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Consumer susceptibility to salesperson influence (CSIS) is developed as a multidimensional construct and segmentation base for adaptive retail selling strategies. Differences in informational, recommendational and relational CSSI by gender, age, and purchase pal utilization are investigated in a stratified national random sample of new vehicle purchasers. Specific retail and salesperson strategies are discussed.

Introduction

Personal selling is a critical element in the marketing mix of almost every retailer of consumer durable goods; this is the case because other marketing communication vehicles (e.g., mass media; point of purchase displays) do not allow the marketing message to be adapted to each consumer's specific needs and beliefs (Spiro and Weitz 1990). Weitz, (1978) focuses on this adaptability suggesting that a salesperson's success in influencing the consumer results from his/her ability to collect information from the prospective consumer, plan strategy, transmit messages to implement the strategy, evaluate reactions, and make appropriate adjustments (Spiro and Weitz 1990). Weitz, Suzan and Sujan (1986 p.174) extend this line of thought to develop a framework designed to enable salespeople to "exploit the unique opportunity associated with interpersonal influence—the opportunity to alter influence attempts according to the characteristics of each influence situation".

Individuals differ in their susceptibility to salesperson influence (Weitz 1981). Effective adaptation requires the salesperson to formulate accurate perceptions of the individual susceptibilities (Lambert, Marmorstein and Sharma 1990). Salespeople need to be able to identify those consumers who are most likely to be susceptible to their influence and recognize what types of influence are most appropriate for each consumer or selling situation.

Fortunately, sales personnel seem to naturally develop selling categories and selling approaches or generic scripts (Leigh 1987; Weitz, Suzan and Sujan 1986). Salespeople can apparently be trained to evaluate and classify consumers into general categories and then adapt their sales presentations to each situation (Ingrasci 1981). However, in order to practice adaptive selling effectively salespeople need an elaborate knowledge structure of different sales situations (consumer categories), appropriate sales approaches for each category and the ability to collect the information necessary to match the proper sales approach with each selling situation.

and Weitz 1990). It is likely that the decision processes many salespeople use to categorize consumers approximate a type of "family resemblance model" (Alba and Hutchinson 1987) where category membership is determined by disproportionate weighing of the consumer characteristics (Szymanski and Churchill 1990). Cues emitted by a consumer are evaluated, compared with the salesperson's stored (in memory) classification cues, and the consumer is categorized, providing a starting point for adaptive selling ("working smarter") and better salesperson performance (Sujan and Weitz 1986).

Sujan, Weitz and Sujan (1988) suggest that demographic categorization bases are useful in identifying certain types of consumers. Underlying attributes (e.g., behavioral styles, personality and product needs or desired benefits) may be needed to augment the identification process and guide the implementation of appropriate sales approaches. Consequently, salespersons need both observable cues to classify consumers and information concerning underlying attributes to implement appropriate sales strategies. More specifically, they need to know which types of influence, if any, will be most successful with each consumer type (Brown 1990; Weitz 1981) and how to exercise that influence.

The primary purpose of this study is to test propositions (implied by the social normative influence literature) that link dimensions of consumer's susceptibility to salesperson influence (CSSI) with observable consumer characteristics such as gender, age and the presence or absence of shopping or buying companions. If the different dimensions of CSSI can be successfully linked to observable consumer characteristics, then salespeople can categorize consumers and select the most appropriate initial selling strategy for the selling situation.

**Consumer Susceptibility To Salesperson Influence**

Personal selling has been modeled as an interpersonal influence process (O'Shaughnessy 1971-72) where some consumers may be more dependent than others on the guidance and support of salespeople (Tatzel 1982). Wilkie (1986) devotes a chapter to salespersons' influence on consumer behavior and suggests that salespersons play key roles by "informing consumers about the options available" and "helping consumers to decide which option best fits their needs,"... (1986 p 207). Oshavsky (1973) also notes that the salesperson often exerts substantial power in influencing the customer's actual choice and purchase. Brown (1990 p 18) states that salespersons "must exercise some degree of influence over the buyer to close the sale." Rhoads and Lagace (1989) report that some consumers exhibit an obliging negotiation style where consumers, to some extent, accommodate the wishes of the seller. The foregoing provide a foundation for a definition of consumer susceptibility to salespersons' influence. Formally, consumer susceptibility to salespersons' influence (CSSI) has been defined as "the proneness to be affected by the attitudes, opinions, and behavior(s) of a salesperson, and to allow him/her to impact one's shopping and buying behavior(s)" (Goff and Walters 1990).

The literature on persuasion and susceptibility to influence suggests that salespeople may be able to influence consumers in three basic ways. First, salespeople are a valuable source of information (Swan, Trawick, Rink and Roberts 1988) and consumers often seek information from them (Schuster and Danes 1986). Consumer questions account for a substantial percentage of the acts performed during the sales interaction and apparently, most questions are asked during the information exchange phase of selling (Taylor and Woodside 1980). Further, salesperson knowledge (expertise) appears to be a source of expert power (Harris and Spiro 1981) that can affect persuasion and attitude change in consumers (Sharma 1990). In fact, Funkhouser (1984) maintains that persuasion consists of the proper management of information flows and defines persuasion as "a process of information management aimed at engineering ... decisions (to act)" (p18 1984). Finally, Millman and Fugate (1988) advocate that salespersons learn to convince prospects to accept information that is compatible with closing the sale. Based on the preceding discussion, salespeople should be able to influence consumers' decision making processes by providing important information and regulating the sequence and timing of key pieces of information. Such information may concern aspects of the core product (e.g., industry awards; quality and satisfaction ratings; performance and safety specifications), peripheral benefits (e.g., warranties; financing options), price (e.g., this item will be on sale next week; the boss really wants to move this item) the retail outlet (e.g., good service department), the manufacturer and manufacturing processes (e.g., country of origin; degree
of outsourcing), information about competing products and their related channels and processes and information about other buyers (e.g., another buyer is very interested in this item). Susceptibility to influence though an informational approach is also supported by the following literature (e.g., Bearden and Etzel 1982, Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989, Borgeset, Strayvnski and Chaloult 1985, Burnkrant and Cousineau 1971, Crano, Gorenlo and Shackelford 1988, Deutsch and Gerard 1955, Park and Lessig 1977, Pincus and Waters 1977).

Second, the sales literature suggests that some individuals may be susceptible to suggestions and recommendations by salespersons. Schuster and Danes (1986) indicate that consumers may want advice in the form of suggestions. Wilkie (1986) advises that the use of referent power by salespersons may enhance the likelihood of the consumer following a salesperson recommendation. The following quotes from a durable goods salesperson (cited by Wilkie) provides an excellent illustration.

That's the point, after a while you can really tell which consumer you can sell a product to at a high price; the type of customer that you can dictate what they were going to buy... you can take them to the most expensive pieces of merchandise, or if they can't afford an expensive piece of merchandise, you can at least steer them to a piece of merchandise that has the highest margin. They just have a look about them, it's hard to explain, probably not as self-assertive, the type of people that need to be told what to buy (Wilkie 1986, p. 216).

They are very malleable people and I could steer them to any spiff item I wanted (Wilkie 1986, p. 218).

...they would buy just about what you told them to buy (Wilkie 1986, p. 219).

The concept of a segment of consumers who are susceptible to recommendations by salespersons is supported by Stafford and Greer (1965) who report a dependent "shopper" type that relies on and tends to be dominated by salespersons. Buzzotta, Lefton and Sherborg (1972) also note a submissive customer type.

Consultive selling is a less machiavellian approach, where the salesperson makes recommendations that are in the customer's best interest (Swan and Nolan 1985). Consultive selling may be the most appropriate approach as trust increases consumer receptiveness to salesperson suggestions (Swan and Trawick 1987) and can become a persuasive tactic (Milliman and Fugate 1988). Further, it is less likely to engender feelings of manipulation by consumers and more likely to result in repeat purchasing and positive word of mouth.

The non-sales literature concerning persuasion and recommendation also supports the notion that some individuals are susceptible to suggestions and recommendations (e.g., Borgeset, Strayvnski and Chaloult 1985; Clegg and Munch 1984; Cohen 1967; Cox and Bauer 1964; Periasamy, Olshavsky and Tapp 1982; Gheorghiu and Walter 1989; Janis 1954; Norchraft and Neale 1987; Wu and Shaffer 1987). Therefore, salespeople should be able to exercise influence with some consumers by making suggestions about the benefits of buying the item and by direct recommendation. For example, car salespeople might suggest "this car is perfect for you," or "if you buy this car all your friends will be envious" or "this is the ideal car for a college student, working woman, or young family, ..." In addition, they might engage in direct testimonials, such as "I drove this model for six months and really loved it" or "every time I drive this car other people notice me." This type of influence may also be exerted concerning the closing process.

Finally, a review of relationship marketing and related literature suggests another potential source of salesperson influence, specifically, the need for consumers to develop associations and relationships with sales personnel (e.g., Berscheid and Walster 1969; Crosby, Evans and Cowles 1990; Crosby and Stephens 1987; Dwyer, Schurr and Oh 1987; Gronroos 1990; Stone 1954). Kotler (1984, pp. 712-713) suggests that salespersons are evolving towards "relationship managers", who are "able to build strong ties with important customers (Swan and Nolan 1985, pp. 39)". Spiro and Perreault (1979) explicitly cite (industrial) salespeople's attempts at influence customers by relying on their personal affiliation and congenial relationships with those customers. Likability of the salesperson is also important to some consumers and may provide an opportunity for salespeople to differentiate themselves (Weibaker 1990). Harris and Spiro (1981) list friendship and relationship as a types of referent power and influence strategies that are often utilized by salespersons. Further, rapport building is suggested as an adaptive selling strategy applicable to certain types of consumers (Nickels, Everett and Klien 1983). Leigh and McGraw (1989) suggest that salespersons may be able to identify relationship-oriented (vs. task-oriented) consumers and uti-
lize appropriate relationship oriented selling scripts that define the norms and behaviors that influence the development and maintenance of buyer-seller relationships (Dwyer, Schurr and Oh 1987; Leigh 1987).

In all three of the above approaches, salespeople can be construed as exerting a type of interpersonal influence during social and economic exchange. Consequently, CSSI can be thought of as a special type of susceptibility to interpersonal influence. Susceptibility to interpersonal influence is considered by some authors to be a general personality trait that is stable across a wide range of social situations (McGuire 1968). Since personal selling is a social situation it seems appropriate to consider CSSI as a multidimensional type of susceptibility to interpersonal influence and to treat CSSI as an individual difference trait. Individual difference traits can be viewed as predispositions to enact characteristic behaviors (Snyder and Ickes 1985; Brown 1990). Specifically, informational CSSI can be viewed as the tendency of consumers to accept information from salespeople. Recommended CSSI can be construed as the willingness of consumers to accept a salesperson's recommendations about purchase decisions. Relational CSSI can be interpreted as the tendency to seek personal relationships with salespeople.

It is probable that the above susceptibilities (dimensions of a personality trait that should facilitate adaptive selling) are not mutually exclusive. They may be correlated and it may be possible for some individuals to exhibit more than one dimension of CSSI. Salesperson influence strategies may have a synergistic affect. For example, effective use of the informational approach may enhance the credibility of recommendations made by the salesperson. Also, if a salesperson's use of the informational or recommendation approaches result in a good fit between the consumer's needs and the benefits provided by the product, the effectiveness of relationship marketing approaches may improve.

**Propositions**

Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel (1989) have suggested that studies examining the differences in susceptibility to interpersonal influence based on gender and age be performed. Both of these consumer demographic characteristics are easy for salespeople to identify. Consequently, their relationship to CSSI is of interest as they have potential as a basis for consumer categorization.

The general marketing literature concerning gender tends to be equivocal as the results may be influenced by the product or product class studied. The literature linking gender to susceptibility to influence is sparse. One recent study reported that men received lower final price quotes for new automobiles and that salespeople ask men different questions during bargaining (Ayers 1991). Vehicle salespeople tended to utilize different sales tactics with women (e.g., overstate dealer costs; emphasize gas mileage, color, and dependability) (Ayers 1991). These tactics imply that vehicle salespersons may tend to utilize an informational approach with women. However, another study suggests that men tend to ask more questions of negotiation partners (Neu, Graham and Gilly 1988) implying a susceptibility to informational CSSI. A general research proposition that links informational CSSI to differences in gender seems appropriate.

On the other hand, several studies have suggested that in everyday interactions men reveal dominance and women submissiveness (e.g., Bernard 1972; Frieze and Ramsey 1976; Lakoff 1975), even through subtle verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Kimble, Yoshikawa and Zehr 1981). Also, women seem to be less dominating and more compromising than men in negotiation behaviors (Kilmann and Thomas 1977). It has also been posited that females are more open to influence from others and more dependent (Tedeschi, Schlenker and Bonoma 1973). Women may also have more positive attitudes and belief structures towards selling and salespeople (Muehlhing and Weeks 1988) and stronger purchase motivations (Widgery and McLaugh 1991). Further, females may be "more responsive to the strategies of negotiation partners..." (Neu, Graham and Gilly 1988). This suggests that women may be more susceptible to recommendational CSSI.

Women seem to have a stronger interpersonal orientation toward others (e.g., Rubin and Brown 1975; Solomon 1969). Gilligan (1982) suggests that women are quicker to recognize their own interdependence and be more concerned with the other in an interdependent relationship. This concern for relationships seems to result from socialization that starts in early childhood (Rheoads and Lagace 1989). Gilligan (1982, p. 7) maintains that "female identity formation takes place in a context of ongoing relationships". This may result in women being trained in relationship skills and thus developing a more integrating negotiation style (Rheoads..."
and Lagace 1989). In other words, women are more likely to facilitate exchange that benefits both parties. Women also tend to be more susceptible to social influence (Churchill and Moschis 1979). However, men tend to provide more information about themselves (Neu, Graham and Gilly 1988). Both interpersonal orientation and consumer disclosure are important elements of relational selling (Crosby, Evans and Cowles 1980). Consequently, a general research proposition that links relational CSSI to differences in gender seems appropriate.

Hence:

\[ P_{14}: \text{The level of susceptibility to informational} \]
\[ \text{CSSI is higher for females than for males.} \]
\[ P_{15}: \text{The level of susceptibility to} \]
\[ \text{recommendational CSSI is higher for females than for males.} \]
\[ P_{16}: \text{The level of susceptibility to relational} \]
\[ \text{CSSI is higher for females than for males.} \]

It has been suggested that the highest levels of interpersonal influence occur during the teen and early adult years (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989). One would suspect that peer pressure would be greater prior to adulthood. Nevertheless, the influence of others as information sources seems to have a positive relationship with age (Phillips and Sternthal 1977). Further, sales clerks are an important source of information for the elderly (e.g., Lambert 1978; Lumpkin and Greenberg 1982; Lumpkin 1985). In addition, the elderly use salespeople to a greater extent as an information source than the non-elderly (Lumpkin and Festervand 1988). The above suggests that age should have a positive relationship with informational CSSI.

Rhoads and Lagace (1989) found older industrial buyers to be more obliging in their negotiation styles and suggest that younger adults are more dominant in their interpersonal interactions. Erickson (1982) indicates that younger adults tend to be more competitive than older adults. However, several studies support the notion that older consumers rely heavily on experience in making product choices for durables (e.g., Westbrook and Fornell 1979) as well as most products (e.g., Schiffman 1971; Reid, Teel and Vanden Bergh 1980; Michman, Hocking and Harris 1979). Older consumers tend to be more cautious and to seek a great deal of certainty in their decisions (Botwinick 1973). Consequently, older more experienced consumers could be less susceptible to salespeople and their recommendations.

Vaillant found that older adults were more other oriented (1977) and Rhoads and Lagace (1989) suggest that older industrial buyers are more integrating in their negotiation styles suggesting some proclivity towards relationship marketing. Nevertheless, consistent with Bearden et. al.’s (1989) observation, recommendation and relational CSSI could peak during the teen age years and then decrease as the consumer gains purchase experience. The result would be a negative relationship between age and recommendation and relational CSSI for adults.

Hence:

\[ P_{24}: \text{The level of susceptibility to informational} \]
\[ \text{CSSI is higher for older adults than for younger adults.} \]
\[ P_{25}: \text{The level of susceptibility to} \]
\[ \text{recommendational CSSI is lower for older adults than for younger adults.} \]
\[ P_{26}: \text{The level of susceptibility to relational CSSI} \]
\[ \text{is higher for older adults than for younger adults.} \]

One purchase behavior that is easy for salespeople to identify, that may also be connected to CSSI, is the utilization of a shopping/buying companion or "purchase pal". Reliance on a purchase pal suggests some susceptibility to interpersonal influence from the purchase pal. Consumers who utilize a purchase pal may have less confidence in their ability to judge or evaluate complex product offerings and seem to substitute the expertise of others for their own deficiencies (e.g., Hartman and Kiecker 1991; Solomon 1987). The reduction of perceived risk seems to be the primary reason for the utilization of a purchase pal, although they may fulfill a variety of other objectives (Kiecker and Hartman 1993). Purse, Punj and Stewart (1984) have linked the utilization of purchase pals to high levels of interpersonal search or information gathering, interpersonal communication, and susceptibility to influence. Woodside and Sims (1976) found that the presence of purchase pals combined with high salesperson expertise had a synergistic effect on sales by increasing the likelihood of purchase and reducing resistance to higher prices. The participation (or lack thereof) of others in the decision making process appears to be one criterion by which salespeople classify prospective buyers (Purse Punj and Stewart 1984). It is felt that consumers who utilize a purchase pal may lack experience and expertise (Solomon 1987) and thus be more susceptible to
influence by salespeople (Bell 1967).

Hence:

\[ P_{3c} \]: The level of susceptibility to informational CSSI is higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal than for consumers who are not inclined to utilize a purchase pal.

\[ P_{3r} \]: The level of susceptibility to recommendational CSSI is higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal than for consumers who are not inclined to utilize a purchase pal.

\[ P_{3e} \]: The level of susceptibility to relational CSSI is higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal than for consumers who are not inclined to utilize a purchase pal.

**Method**

It seems appropriate to examine the foregoing propositions with data concerning the purchase of a new vehicle for several reasons. First, the new car market is an important and large market. Recently new car sales represent over $100 billion per year in transactions (Bureau of Census 1988). Second, for most Americans, buying a new car is their largest consumer purchase after the purchase of a home (Bureau of Economic Analysis 1986). Consequently, the purchase is important and most recent buyers will recall their behavior. Third, the purchase of a new vehicle represents a transaction where there is usually extensive salesperson and shopper/buyer/consumer interaction. Fourth, there should be a wide range in behaviors concerning the primary variables of interest for the purchase of a new vehicle. Purse, Punj and Stewart (1984) describe several types of automobile purchasers who can be identified by vehicle salesperson and suggest that there is a linkage between the identifiable shopper/buyer types and their search/purchase behaviors. Finally, at this initial point in the development of CSSI as a construct, it seems fitting to focus on one type of sale and attempt to establish internal validity (Calder, Phillips and Tybout, 1981) before attempting to provide external validity and generalizations (Weibacker 1990) across several types of sales.

**Measures**

The measures of the dimensions of CSSI for this current study were refined from a study of CSSI concerning mall goods (Goff and Walters 1990). In the previous study, a set of CSSI items were developed by expert review, pretested on a convenience sample of graduate students, and refined on a random sample (n=329) of buyers by the use of factor analysis and reliability assessment. For the present study, informational, recommendational and relational CSSI items were derived from the focus group interviews, the previous CSSI study and related literature (e.g., Crosby, Evans and Cowles 1990; Crosby and Stephens 1987; Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989).

Focus group interviews were conducted by a professional research firm with new vehicle buyers in Phoenix, Arizona. One of the purposes of the interviews was to assist in the refinement of CSSI scale items and adapt them for vehicle purchasing. Another purpose was to explore the possibility of linkage between CSSI dimensions and identifiable characteristics. A separate focus group (n=4 or 5) was held for new purchasers of each of the following types of vehicles (1) trucks, (2) high priced sedans, (3) low priced sedans, (4) sports cars. Focus group participants were males and females age 25-65, who were both the primary decision maker and the driver of the vehicle purchased. The items were subject to an interactive refinement process between the principal investigators and knowledgeable industry personnel. Scales of the items were developed via principal components analyses of the data and subsamples of the data (odd or even numbered observations). Reliability of each scale was examined via the computation of Cronbach’s alpha. Table 1 shows the items used to measure the three types of CSSI. Table 2 provides an intercorrelation matrix and descriptive statistics of the scales.

The CSSI and purchase pal measures were interspersed among several shopping and buying attitude and behavior items. The survey included standard demographics. All of the measures were subjected to expert review and refinement by academic, marketing research and automobile industry professionals. Gender was measured by a traditional structured category question. Age was measured in five year increments ranging from under 20 through
Table 1
Consumer Susceptibility to Salesperson Influence Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational CSSI (Cronbach’s alpha = .77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1. I consider salespeople to be a good source of information about</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2. I think vehicle salespeople are usually very professional.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3. I trust the information that I get from vehicle salespeople.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4. I enjoy talking to salespeople about cars.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a5. Vehicle salespeople help reduce the anxiety associated with</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buying a new vehicle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendational CSSI (Cronbach’s alpha = .67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1. I want vehicle salespeople to help me make decisions.</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2. I depend on salespeople to help me choose the best vehicle for</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3. I prefer to purchase a vehicle that a salesperson has</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4. I feel some obligation to please vehicle salespeople.</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b5. I could be talked into a purchase by a persuasive vehicle</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salesperson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b6. I don’t care what a salesperson thinks about my choice of a</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicle*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational CSSI (Cronbach’s alpha = .81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1. I prefer dealing with vehicle salespeople who develop a personal</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2. I like to develop a personal relationship with the salesperson I</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am dealing with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvaule</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance Explained</td>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75 and over. Five point Likert type scales (where 1 = disagree and 5 = agree) were utilized to operationalize the CSSI measures and purchase pal measures. A unidimensional three item summated scale was developed (Cronbach’s Alpha = .77) to measure the inclination to utilize a purchase pal (Table 3).

Data Sources

Data were gathered by a professional research house through a mail survey which was distributed to 2,000 new vehicle purchasers (within three months of purchase) in May of 1990. In order to reduce position bias, two versions of the questionnaire (with a different order to the items) were randomly assigned to the sample members. The client was represented to potential respondents as a major automotive manufacturer that was trying to improve the process of buying a new vehicle and needed a better understanding of what was important to consumers. The person most involved in the purchase of the new vehicle was requested to fill out the questionnaire. A 50 cent incentive was used but pre-notification and follow-up reminders were not employed. The sample was a stratified random national sample comprised of names selected from R. L. Polk’s list of new vehicle registrations for four vehicle types: sports cars, low priced sedans, high priced sedans and truck/sport utility vehicles. Data were collected in all states which did not restrict the use of car registrations for research purposes. Five hundred owners of each vehicle type were selected. The number of responses and response rates
### Table 2
**Intercorrelation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a1</th>
<th>a2</th>
<th>a3</th>
<th>a4</th>
<th>a5</th>
<th>b1</th>
<th>b2</th>
<th>b3</th>
<th>b4</th>
<th>b5</th>
<th>b6*</th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a5</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b6*</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.09  Std. Dev.: 1.27

Item-to-Scale Correlations

|       | .64    | .58    | .55    | .48    | .49    | .50    | .50    | .43    | .35    | .29    | -.35   | .68    | .68    |

* reverse scores

### Table 3
**Purchase Pal Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Component Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Pal (Cronbach’s alpha = .77)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually bring a friend or relative with me when I go to a dealership.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer going to dealerships alone*</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually bring a knowledgeable person with me when I go to a dealership.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (reverse score)

for each vehicle type were as follows: sports cars, 108 responses (21.6 percent); low priced sedans, 149 responses (29.8 percent); high priced sedans, 175 responses (35 percent); and truck/sport utility vehicles, 128 responses (25.6 percent). Overall, 560 useable responses (28 percent response rate) were obtained. The collective respondents exhibited the following demographic characteristics: Average age approximately 45 years, 59.6 percent male, 67.1 percent married, average income approximately $44,000.

**Analysis**

A principal components analysis with a varimax rotation utilizing standardized data was used to guide the development of summated scales for each dimension of CSSI. Median splits were performed to dichotomize the age and purchase pal scales and t-tests were utilized to analyze propositions P1a - P3c.
Table 4
Mean and T-Values of CSSI Scales for Gender, Age and Purchase Pal Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Informational CSSI</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Recommendation CSSI</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Relational CSSI</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-4.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-3.93*</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-2.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Pal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-3.79*</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Means</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

Results

Principal Components Analysis

The principal components analysis results support the existence of three separate dimensions of CSSI. The results of the varimax rotation are reported in Table 1. An oblique rotation was also performed to assess the degree of correlation among the dimensions (.27 between principal component 1 and principal component 2; .29 between principal component 1 and principal component 3; .18 between principal component 2 and principal component 3). The structure was stable across rotations. The dimensions exhibited reasonable face validity and reliability. The largest cross loading was .34 in the varimax rotation (Table 1) and .27 in the oblique rotation (item b2 on principal component 1).

Testing the Hypothesized Relationships

The results of the t-tests analyses (Table 4) indicate the following: (1) $P_{1a}$ is not supported (t-value = 1.13, p-value = .2589), the level of susceptibility to informational CSSI is not higher for males than for females. (2) $P_{1b}$ is not supported (t-value = 1.10, p-value = .2720); susceptibility to recommendational CSSI is not higher for females than for males. (3) $P_{1c}$ is not supported (t-value = -4.06, p-value = .0001), susceptibility to relational CSSI is higher for males than for females. (4) $P_{2a}$ is supported (t-value = -3.93, p-value = .0001), the level of susceptibility to informational CSSI is higher for older adults than for younger adults. (5) $P_{2b}$ is not supported (t-value = 1.45, p-value = .1483), the level of susceptibility to recommendational CSSI is not lower for older adults. (6) $P_{2c}$ is supported (t-value = -2.29, p-value = .0224), the level of susceptibility to relational CSSI is higher for older adults. (7) $P_{3a}$ is not supported (t-value = -0.4798, p-value = .6316), the level of susceptibility to informational CSSI is not higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal. (8) $P_{3b}$ is supported (t-value = -3.79, p-value = .002) the level of susceptibility to recommendational CSSI is higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal. (9) $P_{3c}$ is not supported (t-value = 0.09, p-value = .9253) the level of susceptibility to relational CSSI is not higher for consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal.

Discussion

The findings of this study have implications for both practitioners and academics. First, CSSI is conceptualized as a three dimensional construct with each dimension suggesting a different set of strate-
gies and accompanying generic adaptable scripts. Second, there is a linkage between obvious demographic characteristics and each of the three CSSI dimensions. Based on the above, CSSI may be a valuable segmentation base (a type of response elasticity) upon which marketing mix strategies can be formulated and should receive further assessment for measurability, substantiality, accessibility and actionability (criteria for effective segmentation, Kotler 1991). The possibility of CSSI types with easy to identify characteristics is an important step forward in operationalizing effective adaptive selling strategies. The results suggest that males may be more susceptible to relational CSSI. In addition, older consumers seem to be susceptible to information and relational CSSI, while consumers who are inclined to utilize a purchase pal seem to be susceptible to relational CSSI.

**Implications for Practitioners**

Superior product knowledge is essential to adaptive selling in general (Anglin, Stolman and Gentry 1990) and should be especially important in selling to consumers susceptible to informational CSSI (informationals). Informationals may require very knowledgeable well trained salespeople who are capable of utilizing expertise power by giving extensive information about core and peripheral benefits (e.g., warranties) and competitor offerings. Salespeople may want to disclose personal information about their education and experience as appropriate in their adaptable scripts. To increase credibility, salespersons should support some of their claims with evidence from independent agencies (Sharma 1990) and may need to provide longer, more plausible responses, not hesitate before answering and make sure that all information given is consistent (Fine and Gardial 1990). The salesperson should offer information in a way that allows the consumer to maintain control over the decision making process (Schuster and Danes 1986). Salespersons may be able to enhance receptiveness to recommendations by building consumer trust (Hawes Mast and Swan 1989). The use of a trust transference technique (Milliman and Fogate 1988) such as supporting a recommendation with information from an independent outside source (e.g., Consumer Reports) should prove helpful. Recommending a product that is already perceived to be high quality tends to have a halo effect on salesperson credibility causing the salesperson to be perceived as more trustworthy (Sharma 1990). Engaging in self-disclosure (Miell, Duck and Langaipa 1979) and personal use of the product may also induce trust.

If the salesperson is likeable the consumer is more likely to be receptive to suggestions (Wilkie 1986). Consumers who are receptive to recommendations may have low self-esteem, so salespersons should make clear positive statements, since ambiguous comments are likely to be perceived as disparaging (Fine and Gardial 1990). Personal compliments may also reduce consumer's feelings of inadequacy. Salespeople may be able to utilize reward power by reinforcing ego and social needs through praise, approval/disapproval and fear appeals. Consumers who are receptive to recommendation (recommendational) may want reassurance that they are getting a good product and making the right decision (Wilkie 1986). Funkhouser (1984) gives nine persuasive strategies (with examples) that may be exercised with recommendationals. Nevertheless, the best long run strategy seems to be consultive selling where the recommendations are in the consumers best interest (Swan and Nolan 1985). Consultive selling is more likely to engender consumer satisfaction, positive word of mouth and repeat purchasing.

Consumers who are amenable to a long run exchange relationships with salespersons (relationals) require that the salesperson be suitable for such a relationship. Swan, Traylor, Rink and Roberts (1988) suggests that trustworthiness manifest as dependability, reliability, honesty, responsibility and likability is essential to the development of long run exchange relationships. Credibility also seems to be related to the desirability of salespersons for long run relationships (Sharma 1990). Salespeople should explore the basis for a long term relationship (e.g., common interests, hobbies) with the consumer. Engaging in "solidarity" comments (e.g., reinforcing the customer's choice, calling the consumer by name) seems important as consumers relate to the relationship between themselves and the salesperson, not just to product characteristics (Schuster and Danes 1986). Salespeople need to be trained in relationship marketing activities. Crosby and Stephens (1987) and Crosby, Evans and Cowles (1990) list several relationship marketing activities that salespersons can engage in to cultivate relationships. The agent should stay in touch to see if the consumer is satisfied, send birthday or holiday cards, and send infor-
formation about new product or service offerings. The salesperson should also express an interest in a long term exchange relationship. A relationship marketing strategy requires dealer support for salesperson relational activities and dealer policies that emphasize repeat purchasing and promote the development of consumer loyalty to the dealer and salesperson. Dealers may need to evaluate their management practices to reduce turnover rates among their salespersonnel in order to gain the full benefit of relationship building.

It seems reasonable to suggest that salespeople can be trained to make preliminary identification of susceptible consumers and attempt appropriate presentations based on informational, recommendational or relational approaches. With training and experience, they should be able to learn to adapt their presentations and to employ the most effective influence strategy at the right time. Although this work suggests a starting point for adaptive selling approaches for durables, it would be sagacious to do original research before attempting to apply the foregoing adaptive selling strategies for other products or services (e.g., real estate, insurance, home appliances). It is possible that the gender and purchase pal results may change with the product category. Gender results may be related to the level of consumer knowledge and expertise for particular product categories. Further, patterns of joint decision making—which may be related to the utilization of a purchase pal—vary across product categories (Davis and Rigaux 1974).

**Implications for Research**

Gender findings tend to be related to the product class studied and caution should be used in generalizing the gender findings of this study to other product classes. First, females do not seem to be more susceptible to informational CSSI. However, it should be noted that both women and men tend to be more receptive to informational influence than to recommendational or relational influence. Other studies have suggested a gender difference for recommendational CSSI. Nevertheless, the findings of this study do not support a gender difference for recommendational CSSI. One plausible explanation is that females are less susceptible to direct influence in general in the 90s than they were during the 70s as much of the literature cited was originated during that era. Further, the nature of the transaction investigated in this study (the actual purchase of an expensive durable with considerable perceived financial and performance risk) may cause females to be perceptually vigilant against undue influence by salesperson’s recommendations. Gender appears to be related to relational CSSI in that men have greater interest in developing a relationship with salespeople. Most vehicle salespeople are men and it is probable that most women feel less comfortable than men engaging in relationship marketing activities with vehicle salesmen. Dyadic studies concerning susceptibility (and resistance) to relationship marketing activities and the gender of both parties involved in the exchange seem warranted. Supplementary studies across multiple product/service lines are needed before unequivocal statements can be made about the relationship between gender and the dimensions of CSSI.

Age seems to have a complex relationship with CSSI. Informational CSSI appears to have a positive relationship with age as inferred from Phillips and Sterntahl (1977). Perhaps, as consumers gain experience with gathering information from salespeople they become more proficient at asking the right questions and evaluating the information provided. This would increase the value of salespeople as an information source due to learning. The relationship may also be the result of social/cultural changes wherein younger consumers are more likely to obtain information from other sources. Age is apparently not related to recommendational CSSI. Since older consumers rely heavily on experience and tend to be more cautious in their decision making, it is probable that salesperson recommendations are given less weight. This may offset susceptibility derived from the tendency for older consumers to be less competitive and dominant in their interpersonal interactions. It should be noted that this sample was comprised entirely of adults who purchased new vehicles and did not include subjects in the peak years of susceptibility to social normative influence (e.g., teenagers) or extremely elderly, inactive or dependent adults (e.g., nursing home patients). Age does seem to be related to relational CSSI. It is likely that relationalists become more selective in choosing their transaction partners as they gain experience and thus seek relationships with a few salespersons who have desirable qualities. The results also suggest a proclivity towards relationship marketing by older consumers. These proclivities towards relationships may counteracted any general weakening of social normative influence that may be associated with aging. It should
be noted that relationship marketing is not a widespread phenomena in retail vehicle sales. Studies of industries with proactive relationship marketing campaigns (e.g., life insurance, industrial sales) may exhibit stronger relationships between relational CSSI and age.

Purchasing roles, not salespersons, seem to be the primary source of informational and relational influence (Hartman and Kiecker 1991) for consumers who use purchasing roles. However, these consumers, do seem to be susceptible to recommendations given by salespersons. This finding is consistent with the primary roles perceived by consumers for their purchase roles. Purchase roles are expected to augment consumer confidence (information, moral support) and enhance fun and enjoyment (relational aspects) (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980) in the purchase process. Purchase roles may also make recommendations (Hartman and Kiecker 1991) but that does not seem to preclude susceptibility to salespeople's recommendations.

From a more academic perspective, this study provides a foundation for additional research in applied psychology, consumer behavior and sales research. This is the first attempt to develop CSSI as a multidimensional extension of sustainability to social normative influence. It seems reasonable to suggest that the dimensions of CSSI are at least partially rooted in different needs or motives. Informational CSSI suggests a teleological motive (McGuire 1974), recommendational CSSI seems rooted in a need for deference or compliance (Edwards 1955) and relational CSSI suggests a need for affiliation (Edwards 1955). Further, the CSSI constructs appear to be facets of an individual difference trait (susceptibility to salesperson influence). Additional research is needed to confirm CSSI as an individual difference trait and separate trait effects from the situational effects that are endogenous to sales interactions. Refinement of CSSI measurements (e.g., relational CSSI) may also be warranted. It is probable that additional cognitive and behavioral variables are linked to CSSI dimensions. The relationships among CSSI dimensions and trust, similarity, consumer resistance strategies, consumer knowledge and experience should be examined across interactive dyads of salespersons and consumers. Various measures of consumer response elasticities (e.g., price, advertising), product involvement, shopping, buying, communication and negotiation styles should also be examined for relationships to CSSI. Overt and observable consumer behaviors (e.g., number of test drives, dealer visits, price quotes, time spent in activities) suggested by Purse, Punj and Stewart (1984) should be explored as possible indicators of CSSI dimensions. Additional research is needed to assess the complex relationships among CSSI dimensions, salesperson ability to assess and/or alter consumer importance weights, and sales performance. In addition, the best methods for training salespeople in adaptive CSSI selling techniques need examination and field experiments are needed to address the reservations articulated by Morgan and Stoltman (1990) concerning effective implementation of adaptive selling.

Finally, from a theoretical viewpoint, the results of this study provide empirical support for the concept of adaptive selling. It does not seem reasonable that a standard sales communication or fairly rigid "canned" presentation could be equally effective across the different segments based on CSSI.
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