman can deal with agreeably because similarity of interests, age, etc. help to create mutual understanding and confidence between a salesman and a customer. He states that "this is particularly true in the sale of intangibles or specialties where the confidence of the customer in the salesman is an essential factor in the transaction" (Canfield, 1950, p. 77).

Haas has discussed the differences in the specialty selling of tangibles (goods) and the specialty selling of intangibles (which includes services). Haas defines a specialty as "any article of relatively high price, of fairly durable nature, nonconsumable in use,
irregular in time of purchase, and, in practically every case calling for the exercise of personal selection upon the part of the buyer" (Haas, 1967, p. 34). He claims that specialty selling requires considerable creativity and presents many challenges. Furthermore, he argues that this is particularly true for the sale of intangibles. He states:

When a prospective customer can touch, smell, taste, or test the article he contemplates buying, there is a greater possibility of the customer imagining himself as the owner and, of course, purchasing the item.

In contrast to this type of selling, there are many problems that confront a salesman who sells intangibles. . . Imaginative selling. . . is required to paint a picture that will clearly portray to the prospect what he is buying (Haas, 1962, p. 37.

Haas continues by saying that this situation is especially true in selling life insurance and that the insurance salesman must make intangible values appear so real that the prospect will want to purchase life insurance.

Product attributes can also be important factors to the sale within the categories of goods or services. According to Canfield, . . . Since necessities, normally low in price, are subject to keen competition, price is usually a major factor in selling them. In selling luxuries, on the other hand, a salesman usually subordinates price and emphasizes quality and service (Canfield, 1950, p. 159).
There is some evidence that, for goods, product attributes are more important than the salesman's behavior. Olshansky (1973) analyzed the interactions between appliance salesmen and their customers. An analysis of unsuccessful transactions (no sale made) revealed that, in most cases, the primary reason for an unsuccessful sale was not an error in the salesman's strategy. The primary reason for unsuccessful sales was that the store did not have the particular model, brand, or specific product attributes desired.

Canfield, Haas, and Olshansky have indicated that in those situations where product attributes are relatively unimportant, the behavior of the salesman determines whether or not a sale is made. On the other hand, in those situations where the sale largely depends on the product attributes, the behavior of the salesman is relatively unimportant. This theory can explain some of the previously discussed contradictions in salesman selection research that attempted to relate salesman's behavior to sales performance.

Tosi (1968) found that role consensus was not related to his subject's effectiveness as salesmen. His subjects were selling to druggists. Druggists are sophisticated buyers and are extremely concerned with the properties of the drugs. It is reasonable to believe that the sale would be more dependent upon the quality or the effectiveness of the drugs rather than on the behavior of the salesman. On the other hand, Riordin, et. al. (1977) studied life insurance salesman and found that role consensus was related to performance. Their customers could not see or feel the product and, consequently, the sale probably depended largely upon the degree of per-
ceived similarity, confidence, and trust the customers had in the salesman.

Tobolski and Kerr (1952) found that measures of empathy accurately predicted the performance of new-car salesmen but not of used-car salesmen. This can be explained in terms of the differences between new and used cars. A person buying a new car is buying a specialty or luxury item. He has a wide range of models and prices from which to choose. The sale is probably more dependent upon the salesman's ability to determine which attributes are most important to the buyer. In addition, new cars usually come with a warranty and, therefore, the quality of service becomes important. As compared to a new car buyer, a used car buyer is probably looking for a different set of product attributes. He will generally have a smaller selection to choose from and service quality is not as important since most used cars have a limited warranty or no warranty at all. A used-car buyer is probably very concerned with price. If he were not, he would be buying a new car. Since he has a smaller selection and is concerned with price, the sale is probably dependent upon whether or not the dealer has a car with the features he wants and in the price range he can afford.

Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) found that industrial salesmen tended to score low on measures of empathy and ego strength whereas Greenberg and Mayer (1964) found that similar measures were positively related to sales performance in three different industries. Again the contradiction can be explained in terms of whether or not product attributes were an important determinant of the sale. Lamont and
Lundstrom's subjects were salesmen involved in selling highly technical products, and the buyers were probably primarily interested in the nature of the products themselves. Conversely, Greenberg and Mayer used salesmen that operated in markets where particular product attributes are relatively unimportant. Life insurance and mutual fund industries are both situations in which the salesman is selling services and not a tangible product. Therefore, product attributes are not very salient. As discussed earlier, the automobile industry is also a situation in which particular product attributes may play a very minor role in the sale.

These studies strongly indicate that the salesman's behavior becomes less important to making the sale as the importance of product attributes increases. Therefore, it seems likely that SM should be more strongly related to sales performance in those situations in which product attributes are relatively unimportant. More specifically, it appears that SM should be more related to performance for salesmen of services than to performance for salesmen of goods. Also, it appears that SM will be more related to performance of salesmen of specialties or luxuries than to performance of salesmen of necessities.

There is also a possibility of a sales situation in which both product attributes and the behavior of the salesman are important to making the sale. The real estate industry is conceivably such a situation. In this case, the purchase price is usually quite high and selection is somewhat limited. Therefore, the attributes of a particular piece of property are important. At the same time, real
estate sales usually involve a more intense (in terms of time, contact, etc,) interpersonal relationship between the salesman and the prospect than do life insurance or automobile sales. Therefore, it would seem likely that in this type of situation, the strength of the relationship between SM and performance would be greater than in a situation in which the salesman's behavior is relatively unimportant to making the sale. At the same time, the strength of the relationship should be less than in a situation in which the salesman's behavior is relatively important to making the sale.

The present study was concerned with what social attributes increase the effectiveness of salesmen. The specific problem was to test the relationship between SM and sales performance and to examine how this relationship changes as a function of the importance of product attributes. This was done by comparing correlations between measures of sales performance and SM for salesmen of goods and salesmen of services. Automobile and life insurance agents were chosen to represent respectively those two types of sales. Real estate salesmen were chosen for study in order to compare the relationship between SM and performance for salesmen in a situation in which both product attributes and the salesman's behavior have high importance.

Based on previous literature and interpretation of the sales situations, three specific hypothesis concerning the relationship between SM scores and measures of sales performance were developed. First, previous literature has shown that certain abilities are important to success in sales. Self-monitoring individuals should have these abilities. Therefore, it was hypothesized that there would be
a positive relationship between SM scores and measures of sales performance for all three groups of salesmen. Second, studies by Riordin, et. al., (1977), Tobolski and Kerr, (1952), and Tosi, (1968) have indicated that the relationship between various personal attributes of the salesman and performance varies with the degree to which the sale depends on the specific attributes of the product sold. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the relationship between SM and measures of sales performance would be greatest for life insurance agents, less for real estate agents, and least for automobile salesmen.

Finally, research by Harrell (1960), Lamont and Lundstrom (1977), Rush (1953), and Tobolski and Kerr (1952) has indicated that there is a stronger relationship between a salesman's personal attributes and supervisory ratings of his performance than there is between personal attributes and objective measures of performance. Therefore, since SM is a personal attribute, it was hypothesized that SM scores would be a more efficient predictor of supervisory ratings than they would be of objective measures of sales performance.

Method

Subjects.-- Three groups of salesmen served as subjects for the study. The first group consisted of ten male and four female life insurance agents employed by a southern life insurance company. All agents sold burial insurance policies to individuals. The second group consisted of 13 new and used car salesmen employed by an automobile dealership selling domestic cars and trucks. The final group consisted of 16 female and two male real estate agents. These agents
sold both residential and commercial property. All subjects worked full time as salesmen and all subjects used in analysis had been employed at least six months with their respective firm. Participation in the study was voluntary for all subjects.

**Instruments.**-- Two paper and pencil instruments were used in the study. These were Snyder's Self-Monitoring Scale and a paired comparison supervisory rating form.

The Self-Monitoring Scale (Appendix A) is an internally consistent self-report measure. It consists of 25 true-false items. Agreement with a "true" item and disagreement with a "false" item are indicative of self-monitoring. All items are scored in the direction of self-monitoring. Snyder (1974) reports that the scale has a test-retest reliability in the .60 to .70 range. The test has been shown to have both discriminant and construct validity (Snyder, 1974; Snyder and Monson, 1975).

The rating form used (Appendix B) was a simple single page form of instructions and all possible pairs of names of the salesmen participating in the study. Each form had space provided for the supervisors name, the name of the company for which he worked, and the date. A salesman's rating was considered to be the number of times he or she was chosen as the better salesman of the pair. These ratings were converted to standard scores.

**Procedure**

SM scales were administered to the salesman in groups. The scale was administered on one occasion at each company. All salesmen participating in the study for that company completed the scale at
that time. Each session began with a brief explanation of the study and a request for volunteer participants. Subjects were assured of confidentiality and informed that their scores and interpretation would be available upon request. The scales were then distributed to those salesmen wishing to participate in the study and were completed at that time. Average length of time to complete the scale was 15 minutes.

Supervisory ratings were obtained by mail. Each supervisor received a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and asking for his or her cooperation. They also received a rating form for all of their salesmen and an envelope addressed to the E. They were instructed, both orally and in writing, that for each pair of salesmen they were to indicate which person they considered to be the better all-around salesman. They received explicit instructions not to rate the salesmen strictly on the basis of their sales volume. After rating all pairs of salesmen, the managers placed the completed forms in the preaddressed envelope, sealed it and mailed it to the E.

Other information concerning the salesmen's performance and work history was obtained from company records. This included information on the number of sales and gross volume of sales for the last six months prior to the study. The salesman's time with the company was also recorded.

**Design and analysis.**-- Both subjective and objective criteria were used for all subjects in the study. The subjective criterion used for all groups of salesmen was a managerial rating obtained from the instrument (Appendix B) previously discussed. Since the primary pur-
pose of the study was to test the relationship between self-monitoring and sales effectiveness, it was decided that the objective criteria should reflect only actual measures of sales. For life insurance agents, two objective measures of sales performance were used. These were Average Monthly Sales Volume (ASV) based on sales for the six month period prior to the study. The second measure used was the Average Number of Sales per Month (ASM) for the same time period. Information on the ASV was not available for all real estate agents, nor was it available for any of the car salesmen. Consequently, only the ASM was used as an objective measure of sales performance for these two groups.

Since both prior experience and time with the company are known to affect a salesman's performance (Nixon, 1942), an attempt was made to include this information in the analyses by using partial correlations incorporating this information to test the relationship between self-monitoring and sales performance. Information on time with the company was available and was included in the partial correlations, however information on prior experience was not available.

Results

The mean and standard deviation of SM scores, Length of Service, Managerial Rating Scores, and Average Number of Sales per Month were computed for each group of salesmen. For life insurance agents, the mean and standard deviation for Average Monthly Sales Volume was also computed. These means and standard deviations are shown in Table 1. Examination of the means and standard deviations indicated that the distributions of some of the variables were skewed. Therefore, all
Table 1.
Means and Standard Deviations for SM Scores, Length of Service and Criteria for Three Types of Salesmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insurance (n=14)</th>
<th>Real Estate (n=13)</th>
<th>Automobile (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASV</td>
<td>61.72</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ASV not available
variables were transformed into standard scores using the formula:

\[
T = \frac{X - \bar{X}}{s} + 50
\]

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to test for differences in SM scores among the three groups of salesmen. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in the SM scores of the three groups (F with 2 & 35 df = 4.09, p less than .05). Subsequent t-tests showed that life insurance agents scored significantly lower than real estate agents (t with 25 df = 2.01, p less than .05) and significantly lower than automobile salesmen (t with 23 df = 2.99, p less than .05). The difference between real estate agents and automobile salesmen was not statistically significant.

The standard scores were then used to compute Pearson Product Moment Correlations between SM scores, Length of Service (in years), and subjective and objective measures of the salesmen's performance in order to test the relationship between SM and sales performance. (See Table 2.)

The first hypothesis was that SM scores would be positively related to performance for all groups of salesmen. However, none of the correlations between SM scores and criteria were significant for any of the three groups.

Correlations between SM scores and Ratings (r = .03, df = 36) and between SM scores and ASM (r = -.27, df = 36) for all groups of salesmen combined were also computed. Again, neither correlation was significant.
Table 2.
Intercorrelations between Self-Monitoring, LOS, Managerial Ratings, ASM, and ASV for Three Groups of Salesmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>ASV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Real Estate Agents    | Real Estate Agents    | Real Estate Agents    | Real Estate Agents    | Real Estate Agents    |
| SM                    | LOS                   | Rating                | ASM                   | ASV                   |
| SM                    | -.01                  | .17                   | -.21                  | *                     |
| LOS                   |                       | .02                   | .13                   | *                     |
| Rating                |                       |                       | -.18                  | *                     |
| ASM                   |                       |                       |                       | *                     |

| Automobile Salesmen   | Automobile Salesmen   | Automobile Salesmen   | Automobile Salesmen   | Automobile Salesmen   |
| SM                    | LOS                   | Rating                | ASM                   | ASV                   |
| SM                    | -.06                  | -.10                  | -.18                  | *                     |
| LOS                   |                       | .52                   | .74**                 | *                     |
| Rating                |                       |                       | .51                   | *                     |
| ASM                   |                       |                       |                       | *                     |

*ASV not available

** p less than .05
Although none of the simple correlations between SM and measures of sales performance were significant for any of the three groups of salesmen, it is possible that the effects of length of service suppressed any such relationship. Therefore, partial correlations between SM scores and measures of performance with LOS partialed out were computed for the three groups of salesmen. These partial correlations are shown in Table 3. Again contrary to predictions, there were no significant correlations between SM and measures of sales performance for any of the three groups.

The second and third hypotheses about the nature of differential validity of SM were not tested further since all of the relevant correlations were nonsignificant.

Additional Analyses

A recent article by Briggs, Cheek, and Buss (1980) has indicated that the SM scale may actually consist of three separate subscales. The first subscale was termed "Extraversion" and involved items about being the center of attention, telling jokes and stories, and being good at charades. The second subscale was "Other-Directedness" and included items related to pleasing others, conformity to the social situation, and hiding one's true feelings. The final subscale was termed "Acting" and consisted of items involved with acting, entertaining, spontaneous speaking in public, and the ability to lie. These three subscales included 20 of the 25 items in the SM scale.

Since it is possible that these three subscales do exist and do indeed measure separate aspects of SM behavior, the data were reanalyzed using subscale (Factor) scores rather than total SM
Table 3.
Partial Correlations between SM Scores, Managerial Ratings, ASM, and ASV with Length of Service Partialed Out for Three Groups of Salesmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>ASM</th>
<th>ASV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ASV data not available for this group
scores.

We inquired first whether subscale scores for the three groups of salesmen differed significantly. The results of the three one-way ANOVAs are shown in Table 4.

Significant differences occurred for the factors "other-direct-edness" and "acting." On the 0-D scale, life insurance agents scored significantly lower than both real estate agents ($t = 2.08$, $p$ less than .05) and automobile salesmen ($t = 2.65$, $p$ less than .05). A similar pattern was observed on the acting scale. Life insurance agents scored significantly lower than automobile salesmen ($t = 2.75$, $p$ less than .05) and, although not significantly lower, they also scored lower than real estate agents ($t = 1.63$).

As in the case of total SM scores, LOS might have masked any relationship that existed between SM subscale scores and criteria. Consequently, partial correlations between SM subscale scores and criteria with LOS held constant were computed for each group of salesmen.

The partial correlations between each of the three subscales and criteria for life insurance agents and Z-scores are shown in Table 5. The only significant relationship controlling for LOS is between the "acting" score and criterion rating for automobile salesmen. Given that 21 correlations are exhibited in Table 5., it is quite possible that this one significant partial correlation was a chance occurrence.

Since a salesman's sales volume may have acted as an excessive influence on the manager's rating of the salesman's performance as a whole, one final set of partial correlations was conducted. Partial
Table 4.
Analysis of Self-Monitoring Subscale Scores for Three Groups of Salesmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Automobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-D.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p less than .05
Table 5.
Partial Correlations and Z-scores between Extraversion, Other-Directedness, and Acting Subscales and Criteria for Three Groups of Salesmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Real Estate*</th>
<th>Atomobile*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ASV not available

** p less than .05 for a one-tailed test
correlations between SM subscale scores and managerial ratings with ASM partialed out were computed for each group of salesmen. The partial correlations, errors and resultant Z-scores are shown in Table 6. Again, none of the Z-scores were significant at the .05 level for any of the three groups.

Discussion

This study provided very little evidence that SM is an important ability for a salesman to possess. Almost all of the relevant correlations and partial correlations between SM scores and measures of salesmen performance were essentially zero. One exception, which may be a statistical artifact, being the relationship between acting subscale scores and manager's ratings for automobile salesmen.

Although it is possible that there is no relationship between SM and "sales ability," this seems unlikely in light of previous research. Abilities similar to the sensitivity to situational cues and the appropriate behavior modification of the self-monitoring individual have been shown to be important determinants of sales performance. Therefore, it is likely that there is some other explanation for the failure to find significant relationships between SM scores and measures of sales performance in this study.

There seem to be two plausible reasons why no such relationships were found in this study: possible defects in the design of the study itself; possible defects in the underlying rationale.

The Study:

It is possible that the small sample sizes were the reason for the failure to find any significant relationships. The effects
Table 6.
Partial Correlations, and Z-scores between Extraversion, Other-Directedness, and Acting Subscales and Ratings with ASM partialed out for Three Groups of Salesmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Other-Directedness</th>
<th>Acting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Estate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial r</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-score</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the limited sizes and ranges of the sample are unknown. Further, it is possible that, even if the hypotheses were correct, extremely low self-monitors could have selected themselves out of the sales field for all samples. All of the salesmen participating in the study were successful to the degree that they were maintaining their jobs with that company.

Also, self-monitoring was operationally defined for this study by a particular instrument: the SM scale. The SM scale is a reasonably reliable instrument and, as previously discussed, has been shown to possess some degree of construct validity. However, it is quite possible that it does not adequately measure the aspects of SM that are directly relevant to salesmanship. Briggs, et. al. report that they believe that the test may not adequately measure the construct of self-monitoring. Also since the SM scale is a self-report measure, the salesman's true behavior may differ considerably from what he reports. For example, it is not known to what extent high SM individuals differ in their responses to the scale from low SM individuals due to the social desirability of the scale itself.

Rationale:

Whereas the design factors described above may have obscured the hypothetical relationship, there is evidence that the underlying rationale itself oversimplifies the SM-sales effectiveness relationship.

Based upon the literature, the rationale assumed that high SM salesmen would create a climate of perceived similarity and trust. This climate is expected particularly to facilitate sales of intang-
ible products.

Although the results provide evidence that SM score is associated with type of sales (i.e. tangible vs. intangible), the direction of the obtained findings was opposite to that assumed by the rationale. Life insurance agents (selling a relatively intangible product) scored lower on SM (total and two of the three subscales) than did real estate or automobile salesmen. This suggests that the rationale underlying the hypothesized relationship neglected certain factors that may interact with and thereby condition the SM-product relationship.

At least two speculative interpretations of this interaction seem plausible.

First, shifts in sales appeal (presumably characteristic of high SM salesmen) may be differentially regarded by the customer as a function of product tangibility. Given a tangible product (e.g. real estate, automobiles) such changes may be perceived by the customer as genuine attempts to reach better decisions or as answers to specific questions. For intangible products (such as insurance) a shifted sales appeal may be perceived as a transparent attempt at ingratiating.

Second, behavior associated with self-monitoring might be differently regarded by fixed-price product vs. negotiable price product customers. Both real estate sales and automobile sales involve some degree of price negotiations. The salesman has to create a desire to buy the product and also has to create a willingness to purchase the product or property at the most favorable terms for the
vendor. Insurance agents need only to create a need for the product. The price of the product is predetermined by actuarial tables and is not negotiable. Consequently, if SM is important to negotiating ability, low SMs would not necessarily be at a disadvantage in those fields wherein price negotiation was not particularly important. On the other hand, they would be at a disadvantage in sales fields were negotiations were important and therefore may have been selected out of sales in those areas.

Either of these explanations is plausible. However, the second seems to be most likely at this time. Real estate agents were not significantly different from automobile salesmen in SM scores, but the two groups were different from insurance agents. At the same time, the mean LOS for insurance agents was almost identical to that of automobile salesmen whereas the mean LOS for real estate agents was much lower. Both high and low LOSs are associated with high and low SM scores whereas only high SM scores are associated with sales fields that involve negotiations. This would seem to indicate that the low SMs are selected out of those fields that involve price negotiations.

Conclusion

Although this study found very little evidence of a relationship between SM and some of the many possible measures of sales performance, it cannot be taken to signify that such a relationship is non-existant. The role of SM could well be moderated by such other aspects of the sales interaction process as product tangibility and price negotiability.
Previous literature would seem to indicate that there is a high probability of some relationship between SM and sales performance even though the relevant parameters are currently not understood. As in the case of role congruence, it is probably necessary for a salesman to possess some minimum degree of SM ability, even though a high level of SM ability would not necessarily further facilitate the salesman's ability to make sales. That is, SM may be a necessary but not sufficient ability for success as a salesman. In any case, the current understanding of all the parameters in the sales interaction process is insufficient. The true role of SM in sales performance will probably not be known until the effects of other relevant variables are better understood.
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APPENDIX A: SELF-MONITORING SCALE

1. T F I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
2. T F My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes and beliefs.
3. T F At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
4. T F I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
5. T F I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
6. T F I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
7. T F When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.
8. T F I would probably make a good actor.
9. T F I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.
10. T F I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.
11. T F I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.
12. T F In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
13. T F In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.
APPENDIX A: SELF-MONITORING SCALE

14. T F I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
15. T F Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.
16. T F I am not always the person I appear to be.
17. T F I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.
18. T F I have considered being an entertainer.
19. T F In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.
20. T F I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
21. T F I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.
22. T F At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
23. T F I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should.
24. T F I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
25. T F I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
Rating of Salesman Performance

Supervisor # __________________________ Date / / /

Listed below are pairs of the names of the salespersons that you supervise. All possible pairings of salespersons are shown. For each pair of salespersons, indicate which person you believe is the better salesperson by circling his or her name. Your choice should reflect the salesperson's performance in all aspects of the job and should NOT be based solely on his or her sales volume. Be sure to indicate the better salesperson for all pairs.
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