ERRATUM

Erratum to: An offer you can't refuse: consumer perceptions of sales pressure

James J. Zboja¹ · Ronald A. Clark² · Diana L. Haytko³

Published online: 30 April 2016
© Academy of Marketing Science 2016

Erratum to: J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci.
DOI 10.1007/s11747-015-0468-z

Tables 3 and 4 in the original version of this article contained mistakes in the entries. The correct tables are shown below:

Table 3 Means, standard deviations, correlations, reliabilities, and convergent/discriminant validity assessment of the measurement model

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>AVE</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. POSP (A)	2.47	1.30	0.60	.86	0.55	0.05	0.15	0.04	0.36	0.28
2. POSP (D)	2.51	1.45	0.75	0.74**	.90	0.04	0.17	0.01	0.29	0.21
3. SKNOW	5.44	1.51	0.88	−0.22**	−0.19**	.98	0.03	0.00	0.26	0.24
4. TIME	3.44	1.63	0.66	0.39**	0.41**	−0.17**	.85	0.02	0.15	0.15
5. SCPK	5.93	0.66	0.63	−0.19**	−0.12*	0.06	−0.13*	.83	0.02	0.02
6. SAT	5.09	1.41	0.77	−0.60**	−0.54**	0.51**	−0.39**	0.13*	.94	0.62
7. TRUST	4.89	1.26	0.75	−0.53**	−0.46**	0.49**	−0.39**	0.13*	0.79**	.90

POSP (A, D) Perceptions of Sales Pressure (Aggressive, Directive), *SKNOW* Salesperson Product Knowledge, *TIME* Time Pressure, *SCPK* Self-Confidence, Persuasion Knowledge, *SAT* Satisfaction with Salesperson, *TRUST* Trust in Salesperson

- Listwise $n = 275$, *AVE* Average variance extracted
- Construct reliabilities are provided on the diagonal in bold
- Shared variances are reported above the diagonal
- Pearson correlations are below the diagonal

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0468-z>.

✉ Diana L. Haytko
dhaytko@fgcu.edu

¹ Department of Management & Marketing, Collins College of Business, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK 74104-9700, USA

² Department of Marketing, College of Business, Missouri State University, Springfield, MO 65897, USA

³ Department of Marketing, Lutgert College of Business, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, FL 33965, USA

Table 4 Structural model results maximum likelihood estimates

Hypothesized Path	Path Coefficient	R^2	Support
1a. Salesperson Knowledge → POSP (A)	−0.14*	0.31	Supported
1b. Salesperson Knowledge → POSP (D)	−0.11	0.29	Not Supported
2a. Time Pressure → POSP (A)	0.47*		Supported
2b. Time Pressure → POSP (D)	0.49*		Supported
3a. Self-Confidence (PK) → POSP (A)	−0.14*		Supported
3b. Self-Confidence (PK) → POSP (D)	−0.07		Not Supported
4a. Salesperson Knowledge → Satisfaction	0.38*	0.64	Supported
4b. Time Pressure → Satisfaction	−0.14*		Supported
4c. POSP (A) → Satisfaction	−0.52*		Supported
4d. POSP (D) → Satisfaction	−0.03		Not Supported
5a. Salesperson Knowledge → Trust	0.38*	0.61	Supported
5b. Time Pressure → Trust	−0.17*		Supported
5c. POSP (A) → Trust	−0.50*		Supported
5d. POSP (D) → Trust	0.02		Not Supported
Structural Model Results:			
χ^2 ($df = 258$, $n = 275$) = 675.49, $p < .05$			
CFI = .97; TLI = .97; IFI = .97; RMSEA = .077			