

An Examination of the Relative Effectiveness of Training in Nonverbal communication:  
Personal Selling Implications

by

Robin T. Peterson

Wells Fargo Distinguished Professor

Department of Marketing

College of Business Administration and Economics

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, NM 88003

505-646-5748

Ropeters@nmsu.edu

An Examination of the Relative Effectiveness of Training in Nonverbal communication:  
Personal Selling Implications

Key Words: nonverbal, communication, selling, training, education

### Abstract

This paper examines the potential effectiveness of training in nonverbal communication for sales representatives. The literature on this subject was reviewed and a study, using students as sales representatives, conducted to evaluate the potential of training in body language. The research results provide support for the proposition that such training can be of value in academic and practical applications.

## Introduction

Those who are personally involved in or are scholars in the personal selling field are vitally interested in means of improving the communication process. One medium which has received considerable attention is verbal intercourse. A second medium, one which focuses on overt behavior, holds a similar degree of promise. This methodology, termed “body language” or “nonverbal communication” has been defined simply as “messages without words” or “silent messages” (Manning & Reece, 1989). In turn, it includes behavior which relates to such phenomena as the linear distance between sales representatives and prospects, salesperson posture, hand shake techniques, facial expressions, arm movements, hand movements, and placement of the legs and feet. It is generally well accepted that this practice is more an art than a science, but still has considerable practical value. Further, it is a field of study that can be taught (Schwebel & Schwebel, 2002), so its benefits are available to individuals who lack innate capabilities in its application.

Those sales representatives who rely primarily upon the spoken word to communicate with prospects may be neglecting an important tool for conveying their ideas. Of course, nonverbal communication is not based upon exact and precise science nor can it be expected to invariably produce desired results. However those who endeavor to learn and diligently practice this technique may be able to improve their performance considerably. This field has been the object of considerable study by researchers in psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology, and other social

science disciplines and, to a lesser degree, by business administration researchers in marketing and management.

The purpose of the study described in this paper is to assess the effectiveness of personal selling effort conducted with guidance from various nonverbal communication education and training sources compared to effort that is not so guided. A review of pertinent literature relating to body language is provided. Further, the selling performance of personal selling students who have received body language training is compared to that of students who have not been exposed to this training and differences between the outcomes produced by these two groups of subjects analyzed. If the achievements of the first group significantly exceed those of the second, this provides rationale for the inclusion of nonverbal communication instruction in university personal selling courses and possibly in corporate sales training programs..

#### Review of the Literature

The literature provides considerable support for the effectiveness of nonverbal communication as a tool for conveying thoughts, attitudes, perceptions, and meaning. Research indicates that approximately 55% of interpersonal messages are conveyed through this source (Lavan, 2002). This appears to be logical, since most human beings are visually dominant and live in a society dominated by visual images and so are more inclined to believe the evidence of the eyes more than that of the other senses (Sampson, 1995). However, many individuals are unaware of its importance and tend to be unskilled in its practice. Hence, if they desire to improve their communication abilities, they are likely to benefit from training in order to take advantage of this method

(Bone, 1998).

A very large number of studies, some academic and some applied, have focused upon body language usage. Only a selected few are cited here to illustrate the potential that is inherent in this approach. One caveat cited by many researchers and practitioners is that communication is best achieved by employing a “cluster” or combination of nonverbal behavior cues, rather than just one, such as maintaining eye contact or maintaining an erect posture (Zebrowitz, 2003; Anonymous, 1999). However, one researcher does propose that single nonverbal elements do have distinct meanings and create unique and specific impressions among observers (Slattery, 2002). A widely-believed viewpoint among scholars is that communication is optimized when verbal and nonverbal elements operate in an integrated fashion, producing a coordinated and synchronized effect (Laplante & Ambady, 2003; Jones & LeBaron, 2002). At the opposite extreme, where verbal communication carries on message and body language a conflicting message, the result is likely to be communications failure.

Another caveat is that a number of the nonverbal behaviors are culturally specific—they may convey one meaning in one culture and a different meaning in another. In Denmark, for instance, handshakes that are of short duration are likely to be perceived positively, whereas the opposite is true for Italy (Clayton, 2003). Many of the findings set forth in this paper were based upon the cultural norms prevalent in the United States and might not apply to other locales.

Many research findings on the impact of nonverbal behavior suggest that this method is a powerful tool for conveying thoughts, facts, and impressions. One study

reported that nonverbal indicators of involvement and pleasantness were found to be systematically related to relational message perceptions of intimacy, dominance, composure, and informality (Burgeon & Le Poire, 1999). This would lead to the conclusion that body language which conveys the image of mental involvement by and a pleasant demeanor of the communicator could lead to positive results. Another study indicated that perceivers with access to nonverbal visual information were the most accurate receivers of dyadic rapport (Grahe & Bernieri, 1999). In turn, empathy is a characteristic of sales representatives that is correlated with success (Futrell, 2002). Boone and Buck (2003) found that high emotional expressivity contributes to interpersonal attraction independently and on par with the contributions of physical attractiveness and can act as a marker for cooperative behavior or trustworthiness. In a related study, an inquiry conducted by Mongrain & Vettese indicated that women who constricted their nonverbal expressions were perceived by others as ambivalent (Mongrain & Vettese, 2003). Expressing emotions, then, as through facial expressions and hand gestures, may be a useful practice.

One inquiry provided evidence to the effect that cooperation from another person could be facilitated by sustained eye contact, especially if the other person has roots in a western hemisphere culture (Kurzban, 2001). Another study revealed that dominant body language produced more liking and comfort on the part of most recipients of communications than did submissive body language (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Apparently, there exists a negative reaction on the part of many observers, to overly passive and acquiescent behavior. Yet another inquiry showed that a relaxed facial

expression and direct eye contact yielded higher power attributions and credibility ratings than did behavior which lacked these elements (Aguis, Simonsen, & Pierce, 1998). Both power and credibility have been linked to effectiveness in selling (Futrell, 2002).

Mignault & Chaudhuri (2003) discovered that a bowed head conveys that the communicator is submissive, sad, and displaying inferiority, whereas a raised head is perceived as more dominant and displaying pride and happiness. This finding has obvious implications for sales representatives. Vrij, Edward, Roberts, and Bull (2000) found in an experiment that 78 percent of the lies and truths set forth by speakers could be correctly classified on the basis of nonverbal behavior alone. It is not recommended here, of course, that sales representatives should engage in non-truthful communication. On the other hand, when telling the truth they should avoid excessive use of behaviors that are often associated with lying, such as keeping the body more rigid than is usual or fidgeting with hands and arms (Clayton, 2003).

The research findings set forth above suggest that body language can exert a powerful impact on the perceptions of others regarding the source of the communication and that this effect can be very applicable to sales representatives. Analysts in numerous disciplines and applied fields have assessed nonverbal communication concepts and insights, as they apply to their particular area of interest. In the opinion of some commentators, arrogant body language on the part of many journalists in the U.S. have led to their low public respect and esteem (Lehrer, 1998). There is evidence that librarians who are trained in nonverbal communication can replace negative perceptions

of themselves with positive ones (Sampson, 1995). This is a concern to those who work in libraries because they are sometimes viewed as distant and non-helpful. A number of hotel managers have improved the images of their organizations among their guests by providing up-front employees (such as desk clerks and bell hops) with training in this field (Jafari & Way, 1994). As physicians compete to attract and retain a strong client base, their services can be interpreted positively by potential patients through correct body language on the part of the physicians and their employees. Patients often make physician-choice decisions based upon their perceived image of the doctor, as revealed by verbal and non verbal communications (Aruguete & Roberts, 2002; Hill & Garner 1991).

Other applications are available, for a variety of occupations. There is evidence that the body language of teachers has an influence on the evaluation direction (positive or negative) and level that they receive from their students (Babad, Avni-Babad, & Rosenthal, 2003). Corporate recruiters have found this method to be useful in conveying information to job seekers (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002). A study has indicated that lawyers can project a favorable impression of themselves and their firms, in the ranks of prospective clients through sustained eye contact and other forms of body language, such as erect but relaxed sitting position and close proximity to the clients (Clarke, 1989). In this same vein, accountant who serve as expert witnesses can benefit through this technique (Pickholz & Zimmerman, 2002). In restaurants, the eye contact, facial expression, body position, and posture of the staff, including servers and cashiers, has an impact on how customers rate the value of the service (Martin,

1986). Managers in both business and not-for profit organizations can more effectively convey ideas to their employees through correct use of nonverbal communication—that which is compatible with verbal expression (Hancock, 1999; McCaskey, 1979). On the other hand, the job evaluations of employees by their supervisors have been found to be correlated with smiling, gaze, hand movement, and body orientation (DeGroot & Motowidlo, 1999).

A variety of sales related outcomes have been shown to be related to nonverbal communication. One study indicated that those who relied upon this method were able to assess the status of others (Mast & Hall, 2004). In a similar vein, impressions of empathy and power can be effectively conveyed through body language (Gabbott & Hogg, 2001). According to an investigation by Coulson (2004) the subjects in an experiment were able to identify the emotions of others by observing their posture. “Mirroring” or emulating the nonverbal behavior of a communication recipient has been shown to be a potentially effective device for persuading others (Van Swol, 2003). Evasive glances and limited duration eye contact, on the part of a communicator, tend to reduce compliance with requests (Gueguen & Jacob, 2002). Research has revealed that nonverbal communication can enhance clients’ reactions to communications from service providers (Gabbott & Hogg, 2000; Sundaram & Webster, 2000).

Some sources propose that non-verbal communication is of considerable importance in the personal selling domain (Jones, Stevens, & Chonko, 2005; Manning & Reece, 1992; Stewart, Hecker, & Graham, 1987). As such, sales representatives, even those with considerable experience, are well-advised to build and improve their capability with

this approach to conveying ideas. One author indicates that body language is one of the skills that is needed in order to be successful in professional services and sales, yet it is overlooked in many education and training programs (Bohn, 1999). Other commentators have emphasized the need for generating expertise in this arena (Warfield, 2001 Bone, 1998). Personal space, for example, has received some attention in the literature (McElroy, Morrow, & Eroglu, 1990). The need can be especially acute in international marketing, where many sales representatives may be unfamiliar with the appropriate body language for the culture where they are stationed(Tucker, 1995).

A review of sales related books and articles reveals that nonverbal communication is a popular topic of discussion. Numerous sources suggest that this method offers benefits to practicing sales representatives. However, the bulk of the evidence supporting this claim is anecdotal, or is based upon personal experience and intuition, rather than methodical inquiry. Nonverbal disclosures have not been systematically researched in personal selling, and periodic calls for such investigations have been unheeded (Leigh & Summers, 2002). In fact, the bulk of the research in this field emanates from the psychology discipline. Researchers in marketing in general and sales in particular have devoted little effort to this subject. This may be explained, at least in part, by the fact that a landmark Meta-analysis study by Churchill, Ford, Hartley, & Walker (1985) did not uncover nonverbal communication as an important determinant of salesperson performance and did not recommend further research in this field.

Leigh & Summers (2002) conducted an investigation which examined the

effectiveness of nonverbal communication in a sales context. Using videotaped presentations, they found that nonverbal cues (eye gaze, speech hesitations, gestures, clothing, and posture) influenced the experimental buyers' perceptions of the sales representative and their evaluation of the sales presentation. Their work is of value in evaluating the potential value of nonverbal communication. They did not, however, assess the effectiveness of the presentation in a direct manner. Further, the experiment was somewhat artificial, in that videotaped presentations were employed.

Given the demonstrated importance of body language in a variety of applications, the present study was undertaken to provide insights on the potential effectiveness of education and training in this area, as it relates to the personal selling field.

#### Research Methodology

The students who were enrolled in the author's personal selling classes were the subjects who participated in this study. Each of five separate classes was divided into two groups, both made up of the same number of students ( $n = 106$ ): (1) those who were exposed to nonverbal communication training and (2) those who were not so trained. The students in each class were randomly assigned to the groups by the instructor. In order to mitigate contamination of the results, sections of the required textbook which dealt with nonverbal communication were not assigned to the class and the instructor did not cover this topic in the regular classroom lectures. In turn, the members of group one were required to attend two sessions (made up of fifty minutes each) of training in body language. Research indicates that training periods of this length can be effective in imparting useful insights and perspectives in nonverbal

communication (Schwebel, 2002) Appendix A provides an overview of the training coverage which was involved. It focuses on the five major nonverbal communication channels, namely body angle, face, arms, hands, and legs (Gschwandtner, 2002). The members of group two did not undergo training in body language but received two additional sessions (made up of fifty minutes each) of training in prospecting and preparing for sales calls.

In the first body language training session, each student was provided with a written copy of the document set forth in Appendix A and told to study it briefly (This process consumed five minutes). Then the instructor lectured for twenty-five minutes, covering each of the items in the document. Following this, a student (not a subject in the study) who had been briefed by the instructor acted as a prospect in a role playing situation where the instructor demonstrated each item in the document. The role playing procedure lasted for twenty minutes. In the second training session the instructor and the role playing student again demonstrated each of the items, over a span of twenty-five minutes. During the next twenty minutes of the session, the students practiced each of the items on the list, using another student subject as a prospect. The second training session concluded with a five minute review of the material which was previously covered. The group two members experienced this same training process, except that it focused on prospecting and preparing for sales calls.

In order to mitigate possible student suspicions about why they were assigned to special sessions, the instructor informed the students that additional instruction was needed to cover important topics and the class was assigned to separate sessions so

that the number of students in each one was not unduly large.

On the next to the last week of the semester (after the students had completed their textbook reading and received the lectures provided by the instructor) each student was asked to make a sales call on an assigned small retailer –one that was not assigned to any other student (to avoid research contamination that might result from more than one sales call). The retailers were selected randomly from the yellow pages of the local telephone book and assigned to students in a random fashion—a systematic sample from the telephone book. The author contacted each retailer on the list and asked if he or she would be willing to serve as a prospect for a student sales presentation. The objective of each student was to make a sales call, with the purpose of attempting to convince the retailer to attend a free “effective selling techniques” seminar conducted by the author/professor on campus. The students were instructed to employ the materials that they had learned in regularly scheduled-classes, in the special sessions and in the textbook in their persuasion efforts. Further, they were required to avoid collaborating with each other prior to the sales call, as a means of evading contamination of the results of the study from this source.

It might be argued that the prior education and past experience of the student/salespersons might contaminate the results of the study, in that some might have previous instruction, reading, or experience in utilizing nonverbal communication. This was not suspected to be a major contaminant, however. The only prerequisite course for the personal selling offering is principles of marketing, which, as it is now taught at the university in question, does not cover body language. In turn, the personal

selling course used in the study is introductory in nature and is described and promoted to students as an approach to the field that is made available to novices who have little or no exposure to personal selling. As such, it is unlikely that past exposure to the nonverbal communication field took place. If it did, it is even more unlikely that the students received the extent of training that they did in the study reported here.

The objective of the study was to compare the performance of the two groups in producing favorable results. Three dependent variables were employed to achieve this end. One was the number of successful sales (verbal intentions expressed by the retailers to attend the seminar). A different dependent variable—actual attendance at the retailer seminar—might have been utilized. However, the researcher avoided this option because variables other than the persuasiveness of the student (such as the retailers' personal time schedule, contingencies arising in their business operations, and time conflicts) could impact upon their attendance at the seminar. Another dependent variable was self reporting measures prepared by the students, relating to their perceived effectiveness of the education/training they received throughout the entire semester (this includes body language and other training). The third was self-reporting by the students on the usefulness of the nonverbal communications training in particular.

### Research Results

Table One sets forth data on the number of retailers indicating an intention to attend the seminar. After each presentation was completed the student/salesperson asked the retailer/prospect to complete a one question questionnaire while the student left the

room. The questionnaire asked: Please indicate on this form with an "X", your intentions to attend the seminar. The possible responses were : "Definitely will attend," "Probably will attend", "Don't know", "Probably will not attend", and "Definitely will not attend". A *Chi Square* test on the frequencies reveals that there are significant differences between the two groups at the .05 level. In this case, the calculated value of *Chi Square* was 11.214, which exceeds the critical value (9.488) with four degrees of freedom. Further, some comparisons for each possible response are revealing. In this regard, the frequencies for definitely will attend and probably will attend are significantly higher for group one than for group two. Further, the frequencies for don't know and probably will not attend are significantly larger for the second group. These findings support the proposition that nonverbal communication training was effective in preparing the students for a selling role.

(Table One about here)

The students who were involved in the study were asked to self report on their perceived effectiveness of the preparation which they received throughout the semester in taking the class. A simple metric was used to achieve this end. Specifically, the students were asked "We want to measure the extent to which you feel that the training which you received in class this semester prepared you for conducting your selling task. On a scale of one to seven, where one signifies "prepared me very well" and seven signifies "Did not prepare me very well" how would you rate the training which you received in class?" The mean score for group one was 5.9 and for group two was 4.8. A *t* test for the significance of difference between means indicates that the group one

value was significantly larger than the group two magnitude. This finding tends to lend support to the proposition that training in nonverbal communication can have substantial beneficial effects in a personal selling context.

(Table Two about here)

The students in group one were asked to evaluate the nonverbal communication training which they had received, after they had completed their sales presentations. They received a questionnaire which asked them to evaluate this training in terms of: (1) How much did I learn from this training?, (2) What is the practical value of this training to me for my future job success?, and (3). What was the value of this training in motivating me to achieve in selling? These particular dimensions have been employed in prior research studies to assess the usefulness of particular pedagogies (Peterson, 1995). Each of the three constructs was assessed on a seven point scale ranging from “very little” to “very much”. The mean scale value for “ How much did I learn?” was 6.0, for “practical value for future job success” was 6.1, and for “Value in motivating me to achieve in selling was 5.6. These means are all substantially larger than the median value of the scale (3.5), providing additional support for the value of nonverbal communication training.

(Table Three about here)

### Discussion

Research in the psychology discipline has indicated that nonverbal activities have considerable change agent properties that are able to enhance and enrich interpersonal communication activities. These findings have led numerous book and

professional magazine authors in the personal selling field to recommend this form of communication for inclusion in the arsenal tools which sales representatives should bring into play. However, to date, the effectiveness of body language in personal selling has not been the subject of extensive research studies.

This paper has examined the potential contributions of education and training in nonverbal communication as a means for enhancing the proficiency and success of personal selling effort. Considerable literature is in existence, both in business administration and non-business research contexts, that supports the utilization of this form of communication as a potentially valuable tool in persuasive activities. This methodology appears to have promise, but further research insights appear to be needed to verify this. However, only a modest research effort has taken place to examine the effectiveness of this technique in the field of personal selling. A study undertaken by the author, in conjunction with students enrolled in personal selling classes, provided some support for the proposition that training in body language can improve sales effectiveness. The study evidenced support for the value of nonverbal communication training in producing a proxy for willingness to purchase (in this case intentions to attend a seminar) and receiving favorable student evaluations on the effectiveness of the training. These indicators both turned out to be positive.

This study provides a degree of evidence supporting the proposition that body language training should be considered for an important role in the educational and training programs conducted by academics and managerial/educational efforts and training for personnel in industry. There is an indication that such programs are

capable of yielding results that could not be attained through efforts which focus only or primarily upon the sole use of verbal communication as a change agent.

As was indicated earlier, nonverbal communication is most effective when it is used as a complement and in consensus with verbal communication. Hence, training in the two areas can be undertaken through a synthesis approach, where it can be shown that the two can operate closely together and reinforce one another. Neither should be seriously considered as a substitute for the other.

The research described in this paper indicated that training in body language need not be unduly long, in order to produce positive results. The subjects in the study received only one hundred minutes of training, in two classroom sessions. Yet, there is evidence that this training had an impact on their performance. This is not to say that extensive training is never needed, of course, but only to suggest that limited training efforts can be useful when time and monetary resources are not in abundance.

This study has focused upon the utilization of nonverbal communication as a guide to the behavior of sales representatives. Probably equally important is to consider training sales personnel in reading and interpreting the body language presented by their prospects (Anderson, 2001). Skill in this function may be useful as a feedback mechanism to the sales representative who desires to discern the perceptions, attitudes, interests, desires, and motivation to purchase of the prospect. Further research in this area could be of substantial value to the field, since feedback reading and interpretation are important personal selling functions.

This study has certain limitations. The sales representatives in the study were

students enrolled in personal selling classes in one university setting, and they were “selling” a service which did not have a monetary price (the only expense to the prospects was the time and which they would expend in attending the seminar). Hence, the setting was somewhat removed from “real world” applications and cannot be generalized to all selling efforts without reservation. Further, both dependent variables were somewhat subjective and cannot be interpreted as entirely precise and comprehensive measures of selling effectiveness.

A potential limitation of the research is that the makeup of the experimental and control groups could have differed in such a way that personal backgrounds confounded the results. Between group differences could have existed in such variables as grade point average, gender, age, ethnicity, major, tenure in the university, intelligence, personality, and others. It is difficult to control for all of these variables. The author elected to assign students to groups in a random manner, in an attempt to minimize possible confounding from these and other sources.

Of particular concern is student past learning. It cannot be entirely ruled out that some of the subjects in the study had prior training or experience which affected their selling performance, although this is not suspected to be of pivotal importance. Some students may have undertaken previous exposure to nonverbal communication. This is not viewed as a major weakness, however, given the coverage of material in the lecture and the textbook, the limited past selling experiences of students in the course, its prerequisites, and the manner in which it is promoted to students. At any rate, the students enrolled in the classes were randomly assigned to the experimental and

control groups, so any bias engendered from this source would be entirely the effect of chance. Still, it should be recognized that the prior training issue is a limitation of the study.

A further possible limitation is that the study did not measure if the students actually used the information on non-verbal communication during the presentations. However, the very positive responses by group one students on how much they learned about nonverbal communication and the practical value of this training suggest that this technique was included in their efforts. Further, informal conversations held with members of the experimental group, after the study had been conducted, indicated that the non verbal techniques were used in the presentations.

It is recommended that further studies be conducted in settings which more exactly describe realistic selling situations , which employ dependent variables which are likely to more accurately measure effectiveness in personal selling and which control for possible extraneous variables mentioned above. Additional research could concentrate on the most effective pedagogy for body language training. Comparisons could be made, for instance, of the relative effectiveness of lecture, role playing, demonstrations, and other avenues for training.

There is an abundance of possible aspects of nonverbal communication which could provide meaningful research results in future studies in the personal selling field. Many of these have been the subject of research in psychology, but not personal selling. These include differences in nonverbal behavior meaning between cultures and across genders, social classes, and income groups.

### Endnotes

Aguinis, Herman, Melissa M. Simosen, & Charles A. Pierce. 1998. Effects of nonverbal behavior on perception of power bases. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 138 (4): 455-470.

Anderson, Kare. 2001. What you can say without speaking. *Journal of Property Management* 66 (5):, 12-17.

Anonymous.1999. Removing behavioral barriers to never-ending change. *Human Resource Management International Digest* 7 (3): 27-31.

Aruguete, Mara S. & Carlos A. Roberts. 2002. Participants' ratings of male physicians who vary in race and communication style. *Psychological Reports* 91 (3): 793-807.

Babad, Elisha, Dinah Avni-Babad, & Robert Rosenthal. 2003. Teachers' brief nonverbal

- behaviors in defined instructional situations can predict students' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 95 (3): 553-563.
- Bohn, Robert. 1999.. Listening in professional services sales. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* 19 (2): 129-138.
- Bone, Dilys. 1998. Communication of back to genesis and the house of babel. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 30 (7): 236-247.
- Boone, R.T. & R. Buck. 2003. Emotional expressivity and trustworthiness: the role of nonverbal behavior in the evolution of cooperation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 37 (3),:163-182.
- Burgeon, J.K. & B.A. Le Poire. 1999. Nonverbal cues and interpersonal judgments: participant and observer perceptions of intimacy, dominance, composure, and formality. *Communication Monographs* 66 (2): 105-124.
- Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr., Neil M. Ford, Steven W. Hartley, & Orville C. Walker, Jr. 1985. The determinants of salesperson performance: a meta-analysis *Journal of Marketing Research* XXI (2): 103-118.
- Clarke, Judith T. 1989. Lawyer-client relations. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* 5 (1): 101-104.
- Clayton, Peter 2003. *Body language at work*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 137, 142.
- Coulson, Mark. 2004. Attributing emotion to static body postures: recognition accuracy, confusions, and viewpoint dependence. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 28 (2): 117-140.
- DeGroot, Michael G. & S.J. Motowidlo. 1999. Why visual and vocal interview cues can affect interviewers' judgements and predict job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84 (6): 986-993.
- Futrell, Charles M.. 1992. *Fundamentals of selling: customers for life*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin: 452.
- Gabbott, Mark & Gillian Hogg. 2000. An empirical investigation of the impact of non-verbal communication on service evaluation. *European Journal of Marketing* 34 (3): 384-399.
- Gabbott, Mark & Gillian Hogg. 2001. The role of non-verbal communication in service encounters: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Marketing Management* 17 (2): 5-26.
- Grahe, Frank & J. Bernieri. 1999. The importance of nonverbal cues in judging rapport *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 23 (4): 253-270.

Gswandtner, Gerhard .2002. Reading your customers buying signals. From the editors of *Selling Power*, <http://www.sellingpower.com>

Gueguen, Nicolas & Celine Jacob. 2002) Direct look versus evasive glance and compliance with a request. *Journal of Social Psychology* 142 (3): 393-397.

Hancock, Stephen. 1999. How to learn more by studying less. *Management Services* 43 (12),:20-22.

Hill, C. Jeanne & S.J. Garner. 1991. Factors influencing physician choice. *Hospital & Health Services Administration* 36 (4): 491-504.

Jafari, Jafar & William Way. 1994. Multicultural strategies in tourism. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 35 (6): 72-80.

Jones, Eli, Carl Stevens, & Larry Chonko. 2005. *Selling ASAP*. Mason, Ohio: Thomson: South Western: 249.

Jones, Stanley E. & Curtis D. LeBaron. 2002. Research on the relationship between verbal and nonverbal communication: emerging integrations. *Journal of Communication* 52 (3): 499-523.

Kurzban, R. 2001. The social psychophysics of cooperation: nonverbal communication in public goods game. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 25 (4): 241-259.

Kristof-Brown, Amy, Murray R. Barrick, & Melinda Franke. 2002. Applicant impression management: dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management* 28 (1) 27-47.

Laplante, Debi & Nalini Ambady. 2003. "On how things are said: voice tone, voice intensity, verbal content, and perceptions of politeness. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 22 (4): 434-442.

Lavan, Ian. 2002. NLP in business—or more than a trip to the zoo. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 34 (4): 182-188.

Lehrer, Von. 1998. Journalism. *Vital Speeches of the Day*: 139-143.

Leigh, Thomas W. & John O. Summers. 2002. An initial evaluation of industrial buyers' impressions of salespersons' nonverbal cues," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 22 (1): 41-54.

Manning, Gerald.L. & Bruce .L. Reece. 1992. *Selling today: an extension of the marketing concept*. Boston.: Allyn and Bacon: 76.

- Martin, William B. 1986. Defining what quality service is for you," *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 26 (4): 32-39.
- Mast, Marianne Schmid & Judith A. Hall. 2004. Who is the boss and who is not? accuracy of judging status. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 28 (3): 145-166.
- McCaskey, Michael B. 1979. "The hidden messages managers send," *Harvard Business Review* 57 (6): 135-140.
- McElroy, James C., Paula C. Morrow, & Sevo Eroglu. 1990. The atmospherics of personal selling. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 10 (4): 31-42.
- Mignault, Alain & Avi Chaudhuri. 2003. The many faces of a neutral face: head tilt and perception of dominance and emotion. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 27 (2): 111-133.
- Mongrain, Myriam & Lisa C. Vettese. 2003. Conflict over emotional expression: implications for interpersonal communication. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 29 (4): 545-556.
- Peterson, Robin T. 1995 . Life history study for the personal selling class. *Marketing Education Review* 5 (3): 11-19.
- Pickholz, Marvin G. & Phillip Zimmerman. 2002. Litigation in the current environment. *CPA Journal* 72 (9): 62-63.
- Sampson, Eleri. 1995. First impressions: the power of personal style. *Library Management* 16 (4): 25-29.
- Schwebel, David C. & Milton Schwebel. 2002. Teaching nonverbal communication," *College Teaching* 50 (3): 88-92.
- Slattery, Lisa. 2002. What does that smile mean? the meaning of nonverbal behaviors in social interaction *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65 (1): 92-103.
- Stewart, David W., Sid Hecker, & John L. Graham. 1987. It's more than what you say: assessing the influence of nonverbal communication in marketing. *Psychology & Marketing* 4 (4): 303-323.
- Sundaram, D.S. & Cynthia Webster. 2000. The role of nonverbal communication in service encounters. *Journal of Services Marketing* 14 (5): 378-391.
- Tiedens, Larissa Z. & Alison R. Fragale. 2003. Power moves: complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social*

*Psychology* 84 (3): 558-569.

Tucker, Crispin. 1995. Viewpoint. *Human Resource Management International Digest* 3 (5): 2-4.

Van Swol, Lyn M. 2003. The effects of nonverbal mirroring on perceived persuasiveness, agreement with an imitator, and reciprocity in a group discussion. *Communication Research* 30 (4): 461-481.

Vrij, Aldert, Katherine Edward, Kim P. Roberts, & Ray Bull. 2000. Detecting deceit via analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 24 (4): 239-264.

Warfield, Anne. 2001. Do you speak body language? *Training & Development* 55 (4): 60-67.

Zebrowitz, Leslie A. 2003. Commentary overgeneralization effects in perceiving nonverbal behavior: evolutionary and ecological origins. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 27 (2): 133-139.

Table One

Retailer Intentions to Attend the Seminar

	<u>Expressed Intention</u>				
<u>Definitely will attend</u>	<u>Definitely will attend</u>	<u>Probably will attend</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>Probably will not attend</u>	<u>not</u>

<u>Pct.</u> <u>Group</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>
One 19.8%	17*	16.0%	26*	24.5%	22	20.8%	20	18.9%	21
Two <u>25.5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>28</u> *	<u>26.4</u>	<u>31</u> *	<u>29.3</u>	<u>27</u>
Totals 22.6%	27	12.7%	36	17.0%	50	23.6%	51	24.1%	48

---

\*Signifies a frequency which is significantly larger than the frequency of the other group in the column, according to a *Chi Square* test at the .05 level.

---

Table TwoPerceived Effectiveness of Training Preparation

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>
One	5.9*
Two	4.8

---

\*Signifies a significant difference from the other value in the row. according to a *t* test at the .05 level.

Table ThreeEvaluation of Nonverbal Communication Training

<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Variable</u>
6.0	How much did I learn
6.1	What is the practical value of the training
5.6	What was the value in motivating me to achieve

Appendix A

Contents of Nonverbal Communication Instructions

Body Angle

- . When meeting the prospect, make a positive and unhurried entrance
- . Maintain erect but not military posture, lean slightly toward the prospect
- . Stand four to six feet from the prospect
- . Mirror the prospect's body angle with your own
- . Sit or stand at a 45 degree angle to the prospect
- . If possible, avoid separating you and the prospect with objects, such as desks
- . Avoid excessive side to side movements

Face

- . Keep your facial expression relaxed
- . When meeting the prospect, smile in a relaxed manner
- . Smile with the eyes, not just the lips
- . Maintain eye contact but do not stare
- . Keep your gaze at eye level, do not look down
- . Keep your chin up
- . Nod your head to indicate agreement with the prospect
- . Do not blink excessively \_\_\_\_\_

Arms

- . Avoid folded arms

- . Mirror the prospect's arm movement and position with your own
- . Use gestures when making points, but make them unhurried
- . Make arm movements smooth, unhurried, and not jerky

### Hands

- . Handshake firm, use palms not fingers, not too fast, maintain eye contact
- . Avoid touching the face, neck, or body with hands, as by scratching or running your neck
- . Relax hands, do not clench fists or move hands excessively
- . Mirror the prospect's hand placement and movement with your own.

### Legs

- . Sit or stand in an open and relaxed position
- . Point your feet at a 45 degree angle away from the prospect, while sitting or standing
- . Keep your feet flat on the floor
- . While sitting, cross your legs if this is the most comfortable position
- . While sitting, keep your legs relaxed and do not move them around excessively

---

The sources of the body language suggestions were derived from:

1. Clayton, Peter. 2003. *Body Language at Work*. London: Barnes & Noble: 5-29.
2. Lill, David J. 2002. *Selling: the Profession*. Antioch, TN: D.M. Bass Publications: 92-96.
3. Eli Jones, Carl Stevens, & Larry Chonko. 2005. *Selling ASAP*. Mason, Ohio: Thomson:South Western, 249-252.

4. Weitz, Barton A., Stephen B. Castleberry, & John F. Tanner, Jr. 1998. *Selling: Building Relationships*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill: 137-148.

5. Cummings, Richard (1987). Contemporary Selling. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 154-165.

6. Fulfer, Mac (2001). "Nonverbal Communication: How to Read What's Plain as the Nose...or Eyelid...or Chin...on Their Faces," Journal of Organizational Excellence 20 (2), 19-28.

**Department of Marketing**  
**College of Business Administration & Economics**  
**New Mexico State University**  
**Las Cruces, NM 88003**  
**505-646-5748**  
**[Ropeters@nmsu.edu](mailto:Ropeters@nmsu.edu)**  
1-25-05

Professor Douglas J. Lincoln, Editor  
**Journal of Marketing Education**  
Department of Marketing and Finance  
College of Business & Economics  
Boise State University  
1910 University Drive  
Boise, Idaho 83725

Dear Doug:

Hi. For manuscript JME #04-31 I have changed the format of the manuscript, based on the guidelines which you have sent. In my opinion, all have been complied with. Should you require further changes or information, I would be happy to comply..

Thank you for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Robin T. Peterson  
Wells Fargo Distinguished Professor

sr:RTP  
ENCLOSURE:

