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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The primary task of a business concern is to produce goods and services desired in the market place. Questions of efficiency of operation, selection of personnel, or methods of financing the operations can only be answered when there is a market that can be served. It is the task of the marketing segment of the firm to seek this market and bring the product to it. Many activities and techniques are necessary. Authors generally agree on the classification of marketing functions presented by Beckman and Davidson (1962). They have confined their statements of functions to those major activities that must be performed in the marketing of all products. These functions are

1. Buying
2. Selling
3. Transportation
4. Storage
5. Standardization and grading
6. Financing
7. Riskbearing
8. Market Research

This study is concerned with one of these functions. The activity of selling is the arousing, stimulation or direction of a prospective buyer's conscious or dormant desires for want satisfaction that results in action with reference to a given product, service, or seller (Beckman and Davidson, 1962).
The selling effort includes principally the activities of personal selling and advertising. This work is directed at the study of the activity of personal selling.

This chapter will present a discussion of (1) selling and the salesman as viewed by some marketing writers, (2) role theory and expectation theory, (3) a more specific statement of the objectives of the study, and (4) a survey of the pertinent literature.

The selling function

When one attempts to determine the length of time that personal selling has been recognized as a distinct activity, the mind can conjure up visions of the vendor in a stall in an ancient market calling to the passers-by. Selling requires, in some form or other, two people. Today, as always, this activity is important. The selling function, and specifically the personal selling aspect, is an important component in the makeup of the firm as well as the total economy. In an economic system such as the United States, the use of salesmen to convince the customer about the merits of the product is necessary. The competition between similar firms for one customer’s business may demand the presence of a salesman.

An analysis of the cost of personal selling suggests the magnitude of the importance attached to that function by firms.
Spratlen (1963) estimates $28 billion as the cost of salaries for personnel engaged in sales promotion, advertising, and saleswork. Of this amount, $15.8 billion is spent for sales worker compensation. Beckman and Davidson (1962) stress that this amount, in fact, understates the real cost of selling. Spratlen's estimates do not include the cost of managing the sales force, part-time salesmen and other classifications of personnel not included in the census data originally used.

Types of personal selling. Some have simply classified salesmen into two groups: industrial salesmen and consumer salesmen (Hansen, 1961). Beckman and Davidson (1962) further refine this classification. They expand selling to (1) industrial users, (2) wholesalers, (3) retailers, and (4) consumers.

There is little question that the business classification of the customer affects the selling task. McMurry (1961) suggests that the selling task may be ranked in order of creativity required for selling the product. He includes the following levels of creative selling in his discussion.

1. Positions where the salesman's job is predominantly to deliver the product, for example milk, bread and oil.
2. Positions where the salesman is predominantly an inside order taker, for example, the haberdashery salesman.
3. Positions where the salesman is predominantly an order taker but works in the field, as a spice salesman does.
4. Positions where the salesman is not expected or permitted to take orders but is called only to build good will or to educate the actual or potential user, for example, detail men ... (making) calls on the medical profession.
5. Positions where the major emphasis is placed on technical knowledge, for example, the engineering salesman who is primarily a consultant to the client companies.
6. Positions which demand the creative sale of tangible products like vacuum cleaners ...
7. Positions requiring the creative sale of intangibles, such as insurance ...

Beckman and Davidson (1962) point out in discussing McMurry's analysis that "the need for creativity varies from one customer to another," although the salesman is handling the same product line. It is this point which will be pursued in this study. Is the salesman who can adapt his behavior to the expectations of customers more effective in the selling situation than one who does not change his behavior in each situation? The role of a salesman means something different to different customers. Evans (1963) suggests that the "interaction of the two persons (in the selling situation) .... depends upon the economics, social, physical and personality characteristics of each of them." Thus, analysis of these factors should result in factors which will be related to the productivity and effectiveness of salesmen.

In order to clarify the theoretical background underlying the previous statements, it is necessary to explain certain concepts of role theory and expectation theory.

Role theory

A society, or an organization, is composed of a system of interrelated positions. A position may be defined as a cluster of roles performed by an individual (Merton, 1957). Each person holds at least
one position. More than likely, he will hold several. A person may be
a father, salesman, club treasurer and a church deacon. Each of these
positions calls for a different set of behavior patterns which will
be accepted by those with whom the individual interacts. The children
expect love, devotion, discipline and attention. The customer expects
a completely different set of behaviors, such as checking inventories,
aiding in sales promotion, or suggesting new products for purchase.

Positions exist in a society because they contribute some value
to the members of the society. The value contributed to the society
is called the function of the position. The position, then, corresponds
to functions, as commonly understood by group norms, whether or not
there is a close correspondence between "real and commonly understood
function" (Newcomb, 1958). This simply means that the position must
provide a value that the society, or group, considers to be necessary
and desirable, whether or not the value contributed is, in fact, real.
Each position in a system is thus related to other positions, and in
some way to the purpose of the entire system. Positions may be
likened to the gears in a watch. Each gear has a purpose and task,
as does a position in a society. However, as long as the task of the
gears is performed properly, the watch will continue to run. If a
gear fails in a watch, the entire system will fail. The same is not
true for a group or social system. When a position ceases to provide
value to the system, the system will adjust. The position may cease
to exist, but in large part, the structure of the group will remain
unchanged.
A position becomes "differentiated from other positions by virtue of the fact that the member exhibits predictable patterns of performance which elicit predictable responses from the other members" (Stogdill, 1959). Thus, each position is necessarily associated with roles, which are necessary and integral parts of the position system. Roles refer to the behavior of occupants of a position (Newcomb, 1958). Roles and the differentiation of roles are of great functional importance to the system. They provide for the division of labor within a group and the specialization of task among group members (Thibault and Kelley, 1961). It can therefore be said that a role is a "widely shared expectation by the members of a community of what should be the behavior of a person who occupies a position" (Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962). The role then, may be called a set of norms associated with a given position. Norms serve as the building blocks to roles. The structure and the acceptance of norms by others in a group is an important factor in communication. If, in fact, the members of a group share norms, the norm makes communication easier and facilitates understanding. Norms permit the patterning and the structuring of roles. This structure and patterning specifies duties, rewards, punishments, and even attitudes and beliefs of the role participants (Merrill, 1957). This suggests that if the role participant does not meet the role expectations of others with whom he interacts, he will receive a smaller reward. The individual, to a greater or lesser degree learns "such behavior ... expected of him as an occupant ... of ... a position. Thus, the role expectations of the community
guide the occupant's perception of the role" (Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962).

The previous discussion deals with the "accepted rules of behavior," or norms. It should be pointed out that role performances by different individuals holding similar positions may be very different. Two salesmen probably exhibit different behavior patterns while performing the selling function. When calling on one customer, one salesman may be jovial, friendly and generally easy in his approach. Another salesman calling on the same customer may be aggressive, domineering and businesslike in his manner.

Role theory provides, therefore, a possible explanation of the success or failure, or at least differences in output, of various salesmen. It does suggest that the role regulates the relations between people and that conflict can be minimized and dyadic interaction facilitated when the roles of both parties are expected and accepted by each party.

**Expectation theory**

It has previously been suggested that expectations play an important part in the development of norms and roles. Sarbin and Jones (in Maccoby, Newcomb & Hartley, 1958) define role expectation as a "cognitive structure inferred from the person's previous commerce with regularities in other's behavior and from the person's tendency to group a number of descriptions of actions and qualities together with the name of a specific position."
Stogdill (1959) suggests that

Expectation, defined as readiness for reinforcement, is a function of drive, the estimated probability of the occurrence of a possible outcome, and the estimated desirability of the outcome.

By reinforcement is meant the experiencing of an outcome which tends to meet, fulfill, satisfy or confirm the expectation.

By readiness for reinforcement is meant the extent to which an individual is prepared or unprepared to experience, or reconciled or unreconciled to the prospect of experiencing a possible outcome.

The estimated probability or occurrence of an outcome refers to an individual's prediction, judgment, or guess relative to the likelihood that a given event will occur.

The estimated desirability of an outcome is an individual's judgment relative to the satisfyingness of need for, demand for, appropriateness of, or pleasantness or unpleasantness of a possible outcome.

Estimates of probability and desirability interact to determine the level of expectation.

Stogdill thus provides an approach to expectation analysis that permits the development of more operational measurements than the Sarbin and Jones formulation. Stogdill's definition suggests that items in a questionnaire to describe behavior using action sentences can be used to measure levels of expectation. By asking a subject to respond to a questionnaire item indicating the "ideal" behavior in a
given situation, a measure of the desirability estimate may be obtained. 
By asking the subject to indicate the "actual" behavior, a probability 
estimate may be obtained.

Expectation, then, and the reinforcement of expectation is an 
important factor in the development of norms. Conformity to expec­
tations serves to increase the predictability and performance of 
individuals and facilitates the interest of the group (Stogdill, 1959).

Objective of the dissertation

The fundamental unit of interaction is two people in an action-
response situation, or the dyad. The major objective of this study 
is the analysis of the buyer-seller dyad. Based on the previous dis­
cussion of role theory and expectations, it seems reasonable to suggest 
that the salesman holds a position in an economic institution that may 
be described in terms of roles. The total role system of a given sales­
man is different from others. Each salesman, as a person, may interact 
with several other individuals. Thus, one salesman may have a set of 
role behaviors that encompasses his relationship with a wife, other 
family members, friends, superiors and customers. Another salesman may 
not have a family, thus his total role performance is basically dif­
ferent from the first salesman. However, it seems justified to suggest 
that the salesman, in his relationship with customers, is expected to 
meet certain role expectations as held by the customers.

The extent to which the role and norms in the selling situation 
are understood by the role participants makes communication in the 
dyad easier. The expectations that a customer has pertaining to the
role performance of the salesman may be related significantly to the success or failure of that salesman, especially to the success or failure with that given customer.

If a salesman's behavior is not consistent with the expectations of what the customer thinks it "ought to be," it is hypothesized that the selling situation will result in the salesman's acquiring a smaller portion of that customer's purchases. Additionally, if the buyer's probability estimates of salesman's behavior (the actual behavior as perceived by the buyer) agree with or conform to the buyer's desirability estimates (the ideal behavior of the salesman as perceived by the customer), it is suggested that the salesman will be more successful in his dealings with that customer. These comments form the foundation for the development of certain hypotheses concerning (1) role consensus between buyers and sellers and (2) the effect of probability and desirability estimates of the buyer.

Specifically then, this study will examine

1. Role consensus between buyer and seller and its effect on salesmen's productivity.

2. The probability and desirability estimates of customers concerning salesmen's behavior and the effect on productivity.

3. Whether or not the salesman who perceives himself to be adaptive in his role performance is more effective than one who perceives himself to be rigid in role performance.

Specific hypotheses to be tested

It has been previously stated that the study will analyze the relationship between high and low role consensus with respect to the
buyer and the seller. In addition, certain hypotheses concerning the effect of expectations on the part of the buyer and the seller have also been formulated.

**Hypothesis I.** The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer.

**Hypothesis II.** The consensus between the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer.

**Hypothesis III.** The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer.

**Hypothesis IV.** The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer.
Hypothesis V. The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating.

Hypothesis VI. The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating.

Hypothesis VII. The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating.

Hypothesis VIII. There is a significant difference between the percentage of business obtained by salesmen who have only business contacts with customers and those who have social and professional contacts.

Hypothesis IX. There is a significant positive correlation between the actual age of the salesman and (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer, (2) the number of suppliers of the
customer and (3) the gross volume contributed to the firm by the salesman.

**Hypothesis XI.** There is a significant correlation between the length of business contact of a buyer and seller and (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer.

**Hypothesis XII.** The consensus between the sales manager's concept of ideal salesman performance and the salesman's concept of ideal salesman's performance is related to the performance rating by the supervisor.

**Hypothesis XIII.** The ideal conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for salesmen in high producing and low producing situations.

**Hypothesis XIV.** The actual conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for salesmen in high producing and low producing situations.

**Hypothesis XV.** The actual conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for high volume producing salesmen and low volume producing salesmen.
**Hypothesis XVI.** The ideal conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for high volume producing salesmen and low volume producing salesmen.

**Survey of the literature**

Studies attempting to determine the effect of the interaction of buyer and seller are rare. In order to provide some understanding of the effect of the dyadic relationship, a brief review of some pertinent literature dealing with role clarity, consensus, or conflict is presented here.

Getzels and Guba (1954) hypothesized a relationship between the role, role conflict, and the effectiveness of the individual. One hypothesis in their study was "the greater the intensity of the actor's involvement to role conflict, the greater his relative ineffectiveness." They studied officer-instructors in a military school. They found that the persons experiencing role conflict were also the ineffective ones. "It seems clear that ineffectiveness in the performance of a role is related to the degree of personal involvement in role conflict." They point out, however, that lack of conflict is not necessarily related to effectiveness. Effectiveness was measured by the peer ratings of teaching effectiveness.

Smith (1957) studied the effect of role clarity on the productivity of groups. When paid subjects remained silent in a task situation which required all members' participation, and did not inform the others in the group of their intention to remain silent, group productivity and satisfaction were reduced. On the other hand, when
silent members informed other group members that they would remain silent, the other group members had more accurate perceptions of the role performance of the silent participants. Under this second condition, the productivity of the group did not vary significantly from the level of control group productivity.

Rogers (1957) studied the role of "employee" in a large corporation. The subjects had identical roles, i.e., employees in similar departments. They had little contact on their jobs with anyone except their bosses. Each boss had complete authority to hire and fire which served to limit the number of superordinates who had control over rewards and censure for the subjects. Role insight, role taking flexibility, and flexibility of self perception were found to be significantly related to role success. Role success was defined by the rating of the superior.

Cohen (cited in Blau and Scott, 1962) studied the effect on worker performance of an ambiguous definition of task and inconsistent directions from a superior. Ambiguity of the situation and the inconsistency of directions raised the anxiety of workers, caused less favorable attitudes toward the supervisor, and lowered productivity. It might be inferred from this study that the role behavior of the superior did not conform to the expectations of the subordinates. The unclarity of task and the ambiguity of the power figure's role performance in this situation resulted in lower productivity.

Taves, Corwin and Haas (1963) hypothesized that role consensus between superior and subordinates in the nursing profession was
positively associated with job satisfactions and success ratings from superiors. By using a role conception inventory and obtaining responses from superiors and subordinates, they correlated the difference scores with satisfaction and success. They found high success was associated with high consensus and low success associated with low consensus. Middle success students responded differently than either high or low success participants. They suggest that middle success group members conform to peer group as well as superior group standards.

Idkert (1961) concludes that the higher the productivity of a group, the greater the accuracy of the perceptions of both workers and foremen about the other's expectation of a desirable production rate. "Good performance and high communication go together."

Fleishmann, Harris, and Burtt (1955) cite findings which illustrate the effect of role performance of a power figure on the attitudes and role performance of subordinates. Two to ten months after a training program, the trained supervisors rank lower in dimensions measured than untrained supervisors. In order to explain the unexpected results, a study of leadership climate was undertaken. The follow up study showed that the trainee who worked under a high "consideration" leader tended to rank higher in consideration attitude and behavior. The authors concluded that the kind of supervisor under which a foreman worked was more specifically related to the attitudes and behavior of the foreman than whether or not the foreman had been trained.

The results of the study just cited might be explained in terms of role conflict and trainee expectations. When the trainee returned
to the job and found that his superior expected and practiced different behavior than the training ideal, a conflict developed. Should the trainee implement the training material? Or should he follow the lead of his boss? In most cases, the strongest influence was wielded by the supervisory climate.

Gross, Mason and McEachern (cited in Maccoby, Newcomb and Hartley, 1958) found that the longer school board members served on the board, the greater the consensus among board members in definition of board members' roles. Additionally, they found that when the board acted to reinforce the superintendent's expectation of their action, the satisfaction of the superintendent with his position was higher and the more highly he rated the board.

The studies previously cited deal with some aspect of confusion or conflict in roles. They indicate the importance of clarity and understanding of role requirements by the participants. The first group cited attempts to relate role performance and clarity to the "success" of one of the participants. The second group deals primarily with the effect of different role demands and expectations on the behavior and attitudes of subordinates.

By and large, those studies which attempt to relate "success" with some aspect of role behavior use ratings of superiors in the organization as success criteria. As used in these studies, the rating of a superior usually refers to a situation where a subordinate (a person of lower rank in the organization) is evaluated by a superordinate (a person of higher rank in the organization) concerning the extent to
which the subordinate has been successful in the performance of his tasks. It is admitted that this superior rating is an important factor in the progression of the individual in the organization. However, it seems that factors other than the contribution of the individual to the organization might bias the rater (Kallejian, Brown, and Weschler, 1962). The study by Haas, Taves and Corwin (1963) previously cited supports this statement. High consensus in role was associated with high success ratings by a superior. Perhaps the consensus of a subordinate with a superior with respect to role, or the mere fact the subordinate has the same "ideas" as the superior results in the high performance rating. While it is a necessary part of the task of a superior to maintain some workable relationships with subordinates, it is also necessary that the subordinate "put out" units of product and add value in some way to the firm.

The previously cited research deals with relationships which might be characterized by the term "intragroup." In almost all cases, the subjects were members of a "department" or "problem solving group." Gross, Mason and McEachern (1953) studied the school board and the principal. The principal is not a member of the school board in the same way that a lathe operator is a member of a department in a factory.

Lombard (1955) studied saleswomen in a large department store. When the customer rejected the merchandise, the salesgirl perceived that the customer rejected her. If the customer did not purchase merchandise, the salesgirl perceived it as the fault of the customer. Additionally, if the salesgirl was secure in her beliefs about selling
and the product, she perceived the customer as someone who needed her help. Customers in a hurry perceived that salesgirls were not interested in them.

Whyte (1948) pointed out the importance of interaction between the customers, waitresses and cooks in a restaurant. Whyte found that the behavior of the waitress varied inversely with the perceived social status of the customer she served. The higher the perceived social status, the less friendly and personal the waitress acted.

Evans (1963) conducted a study to determine the effect of dyadic interaction in the life insurance industry. His study included 125 successful agents. The main hypothesis is "the more similar the parties in the dyad are, the more likely a favorable outcome, a sale." Salesmen all showed a high degree of involvement in their job. Evans concludes:

The more alike the salesman and his prospect are, the greater the likelihood for a sale. This is true for physical characteristics (age, height), other objective factors (income, religion and education) and variables that may be related to personality factors (smoking, politics). It is also important to note that the perceived similarity for religion and politics is much higher and of greater importance to the sale than the true similarity.

It should be pointed out here that the research reviewed is not an exhaustive study of the literature. There is a vast amount of marketing research into the desires of customers, the activity of successful salesmen and the personality of successful salesmen. Most of this research follows traditional lines of examination by investigating the individual by using personality scales, questionnaires and interviews.
Method of presentation

This chapter has presented a discussion of the background and theory upon which the study is based. The specific hypotheses of the study were also stated.

Chapter II details the research methodology used. Sample selection, the development and scoring of the instrument, and a brief discussion of the statistical techniques used in the analysis of the data will be presented.

Chapter III presents the results of the analysis of the data. Chapter IV is devoted to a discussion and an analysis of the significant findings.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter will be concerned with the further expansion of the ideas and concepts presented in Chapter I. More specifically, it will include a description of the selling job in the wholesale drug industry, the rationale for the selection of the cooperating firms, criteria used for the purposes of the study, a description of the techniques used in scale development, the selection of the sample and the techniques to be used in the analysis of the data.

Channels of distribution in the drug industry

Figure 1 illustrates the channels of distribution prevalent in the drug industry.

In some cases, the manufacturer of pharmaceuticals and related products deals directly with the retailer. Sales representatives from manufacturers may make contact with retailers to obtain this direct business. In general, the purchase of items in this manner results in a price 15 per cent lower than if the retailer buys the product from a wholesaler.

The retailer may also purchase from a short-line wholesaler. This is a form of specialty wholesaling, in that they handle a relatively narrow line of goods in the drug field. They may limit their stocks to certain brands of pharmaceuticals, and patent medicines. They may only handle limited assortments of toilet articles or sundries.
Figure 1. Typical Channels of Distribution in the Drug Industry.
The full-line, full-service wholesaler can supply almost all the requirements that a drug store may have. These institutions provide delivery, credit and may even aid the retailer in the financing, design, and building of a retail unit. Thus, full-line, full-service drug wholesalers handle relatively the same product lines and brands.

**Basis for selection of cooperating firms**

In attempting a study of this nature several factors must be considered. The variables which affect the selling relationship of the buyer and the seller are numerous and difficult to control for experimental purposes. It is easily seen that factors such as the extent of the line carried by a wholesaler, price or quantity discounts, more and prompt deliveries might be adequate reasons for a retail purchaser to direct substantial portions of his purchases to one wholesaler rather than another. Role consensus and expectations that exist in the buyer-seller dyad may, in many cases, be an insignificant variable. When a wholesale salesman from a full-line, full-service firm is competing for a retailer's business with a salesman from a short-line distributor, other variables may be more important. It is necessary, then, if one is to study the phenomenon of role consensus, for these other variables to be controlled in some manner. For this reason the study concerns itself with only one type of wholesale drug salesman, that is the representative of a full-line, full-service drug wholesale establishment.

It can be seen that much difficulty would be involved if several drug wholesalers were used. Comparisons of salesmen's effectiveness
would be virtually meaningless since many factors, such as variety and assortment of product lines, might affect buying decisions or the loyalties of retail purchasers. Therefore, it was decided to include in the study only salesmen representing the full-line, full-service wholesaler. Thus, by using only the full-line, full-service wholesalers, an analysis of the role relationship and expectations is facilitated because the following contaminating factors have been somewhat controlled.

1. Differences in product lines, and
2. Differences in service offered.

Selection of the retail sample. Each cooperating wholesaler supplied a list of retail customers to whom the questionnaire was mailed. Six retailers were selected for each salesman from each firm. These six customers were selected from three different classifications based on volume. In general, two customers were selected from each third of the volume range for a given salesman. Thus, each salesman has two customers from the lower third, two from the middle third and two from the upper third of the volume range within which his customers fall.

Questionnaires were sent to 250 drug retail firms. Of these, 150 were returned. All responses were not usable, however, since many failed to complete the questionnaire. The following is a summary of pertinent information regarding data supplied by retail respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total questionnaires sent</th>
<th>250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total returned</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received after cut-off date</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partial criterion data
a. Percent of Business 97
b. Number of Suppliers 87
No criterion data 5

Selection of salesmen. The two wholesale firms cooperating in the study had 40 salesmen. Upon receipt of the questionnaires from the retailers, all salesmen, about whom retailers responded, received questionnaires pertaining to the salesman's behavioral concepts as they related to each retailer. Of this total group of salesmen, 35 returned all questionnaires they received. Thus, 103 total responses were received from salesmen resulting in a maximum of 103 matched retailer-salesman pairs.

Only two sales managers provided information regarding their "ideal" concepts of salesman behavior in the selling situation.

Summary. The following summarizes the matched pair N's for the various criteria.

Percentage of Business 97
Number of Suppliers 87
Gross Volume Contributed 103
Supervisor's Performance Rating 66

The salesman's job

In Chapter I, selling was described in traditional terms. Here the concern is the more specific description of the selling job in the firms used in this study. In an earlier study of wholesale drug salesmen, Davis (1948) describes the requirements of the wholesale drug salesman's job.

Advice and Assistance to Retailer—The wholesale drug salesman has one of the most difficult jobs in the entire field of selling. In the first place, the salesman knows that only through the success of his customers can he succeed. The retail store owner, his college training usually limited to
training in pharmacy, often knows nothing about the other aspects of his business except for what he has learned through experience. As a result, the salesman needs to be familiar with all phases of retail sales promotion. He should understand the principles of display, clerk training, store layout, and all the subjects going to make up this field. The average retailer has usually one person—the wholesale druggist's salesman—to whom he can turn for unbiased advice and assistance.

The salesman must also have sufficient merchandising knowledge to become the unofficial buyer for the retailer. He must know whether the druggist sells his merchandise aggressively or simply allows his customers to buy. The salesman must know something of the buying habits of the customers in his territory, and for each individual store. He must subordinate selling to the needs of the retailer, for he knows that he will be back the next week and the next. A counter full of unsold stock, or inventory gathering dust in the storeroom, increases neither the desire nor the ability of the retailer to buy more merchandise. In this connection, the policies of sales managers frequently are responsible for the salesman's failure to give the needs of the retailer first consideration. Often, the salesman is faced with quotas and drives which may be set arbitrarily, particularly on a house line, so that he either falls down on his quota or is forced to over-sell. Salesmen usually dislike drives and special promotions, often with justification. The attitude of many salesmen is summed up in the following comment, made by a salesman from the upper third of his house:

I believe that the average house stresses a few particular lines or items too much, and does not give proper time to the over-all coverage of the wholesale drug field. The quota system (leads to) the following: Jones and Brown work for the same house. The sales manager breaks a deal. Jones goes out and does a good job at the expense of letting everything else go. Brown does a mediocre job on the deal, although he does an excellent selling job on the other items, probably earning more than Jones, making more for the house, and certainly doing a better job for his customers, but Jones gets a pat on the back and Brown is a bum that week....if anything could be done to discourage deals in the drug field it will, in my opinion, be a good step for the retailer, the wholesaler, and the salesmen.

And, from a retailer, a statement in a similar vein:

Salesmen should not and must not push "deals" in order to create gross volume for the wholesaler or
an extra FM for himself. A successful sale is when the consumer is carrying the merchandise out the front door and not when the retailer is storing it in his cellar. It is very unfair to expect salesmen to sell a definite number of items.

Knowledge of Products and Stock—In the second place, the salesman must have some knowledge of the several thousand different items handled by the wholesale house—15,000 is a conservative estimate. He must know off-hand the cost, sizes, retail prices, number packed in a carton, and discount schedules of possibly 1,500 of the most common of these items, and, must be reasonably familiar with this information for hundreds more. If he is to serve his customers adequately, he must know instantly the hundreds of deals currently in effect and keep abreast of the additions and deletions.

It is not enough, however, that he be familiar with the cost, sizes, and prices of the merchandise he sells. The wholesale drug salesman is selling a highly technical line of products to buyers who know many of these products intimately. If he is to talk intelligently to these buyers, he must have some knowledge of the qualities and uses of the products he is handling. While it is not essential that he understand the compounding of prescriptions, he must know the basic facts about the pharmaceuticals, biologicals, drugs and chemicals he is selling. Furthermore, he must keep himself informed of the hundreds of new items appearing in this field every year. Even a knowledge of the professional items he is selling is not sufficient, for among the products in his catalog are such diverse items as face powder, electric shavers, heating pads, first aid supplies, and vitamins. The salesman must understand, and pass on to the retailer, the main selling points about each.

Furthermore, if he is to function efficiently, he must be familiar with all the major laws relating to the drug field. He must know whether the products he is selling take a cosmetic or luxury tax. He must be familiar with the laws regulating the use of narcotics, and know which of the drugs he sells are classed under this heading. He must know the laws regulating the use and sale of poisons, the items that can be sold in patent medicine or permit stores, and regulations concerning Fair Trade and the Pure Food and Drug laws.

Knowledge of Salesmanship—In the third place, the salesman must understand the elements of salesmanship. One student defines salesmanship as "the art, or power, or ability of influencing others to accept your point of view." Even though the salesman bases his approach on service to his customers, he must still "sell" these customers on the desirability of his proposals.
Basically, then, the job of the wholesale drug salesman consists of three requirements. First, to understand retailing and the problems of the retailers in order that he can assist them in selling successfully; second, to understand his own merchandise sufficiently well to discuss it intelligently; and, third, to be familiar with the selling techniques required to sell the merchandise he believes the retailer needs. His job, if handled properly, is a difficult and varied undertaking and requires a broad background of knowledge. Obviously, it is not properly handled in all cases.

Criteria

In Chapter I it was suggested that in large part the research on role consensus and expectation used performance ratings by a superior in the organization as "success" criteria. In this study, the buyer-seller relationship will be analyzed using the following criteria.

Performance ratings. The sales manager from each participating wholesaler rated each salesman included in the study. The rating was accomplished on the Performance Rating Form (see Appendix E). The factors for rating were derived from Davis’s (1949) earlier description of the wholesale drug salesman’s job. Each factor was rated on a five point scale. The following factors were used in the rating process; understanding of the retailer's problems, understanding of his own merchandise, familiarity with selling techniques, and initiative. The total score received on the rating sheet was used as the criterion but grouped in class intervals (see Appendix F).

Percentage of customer's business. The percentage of business that a given retailer does with a wholesaler will be related to various consensus measures (to be discussed later). This measure gives an
estimate of the salesman's ability to secure business. It tends to equate differences in volume of retail business that occur because of retailer size. For example, a salesman who obtains all the business of a retailer selling $100,000 per year will be considered equal to the salesman who obtains all the business of a retailer selling $250,000 per year (see Appendix F).

**Number of other suppliers.** This factor suggests the ability of the salesman to obtain and maintain the loyalty of a customer. It is suggested here that the greater the consensus between buyer and seller, the smaller the number of other suppliers a retailer will have (see Appendix F).

**Gross volume added to the wholesaler.** The average consensus between a salesman and all customers who respond about him will be related to the total gross volume added to the firm by that salesman (see Appendix F). This criterion suggests the ability of the salesman to generate sales volume. It should be pointed out that gross volume added to the firm is not the best measure of a salesman's contribution. The contribution margin added by salesmen would provide a better measure of effectiveness. The contribution margin, as used here, refers to the contribution to profit of the business obtained by a given salesman. It is difficult to assess the contribution of an individual salesman by multiplying the gross margin percentage by the volume generated by that salesman. The margin for each individual item must be summed since one salesman might sell more higher margin items than another. However, for purposes of this study, this contribution margin
was not available. It is assumed here that the gross volume added is highly related to the amount of net margin added.

**High and low producing situations.** High producing situations have been defined for purposes of this study to occur when a salesman obtains a larger share of the business of a customer, relative to other salesmen who call on that retailer. Thus, if a salesman secures 20% of the volume of a customer who spreads the other 80% evenly among eight other wholesalers, it is considered to be a high producing situation. Conversely, if he secured only 10% of the same retailer's business and another salesman obtained 20%, the second situation would be considered a low producing situation.

**High and low producing salesmen.** This criteria will be used to dichotomize salesmen into high producing and low producing groups. While only two firms were used in the study, these may be viewed as four autonomous units since one firm had three branch outlets. From each unit, the top 20% of the salesmen in gross volume generated to the firm were classified as high producing salesmen and the lowest 20% were considered to be low producing salesmen.

**Development of the salesman's behavior scale**

In order to measure the role consensus between the drug salesman and the retailer, a scale has been developed which has as the core of each item some specific behavior a salesman performs. The following technique was used in the development of the scale.
**Item development.** One of the participating wholesalers selected four salesmen with whom the investigator traveled. Each salesman was observed in the selling situation with several retailers. As the salesman began a different activity, a note was made by the observer pertaining to that activity. For instance, if the salesman began to check inventories without first obtaining permission from the retailer, it was so noted.

Some items were developed by a technique similar to Flanagan's (1949) "critical incident" method. Salesmen were asked if they could recall any behavior to which they could directly attribute either a successful or a lost sale. Additionally, items for the scale were developed from salesman evaluation forms and job descriptions provided by the wholesalers (see Appendix D).

A series of 70 items was developed in this manner to be pre-tested. Many of the items seem to overlap, but a reasonable difference in the wording of the items is noticeable. This fact warranted inclusion in the pre-test of all 70 items.

**Item selection.** The items developed by observation were prepared and pre-tested. The questionnaires were administered to nine pharmacists responsible for buying decisions in their stores (see Appendix A). The questionnaires contained identical items and directions with one **significant** exception. On one questionnaire the respondents were asked to keep in mind the **best** salesman who called on them. On the second questionnaire, the respondents were asked to keep in mind the **worst** salesman who called on them. In this manner, it was possible
to obtain behavioral items that discriminated between good and bad salesmen, at least from the buyer's point of view.

The respondents were asked in the pre-test to indicate the frequency that a salesman engaged in the behavior as indicated in the items. The following values and responses were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Rarely or never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Don't know or it doesn't matter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Always or almost always</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the frequency of role behavior for good and bad salesmen, as perceived by the person normally making the buying decision, was obtained.

An example will best explain the technique used to determine which items were to be included in the final questionnaire to be administered to the retail sample. If the retailer felt that the best salesman who called on him always used a relaxed selling approach, he would respond as follows:

R I DK U (A) He uses a relaxed, easy approach in selling.

If the retailer perceived the worst salesman as using this same approach infrequently, his response would have been

R (I) DK U A He uses a relaxed easy approach in selling.

The value five is assigned to the first reply and the value 2 to the second response. The net difference obtained is -3. The absolute difference is 3. If the replies of the same retailer to this item were reversed, the net difference would have been +3.
The net difference for each item by respondent was obtained. It is apparent that many items had positive as well as negative differences. These differences were summed both absolutely and algebraically. For example, if the above item had differences of +3 and -3 the algebraic sum is 0 and the absolute sum is 6.

Items selected for the final mailed questionnaire to customers and salesmen were based on the following criteria

1. Items which had either a high positive or negative value were selected. The average difference between good and bad salesmen required for an acceptable item was arbitrarily set at 2. Therefore, items which can be associated highly with good or bad salesmen, as perceived by the customer were included.

2. Items which had a high absolute difference were selected. The average difference between perceptions of good and bad salesmen was maintained at 2. However, in this case, the sign (+ or -) of the difference obtained was disregarded. These items suggest behavior upon which the respondents did not agree as a group to be highly associated with either good or bad salesmen. Rather, they suggest the individual differences between retailers. For these items, some retailers thought that a good salesman always engaged in the activity indicated in the item, while other retailers thought a poor salesman always engaged in the same behavior.

3. Some items which had no discriminating value between good and bad salesmen were included to round out the number of items on the questionnaire.

The criteria used for item acceptance produced three kinds of items in the main section of the scale. First were those items or role behaviors which a large part of the respondents believed to discriminate generally between good and bad salesmen within the trade. Secondly were those items having high polarity, i.e. they are highly
associated with good or bad salesmen, but there is less general agreement as to whether the item is a norm accepted by a majority of retailers. Rather, it is an item which suggests strongly the personal preference of the individual retailer. Thirdly were items which had no discriminating power, but were utilized to round out the number of items on the scales and to avoid having only "socially acceptable" items (see Appendixes B and C).

Upon receipt of the questionnaires from the respondents, the items were further analyzed to determine if additional items should be deleted for analytical purposes. The Salesman Behavior Description Questionnaire completed by the retailer contained "actual" and "ideal" subscales (see Appendix B). The "actual" behavior subscale had a reliability coefficient of .8561. This suggests a high degree of homogeneity of items within the scale. Basically, 85% of the variation of the total scale score is explained by the items themselves. The other 15% can be attributed to error difference. The "ideal" subscale had a reliability coefficient of .8180.

The Salesman Behavior Description Questionnaire completed by the salesman also contained an "actual" and an "ideal" subscale (see Appendix C). The "actual" subscale had a reliability coefficient of .8330 and the "ideal" subscale, .8112.

These reliability coefficients were determined by analyzing each of the thirty-eight items in relation to the total score of the items on that subscale. On each subscale several items did not significantly correlate with the total subscale score (.05 level of significance).
There was only one item which was not significant on all four subscales. It was decided therefore, not to delete any items and use all thirty-eight items for purposes of the analysis.

**Actual and ideal behavior subscales.** In Chapter I, the concept of probability and desirability estimates was discussed. In order to determine both estimates for the respondents of the questionnaire, the items were worded in terms of what the retailer and the salesman perceived the "ideal" and "actual" behavior of salesmen to be.

If the retailer sees the behavior indicated in the item as being desirable, he will respond to the "ideal" behavior scale indicating to what extent a salesman should engage in that behavior. This response is the operational usage of the desirability estimate. The probability estimate of behavior is operationally defined as the "actual" responses to the items in the questionnaire. When the respondent checks these items, it is assumed that he will be indicating the way the salesman will probably act in his store. The questionnaire completed by salesmen also included "actual" and "ideal" estimates of behavior for dealing with specific customers.

**Scoring techniques**

The questionnaires were completed by the retailers. When the responses were received, the salesmen who called on the responding retailers were given questionnaires to be completed.

The salesman's questionnaire contained the same items included in the retailers' questionnaire. Thus it was possible to obtain a
comparison between the conception of the salesman and the customer concerning the frequency with which salesmen should engage in the aspect of role behavior described by the item.

In scoring the questionnaires, the response of the salesman for a given item is subtracted from the response of the customer. For example, the salesman may respond as follows to an item.

The ideal salesman

R  I  DK  U  (A) Uses a relaxed easy approach in selling.

The retailer may respond to the same item as follows

The ideal salesman

(R) I  DK  U  A Uses a relaxed easy approach in selling.

The difference is 4 (or the value 1 assigned to the retailer's response of R subtracted from the value 5 assigned to the salesman's response of A). Positive and negative values will not be considered since consensus, rather than direction of agreement is the factor under study. Thus, if a salesman and customer agree on a given item in the questionnaire, the disparity will be zero, or consensus will be high. If they disagree, the disparity may be as high as four (on a Likert-type scale, with response values from one to five). For each set of paired responses between customer and salesman, the differences for each item will be summed. The consensus measurements will be analyzed with the criteria previously discussed in this chapter.

Consensus will be determined in the following manner for
analytical purposes (see Appendix G for raw data difference scores used in the analysis of variance with the stated criteria).

1. Actual behavior of the salesman minus the ideal behavior of the salesman (both perceptions by the customer).
2. Actual behavior of the salesman (perceived by the customer) minus the actual behavior of the salesman (perceived by the salesman).
3. Ideal behavior of the salesman (perceived by the customer) minus the ideal behavior of the salesman (perceived by the salesman).
4. Actual behavior of the salesman minus the ideal behavior of the salesman (both perceptions by the salesman).
5. Ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the sales manager) minus the ideal behavior of the salesman (perceived by the salesman).
6. Ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the sales manager) minus the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman).

**Statistical techniques**

In order to examine the hypotheses previously stated, the following techniques were used.

**Variance analysis.** A one way analysis of variance was performed for hypotheses I through VII, XI and XII. The classes were defined by the criterion stated in the hypothesis being tested (See Appendix F). The variance between classes was tested against the variance within classes. The within class variance is the "chance" variance (Mills, 1955). The F ratio was used to test the significance of the relationship between consensus measures and the criteria.

**t tests.** The t test was used to determine if the mean responses of high volume producing salesmen were significantly different from low volume producing salesmen. It was also used to test for
significant differences in responses between salesmen in high producing and low producing situations. The F ratio was used to test the significance of variances in both cases. These tests were used in testing hypotheses XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI.

Correlation. Correlation coefficients were obtained to determine the extent of the relationship between factors specified in hypotheses IX and X.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter is a restatement of the hypotheses stated in Chapter I and a presentation of the findings of the statistical analysis of the data. Tables are included with the relevant statistical data (Appendix G contains all raw data used in the analysis of variance).

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I stated, "The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer." The analysis of the data revealed no significant relationships between consensus and the criteria (see Table 1).
Table 1
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percentage of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14376</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11979</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II stated, "The consensus between the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer." The analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and the criteria (see Table 2).
Table 2

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F,.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percentage of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9450</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7474</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III stated, "The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer." The analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and the percentage of business. The relationship between consensus and the number of suppliers is significant ($F = 4.86, p \leq .05$) (see Table 3).
Table 3

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F .95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percentage of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26823</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Number of Suppliers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21908</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV stated, "The consensus between the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer." The analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and the percentage of business. There is a significant relationship, however, between the consensus measure and the number of suppliers (F = 3.26, p ≤ .05) (see Table 4).
Table 4
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percentage of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14518</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10852</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V stated, "The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) and the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating." The analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and the criteria (see Table 5).
Table 5

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F .95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gross Volume Contributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14668</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supervisor's Performance Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14980</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis VI

Hypothesis VI stated, "The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the salesman) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating." The analysis of data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and gross volume contributed. The relationship between consensus and the supervisor's performance rating is significant ($F = 4.21$, $p \leq .05$) (see Table 6).
Table 6
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F .95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gross Volume Contributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9846</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supervisor's Performance Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9498</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis VII

Hypothesis VII stated, "The average consensus between customers and a salesman with respect to the actual behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) and the ideal behavior of the salesman (as perceived by the customer) is related to (1) the gross volume contributed to the firm by that salesman and (2) the supervisor's performance rating." Analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between the consensus measure and the criteria (see Table 7).
Table 7
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gross Volume Contributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29811</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supervisor's Performance Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29709</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis VIII

Hypothesis VIII stated, "There is a significant difference between the percentage of business obtained by salesmen who have only business contacts with customers and those who have social and professional contacts." The analysis of the data revealed no significant difference between the two groups (see Table 8).
Table 8

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Difference Between Salesmen Who Have Only Business Contacts With Customers and Salesmen Who Have Professional and Social Contacts, Hypothesis VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only Business Contacts (% of Business)</th>
<th>Social and Professional Contacts (% of Business)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>20.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis IX

Hypothesis IX stated, "There is a significant positive correlation between the actual age of the salesman and (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer, (2) the number of suppliers of the customer, and (3) the gross volume contributed to the firm by the salesman." The following results were obtained.

Table 9

Summary of Correlation Data, Hypothesis IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Business</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Suppliers</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Volume Contributed</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation coefficients of age with the percentage of business, number of suppliers and gross volume contributed were not significant.

Hypothesis X

Hypothesis X stated, "There is a significant correlation between the length of business contact of a buyer and a seller and (1) the percentage of business obtained from a given customer and (2) the number of suppliers of the customer." The correlation hypothesis is rejected for length of business contact and percentage of business. The correlation between length of contact and number of suppliers is not significant (see Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Correlation Data, Hypothesis X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>r</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis XI

Hypothesis XI stated, "The consensus between the sales manager's concept of ideal salesman performance and the salesman's concept of ideal salesman's performance is related to the performance rating by the supervisor." Analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship
between consensus and the performance rating of the salesman by his supervisor (see Table 11).

### Table 11

**Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F .95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12436</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis XII**

Hypothesis XII stated, "The consensus between the sales manager's concept of ideal salesman's performance and the salesman's concept of actual salesman's performance is related to the performance rating by the supervisor." Analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between consensus and the criterion (see Table 12).

### Table 12

**Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Variance, Hypothesis XII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F .95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Classes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11507</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis XIII

Hypothesis XIII stated, "The ideal conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for salesmen in high producing and low producing situations." The analysis of the data revealed no significant differences (see Table 13).

Table 13

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Differences in Ideal Conceptions of Salesman's Performance by Salesmen in High Producing and Low Producing Situations, Hypothesis XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Producing Situations</th>
<th>Low Producing Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>138.42</td>
<td>138.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis XIV

Hypothesis XIV stated, "The actual conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for salesmen in high producing and low producing situations." The analysis of the data revealed no significant differences (see Table 14).
Table 14
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Differences in Actual Conceptions of Salesman's Performance by Salesmen in High Producing and Low Producing Situations, Hypothesis XIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Producing Situations</th>
<th>Low Producing Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>129.51</td>
<td>130.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis XV

Hypothesis XV stated, "The actual conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for high volume producing salesmen and low volume producing salesmen." There was no significant difference in mean response of the two groups. However, the variation in responses was significantly greater for low producing salesmen (F = 2.31, p ≤ .05) (see Table 15).
Table 15

Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Differences in Actual Conceptions of Salesman's Performance by High Volume Producing and Low Volume Producing Salesmen, Hypothesis XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Volume Producers</th>
<th>Low Volume Producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>138.60</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31 (p ≤ .05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis XVI

Hypothesis XVI stated, "The ideal conceptions of salesman performance by salesmen are significantly different for high volume producing salesmen and low volume producing salesmen." There was a significant difference in mean responses of the two groups (t = 3.504, p ≤ .05). The high volume producing salesman's mean responses were significantly greater than those of the low volume producers (see Table 16).
Table 16
Summary of Computations for the Analysis of Differences in Ideal Conceptions of Salesman's Performance by High Volume and Low Volume Producing Salesmen, Hypothesis XVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Volume Producers</th>
<th>Low Volume Producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>146.47</td>
<td>134.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>3.504 (p ≤ .05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the results obtained when the data were analyzed. Of the sixteen hypotheses tested, ten were completely rejected.

The discussion presented in this chapter will deal primarily with the expectations of buyer and seller, role consensus between buyer and seller, role consensus between salesmen and their sales manager, and differences in the perception of the selling job between high volume and low volume producing salesmen. It should be noted that the discussion presents explanations of the results which should be regarded as tentative. They are suggested by the author to explain why the relationships occurred as they did.

High producing and low producing salesmen differences

Hypotheses XV and XVI were designed to examine the difference between high volume and low volume producing salesmen with respect to their ideal and actual concepts of the selling job in the wholesale drug industry. In viewing the actual performance of salesmen, the low producing salesmen's responses had a significantly greater variance than those of high producing salesmen ($F = 2.31, p \leq .05$) (see Table 15). The low producers perceived they actually engaged in the behaviors indicated in the scale items with a wider range of frequencies than high...
producing salesmen. In developing the scales, items were included which were considered to be normative by druggists. If the salesmen are, in fact, behaving differently in different situations and not conforming to normative industry practices, the customer may view their activities as not being consistent with preferred practice. This may result in reducing the ability of the salesman to successfully complete transactions with the customer.

Hypothesis XVI, dealing with the difference between ideal conceptions of performance of high producing and low producing salesmen, was accepted (see Table 16). In general, the high volume producing salesmen look at the task of selling as engaging in the behaviors indicated on the scales with a significantly greater frequency than low volume producing salesmen \( (t = 3.504, p \leq .05) \). The high producers perceive themselves ideally as performing services and functions for the retailer more often. This difference in perceptions might be a reflection of the enthusiasm they have for their job that carries over to the retailer. The retailer feels that the salesman is trying to help perform the retailing function more effectively and rewards him with increased sales volume. The salesman who is the high producer apparently feels that the more he can do for a given customer, the more effective he is as a salesman. This finding concerning high producing salesmen suggests validity of Davis' service objective, which basically states that to be effective, the organization and its members must be primarily concerned with the task of supplying the right goods
and services to the market, at the right time, in the right place, and in the right quantity (Davis, 1951).

The acceptance of these two hypotheses indicates that successful salesman (as defined by their gross volume contribution to the firm) do have different perceptions of their jobs, both ideally and actually, from unsuccessful salesmen. Are successful salesmen more effective because they have different perceptions of the job? Or, do they have significantly different concepts of the job because the task of selling to their specific customers requires less time, consequently they have more time to spend with customers personally and believe they should perform these activities frequently to repay the customer for the large volume of business? Obviously, it is difficult to establish causation using statistical techniques. Therefore, it seems most reasonable to suggest only that this difference between high and low producers does exist and that there is a relationship between salesmen's perception of their roles and behaviors as salesmen, and the salesman's effectiveness in generating gross volume. In any case, the findings here suggest that the conclusions of Smith (1957) be reviewed in light of the difference in criteria used in both studies. Smith found that flexibility of self perception was related to role success (defined by the performance rating of a superior). If the responses to the "Actual" Behavior Scale are considered to be similar to Smith's concept of self perception, then flexibility of self perception is not related to role success (when defined as gross volume of sales generated), since the variability of responses was significantly greater for low volume producing salesmen.
Role consensus

One of the major aims of this study was to determine if there was any relationship between role consensus and the effectiveness criteria. Roles refer to the behavior of occupants of positions. They are based on norms. Roles are sets of norms regarding the behavior of occupants of positions. They are ideas of what "ought" to be done. An attempt was made to arrive at this idea of "oughtness" by using an "Ideal" Behavior Scale. It was assumed that if the respondent indicates what the ideal behavior is in a certain situation, this would closely approximate his concept of the role. By comparing therefore, the responses of two individuals to the "Ideal" scales, it is possible to determine to what extent there is agreement between them concerning role behavior. This agreement in perceptions of the role may be termed role consensus. Hypotheses II and VI concern themselves with role consensus between the salesman and the customer with respect to the salesman's job. Hypotheses XI and XII represent attempts to examine role consensus between the sales manager and the salesmen he supervises with respect to the salesman's job.

Role consensus between buyer and seller. There was not a significant relationship between buyer-seller role consensus and the criteria of percentage of purchases or number of suppliers used in the study. Apparently, the extent of agreement between the buyer and the seller with respect to normative behavior is not an important factor in the case at hand. It seems than that mere agreement concerning what "should" be done in the selling situation by a salesman is not related
in any way to the success of a salesman in dealings with a given customer (using percentage of business or number of suppliers as a success criteria). However, a significant relationship does occur between the average consensus between buyers and seller and the performance rating received by the salesman from his superior (F = 4.21, p ≤ .05) (see Table 6). In examining this relationship on a scatter diagram, a bimodal distribution of differences occurs. Initially, as the consensus decreases (or the difference scores increase) the performance rating increases. However, the difference scores begin to decrease while the performance rating is still increasing. Then the difference increases along with a performance rating increase. The meaning of this relationship is obscure at best. It is an area in which further research is required to develop explanations.

Another suggestion might be advanced to suggest why buyer-salesman role consensus was not found to be a significant factor. Perhaps in this industry the role of the salesman is not the key factor in obtaining business from a customer. Other factors may be more important. The extent to which there is consensus with other factors might be the critical variable. True, role consensus might be important. However, the role consensus between the buyer and the wholesale firm may be the most important variable when examining the extent to which a customer places a certain percentage of business with a salesman.
Role consensus between salesmen and the sales manager

When role consensus between the salesmen and the sales manager was analyzed with performance ratings, no significant relationship was found (see Table 11). Thus, role consensus was not related to higher ratings by the boss as found in previous studies (for example see Taves, Corwin, and Haas, 1963).

It was suggested earlier that most supervisor's performance ratings are biased by interpersonal factors, rather than being based on actual performance (Kallejian, Brown and Weschler, 1962). In this study when the supervisor was asked to complete the rating sheet, he also ranked the salesmen by gross volume contributed to the firm. It is conceivable that this gross volume ranking forced him to be more objective, i.e., base his rating on performance criteria rather than personal considerations. It is also possible that the performance ratings by the sales managers in these firms do not reflect the interpersonal biases usually present.

If, then, supervisor subordinate role consensus is related to performance ratings, as suggested in earlier studies, it might be that it is an important factor within the organization but not so significant with individuals outside the organization. This might be the case for any number of reasons. For a salesman, it would be difficult, if not impossible to ascertain how all his customers view his role and fit his own perceptions of role behavior to each customer's notions. Such a situation would probably lead to a good deal of role conflict and
frustration on the part of the salesman, perhaps significantly affecting his total performance in the organization.

**Expectations**

Hypotheses III, IV and VII were designed to test the relationship of expectation to the criteria. Expectation has been earlier defined as "a function of drive, the estimated probability of the occurrence of a possible outcome and the estimated desirability of the outcome" (Stogdill, 1959). In order to assess the effect of expectations of both buyers and salesmen, the responses to the "Ideal" and "Actual" subscales for an individual were compared. When the difference is high, the expectation level is considered to be high, or the individual is "ready for reinforcement." By asking the subject to respond to a questionnaire item indicating the "ideal" behavior in a situation, a measure of the desirability estimate may be obtained. By obtaining a response to an item indicating the "actual" behavior in a situation, a probability estimate may be obtained.

**Buyer's expectations.** It was hypothesized that when the expectation level of a buyer was low (or he perceived little difference between the actual and ideal behavior of a salesman) that there would exist a significant relationship with the percentage of business the salesmen obtained. This hypothesis was rejected (see Table 3). There was, however, a significant relationship between the expectation level of the buyer and his number of suppliers ($F = 4.86, p \leq .05$).
Thus, when the difference between "ideal" and "actual" responses was large, the number of suppliers was high. When the difference was low, the number of suppliers was low.

It is suggested that when the buyer perceives the salesman's actual performance to be similar to his concept of ideal performance, the number of sources from which purchases are made is low. Perhaps the customer feels that his needs can be satisfied by the behavior of the salesman. However, this does not mean that this condition results in a larger percentage of purchases from the salesman. It suggests that expectation level and satisfaction allows the salesman to get into the store. The customer's level of expectation seems to be a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for effective salesman performance. These findings are similar to those cited earlier by Evans (1963). He concluded "The more similar the parties in a dyad are, the more likely ... a sale." The conclusion here suggests that in addition to physical characteristics and objective factors cited by Evans, the customer's perception of how well the behavior of a salesman fits the customer's perception of what that behavior should be, is a necessary condition before dyadic interaction can continue.

Salesmen's expectations. It was hypothesized that the level of salesman's expectation would be related to the percentage of business and the number of suppliers of the customer. There was no significant relationship between expectation level and percentage of business. However, a significant relationship was found between expectation level and the number of suppliers ($F = 3.26, p \leq .05$) (see Table 4).
Inspection of a scatter diagram revealed a curvilinear relationship. When the number of suppliers was small, the expectation level of the salesmen was low, i.e., there was little difference between the actual ideal response of the salesmen. As the expectation level increased, the number of suppliers increased to a point. Then, as expectation level decreased, the number of suppliers increased.

This might be explained by changing concepts of ideal and actual performance on the part of the salesman. In cases where the number of suppliers is low, the salesman has concepts of ideal and actual performance which are similar, i.e., he feels he is performing as he should. This might result from the fact that the number of suppliers is small. The increase in expectation level occurs for a time with the increase in number of suppliers. The salesman may feel that with this middle range of suppliers, he is not able to obtain business because he is not performing his tasks as he should be. His ideal concept of performance is still much different from his actual concept. His ideal performance conception perhaps represents the way he could eliminate competitors. Finally the lower expectation level with larger numbers of suppliers might occur because at this stage the salesman has accepted the competitive situation. His ideal concept of performance represents a situation where he realizes that he cannot eliminate competition so he lowers the ideal concept to coincide with his actual concept of his behavior.

It does not seem reasonable to suggest that salesman's expectations are a factor in determining the number of suppliers. It
seems more reasonable to suggest that this relationship occurs because of the number of suppliers the customer has. Basically, then, salesman's expectations appear to be a function of the number of suppliers, rather than vice versa.

Summary

The study examined the relationship between expectations and role consensus as well as other factors that might be related to successful salesman performance. Role consensus between buyer and seller was not a significant factor for the criteria of salesman's effectiveness as measured by number of suppliers and gross volume of the salesman. It was suggested that this might result from having to deal with so many customers. It was found, contrary to the results of other studies concluded, that role consensus between the salesman and the sales manager is not related to performance ratings by the supervisor.

Role consensus is perhaps more important within the organization than without. It may be that further research will reveal an important relationship between role consensus of buyer and seller in different types of selling situations where more creative salesmanship is required. Role consensus between a subordinate and a supervisor may help the subordinate secure a promotion because his supervisor thinks highly of him, but it does not seem so important as customer expectations in aiding in the securing of business.

Customer expectation levels seem to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for selling. This conclusion supports Evans' (1963) work cited earlier. Evans concludes that a sale occurs when
the customer's expectation is satisfied. This study shows that the salesman who is perceived by the customer as meeting the customer's expectations is more likely to have less competition from other salesmen.

It might be suggested here that the salesman must develop an insight into customer concepts of ideal salesman's performance and attempt to adapt his behavior to those ideal concepts. Other factors, however, must be examined to determine the answer to the question "Why does the customer buy from one wholesaler and not another?"
SALESMA N'S DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
(PRE-TEST)

This questionnaire is being developed by the Bureau of Business Research at The Ohio State University to study the selling function. This phase of the study is concerned with wholesale drug salesmen. You are requested to help. The statements are an attempt to determine the frequency that salesmen engage in behaviors indicated.

Imagine the WORST (or BEST) drug salesman that you have dealt with. Indicate the frequency that he has engaged in the behavior as stated in each item.

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CHOICE IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN.
The symbols are explained below.

R - Rarely or never engages in the behavior
I - Infrequently engages in the behavior
DK - You don't know or it doesn't matter whether or not he does
S - He sometimes engages in the behavior
A - He always or almost always does it.

For example, if the salesman always checks inventory without consulting you, you would answer in the following manner;

R I DK S A He checks shelf and inventory stock without consulting the retailer.

If he rarely knows where items are located in the store, you would respond as follows;

R I DK S A He knows where items are located in the store.

If you don't know, or it does not matter to you whether he knows where the items are, you would respond as follows;

R I DK S A He knows where items are located in the store.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE.
A He tries to sell the retailer without regard to his (the retailer's) mood at the time.

A He asks the retailer to buy from him.

A He keeps trying to make a sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

A He shows the retailer the selling points of the items being sold.

A He tries to sell items which result in the highest margin for the wholesaler.

A He tries to tell the retailer about all the items the wholesaler carries in his inventory.

A He carefully checks the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.

A He does not tell the retailer about all the "deals" he has available.

A He helps the retailer prepare advertising.

A He gives advance notice of special manufacturer's promotions to permit the retailer to coordinate his own promotional activities.

A He completes as much of his sales work as possible before beginning to talk to the retailer.

A He suggests items when he is sure the retailer is low.

A If the wholesaler cannot fill an order, the salesman informs the retailer when delivery will be made.

A He checks recent invoices from his house to insure the retailer receives proper discounts, credits, and merchandise.

A When the retailer prepares an order blank, the salesman informs him when additional purchases will result in larger discounts or "deals."

A He informs the retailers about quantity discounts and merchandise bonuses.

A He contacts manufacturer's representatives to handle problems in stores beyond his (the salesman's) scope.
R I DK S A He gives the retailer free samples of items to sell.
R I DK S A He helps the retailer plan special store promotions.
R I DK S A He informs the retailer of items moving well in other drug stores.
R I DK S A He informs the retailer of price changes on fast moving items.
R I DK S A He invites the retailer for coffee (or a break) before discussing business.
R I DK S A He calls stock shortages to the attention of the retailer.
R I DK S A He takes care of credits and returns to the wholesaler before discussing any business.
R I DK S A He sends new "deals" to the retailer without consulting him.
R I DK S A He suggests that the retailer not purchase items if he (the salesman) finds it moving slow in the store.
R I DK S A He waits on customers when traffic is heavy in the store.
R I DK S A He checks inventories after consulting the retailer.
R I DK S A He verbally tells the retailer what items are short.
R I DK S A He checks shelf and inventory stock without consulting the retailer.
R I DK S A He tells the druggist how many items are needed to fill shelf inventory.
R I DK S A He prepares a written list of pharmaceuticals that are low for the retailer.
R I DK S A He checks with the pharmacist to determine the speed at which pharmaceuticals are moving.
R I DK S A He has sufficient information on new pharmaceuticals to suggest the speed with which the drug will move.
R I DK S A He informs the retailers of the current "deals" offered by the wholesaler.
R I DK S A He knows what the retailer sells.
R I DK S A  He knows where the items are located in the store.

R I DK S A  He suggests items or promotions that will fit in with the character of the store.

R I DK S A  He advises on store layout to move products more quickly.

R I DK S A  He informs the retailer about other retailer's experience with similar "deals."

R I DK S A  He informs the druggist about other retailer's experience with similar products.

R I DK S A  He accepts returns from retailers without question.

R I DK S A  He moves shelf stock to a more prominent shelf position.

R I DK S A  He informs drug retailers about local business trends.

R I DK S A  He knows about recent price changes on the products he sells.

R I DK S A  He continues talking about the merchandise after the retailer has decided to buy.

R I DK S A  He does not suggest items that he thinks cannot be sold in a normal period.

R I DK S A  He obtains extra credits for retailers whenever possible, i.e., he may take back merchandise that the retailer does not want in the store even though it is still good merchandise.

R I DK S A  He accepts returns of merchandise bought from another house, so long as his firm handles it also.

R I DK S A  He provides new product information.

R I DK S A  When he knows of other retailer's experience, he informs the retailer of the probable movement speed of the goods.

R I DK S A  He informs the retailer about manufacturer "guaranteed sales."

R I DK S A  He strongly urges the retailer to purchase "guaranteed sales."
R I DK S A He arranges for inter-store transfers of merchandise between any of his customers when the goods are moving at different speeds in different stores.

R I DK S A He uses a relaxed, easy approach in selling.

R I DK S A He calls at regular intervals on the retailers.

R I DK S A He permits several retailers to split a high cost order so that they may save on the quantity discount.

R I DK S A He takes more returns from his larger customers.

R I DK S A He helps the retailer obtain the least cost combination on purchases.

R I DK S A He allows larger returns from retailers who make a greater percentage of their purchases from him than from other salesmen.

R I DK S A He has an aggressive sales approach.

R I DK S A When he is not sure of item turnover, he does not try to sell it to the retailer.

R I DK S A He informs the retailers about pharmaceuticals and other items being detailed.

R I DK S A He offers new and different items as soon as he knows they are available.

R I DK S A He offers selling hints to retail store personnel to make them more effective.

R I DK S A When he is uncertain about item turnover, he suggests it be tried by the retailer.

R I DK S A When he sells the retailer products not previously handled, he personally "guarantees" the sale.

R I DK S A He offers "deals" and specials before suggesting other items.

R I DK S A He presents the merchandise or "deals" before giving the retailer a chance to ask questions about them.

R I DK S A He asks for questions from the retailer during sales presentations.
APPENDIX B
SALESMAN INFORMATION

Please answer to the best of your ability the following questions about the salesman from (Name of wholesaler).

A. Salesman's name ____________________________  B. Age ___________
C. How long has he called on you ____ (YRS.) ____ (MOS.)
D. Do you ever see him any time other than on business? YES ____ NO
E. If yes, briefly describe when, how often, and what you do. __________

SECTION II

This section of the questionnaire is to determine how the salesman from (Name of wholesaler) performs in your store. Indicate the extent to which he actually engages in the behavior indicated in the item.

Circle the extent to which you think the salesman would actually engage in the behavior indicated.

R Rarely or never  U Usually
I Infrequently  A Always or almost always
DK Don't know or it doesn't matter

Thus, if the salesman usually completes most of his sales work before beginning to talk to the retailer, then you would respond in the following manner:

THE SALESMAN FROM THE ABOVE MENTIONED FIRM . . .

R I DK U A completes as much of the sales work as possible before beginning to talk to the retailer.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY

_____________________________________

THE SALESMAN FROM (Name of Wholesaler)

R I DK U A presents the merchandise or "deals" before giving the retailer a chance to ask questions about them.
R I DK U A suggests the item be tried by the retailer when uncertain about item turnover.

R I DK U A keeps trying to make a sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

R I DK U A contacts manufacturers' representatives to handle problems in stores beyond his (the salesman's) scope.

R I DK U A calls at regular intervals on the retailers.

R I DK U A allows larger returns from retailers who make a greater percentage of their purchases from him than from other salesmen.

R I DK U A uses a relaxed, easy approach in selling.

R I DK U A asks for questions from the retailer during sales presentations.

R I DK U A completes as much of his sales work as possible before beginning to talk to the retailer.

R I DK U A knows what the retailer sells.

R I DK U A offers selling hints to retail store personnel.

R I DK U A gives advance notice of special manufacturers' promotions to permit the retailer to coordinate his own promotional activities.

R I DK U A informs the retailer of price changes on fast moving items.

R I DK U A informs the retailer about pharmaceuticals and other items being detailed.

R I DK U A obtains extra credits for retailers whenever possible, i.e., he may take back merchandise that the retailer does not want in the store even though it is still good merchandise.

R I DK U A suggests items or promotions that will fit in with the character of the store.

R I DK U A checks shelf and inventory stock without consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A sends new "deals" to the retailer without consulting him.
R I DK U A moves shelf stock to a more prominent shelf position.

R I DK U A takes more returns from his larger customers.

R I DK U A advises on store layout to move products.

R I DK U A has an aggressive sales approach.

R I DK U A tries to sell the retailer without regard to his (the retailer's) mood at the time.

R I DK U A continues talking about the merchandise after the retailer has decided to buy.

R I DK U A tries to tell the retailer about all the items the wholesaler carries in his inventory.

R I DK U A offers "deals" and specials before suggesting other items.

R I DK U A tells the druggist how many items are needed to fill shelf inventory.

R I DK U A informs the retailer when delivery will be made if the wholesaler cannot fill an order.

R I DK U A informs drug retailers about local business trends.

R I DK U A accepts returns from retailers without question.

R I DK U A takes care of credits and returns to the wholesaler before discussing any business.

R I DK U A permits several retailers to split a high cost order so that they may save on the quantity discount.

R I DK U A helps the retailer plan special store promotions.

R I DK U A carefully checks the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.

R I DK U A checks inventories after consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A informs the retailer of items moving well in other drug stores.

R I DK U A prepares a written list of pharmaceuticals that are low for the retailer.

R I DK U A checks the pharmacist to determine the speed at which pharmaceuticals are moving.
SECTION III

This section of the questionnaire is to determine how you think the "ideal" salesman from any full line-full service drug wholesale firm should behave in calling on and selling in your store.

Respond to all following items to the best of your ability, keeping in mind how or what the ideal salesman would do in the situation presented in the item. Circle the extent to which you think the "ideal" salesman would engage in the behavior indicated.

R Rarely or never
I Infrequently
DK Don't know or it doesn't matter
U Usually
A Always or almost always

If you feel that the ideal salesman always offers selling hints to retail store personnel, you would respond in the following manner.

THE IDEAL SALESMAN FROM A FULL LINE, FULL SERVICE DRUG WHOLESALER

R I DK U A offers selling hints to retail store personnel.

THE "IDEAL" SALESMAN FROM ANY FULL LINE, FULL SERVICE DRUG WHOLESALER . . .

R I DK U A presents the merchandise or "deals" before giving the retailer a chance to ask questions about them.

R I DK U A suggests the item be tried by the retailer when uncertain about item turnover.

R I DK U A keeps trying to make a sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

R I DK U A contacts manufacturers' representatives to handle problems in stores beyond his (the salesman's) scope.

R I DK U A calls at regular intervals on the retailers.

R I DK U A allows larger returns from retailers who make a greater percentage of their purchases from him than from other salesmen.

R I DK U A uses a relaxed, easy approach in selling.

R I DK U A asks for questions from the retailer during sales presentations.
R I DK U A moves shelf stock to a more prominent shelf position.
R I DK U A takes more returns from his larger customers.
R I DK U A advises on store layout to move products.
R I DK U A has an aggressive sales approach.
R I DK U A tries to sell the retailer without regard to his (the retailer's) mood at the time.
R I DK U A continues talking about the merchandise after the retailer has decided to buy.
R I DK U A tries to tell the retailer about all the items the wholesaler carries in his inventory.
R I DK U A offers "deals" and specials before suggesting other items.
R I DK U A tells the druggist how many items are needed to fill shelf inventory.
R I DK U A informs the retailer when delivery will be made if the wholesaler cannot fill an order.
R I DK U A informs drug retailers about local business trends.
R I DK U A accepts returns from retailers without question.
R I DK U A takes care of credits and returns to the wholesaler before discussing any business.
R I DK U A permits several retailers to split a high cost order so that they may save on the quantity discount.
R I DK U A helps the retailer plan special store promotions.
R I DK U A carefully checks the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.
R I DK U A checks inventories after consulting the retailer.
R I DK U A informs the retailer of items moving well in other drug stores.
R I DK U A prepares a written list of pharmaceuticals that are low for the retailer.
R I D K U A checks the pharmacist to determine the speed at which pharmaceuticals are moving.

SECTION IV - CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION

A. Your Age________ B. 1963 (calendar or fiscal year) gross volume of retail sales $__________ C. Average gross profit__________

D. What percentage of your gross volume could have been purchased from a full line, full service wholesaler__________

E. Number of suppliers of pharmaceuticals, sundries and proprietaries

F. Give the name of suppliers and approximate percentage you purchase from them.

_________________________________ %
_________________________________ %
_________________________________ %

(signature not necessary)

Please return to: BUREAU OF BUSINESS RESEARCH, 1775 South College Road
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, Columbus, Ohio 43210

Firm Code No. _____
PERSONAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Your name _____________________________________  B. Age__________

SECTION II

This section of the questionnaire is to determine your concept of how an ideal salesman should act in dealing with (Name of retailer).

Respond to the following items, keeping in mind how you think the "ideal" salesman would act in the above mentioned retailer's store in the situation presented in the item. Circle the extent to which you think the "ideal" salesman would engage in the behavior indicated:

R Rarely or never  U Usually
I Infrequently   A Always or almost always
DK Don't know or it doesn't matter

Thus, if in calling on the above store, you think the "ideal" salesman should always try to continue making the sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal, you would respond as follows:

WHEN CALLING ON THE ABOVE MENTIONED FIRM, THE IDEAL SALESMAN . .

R I DK U A keeps trying to make a sale even if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY.

WHEN CALLING ON (Name of retailer), THE IDEAL SALESMAN . .

R I DK U A presents the merchandise or "deals" before giving the retailer a chance to ask questions about them.

R I DK U A suggests the item be tried by the retailer when uncertain about item turnover.

R I DK U A keeps trying to make a sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

R I DK U A contacts manufacturers' representatives to handle problems in stores beyond his (the salesman's) scope.

R I DK U A calls at regular intervals on the retailers.
WHEN CALLING ON (Name of Retailer), THE IDEAL SALESMAN.

R I DK U A allows larger returns from retailers who make a greater percentage of their purchases from him than from other salesmen.

R I DK U A uses a relaxed, easy approach in selling.

R I DK U A asks for questions from the retailer during sales presentations.

R I DK U A completes as much of his sales work as possible before beginning to talk to the retailer.

R I DK U A knows what the retailer sells.

R I DK U A offers selling hints to retail store personnel.

R I DK U A gives advance notice of special manufacturers' promotions to permit the retailer to coordinate his own promotional activities.

R I DK U A informs the retailer of price changes on fast moving items.

R I DK U A informs the retailer about pharmaceuticals and other items being detailed.

R I DK U A obtains extra credits for retailers whenever possible, i.e., he may take back merchandise that the retailer does not want in the store even though it is still good merchandise.

R I DK U A suggests items or promotions that will fit in with the character of the store.

R I DK U A checks shelf and inventory stock without consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A sends new "deals" to the retailer without consulting him.

R I DK U A moves shelf stock to a more prominent shelf position.

R I DK U A takes more returns from his larger customers.

R I DK U A advises on store layout to move products.

R I DK U A has an aggressive sales approach.

R I DK U A tries to sell the retailer without regard to his (the retailer's) mood at the time.
WHEN CALLING ON ____________________________
(Name of Retailer)
THE IDEAL SALESMAN . . .

R I DK U A continues talking about the merchandise after the retailer has decided to buy.

R I DK U A tries to tell the retailer about all the items the wholesaler carries in his inventory.

R I DK U A offers "deals" and specials before suggesting other items.

R I DK U A tells the druggist how many items are needed to fill shelf inventory.

R I DK U A informs the retailer when delivery will be made if the wholesaler cannot fill an order.

R I DK U A informs drug retailers about local business trends.

R I DK U A accepts returns from retailers without question.

R I DK U A takes care of credits and returns to the wholesaler before discussing any business.

R I DK U A permits several retailers to split a high cost order so that they may save on the quantity discount.

R I DK U A helps the retailer plan special store promotions.

R I DK U A carefully checks the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.

R I DK U A checks inventories after consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A informs the retailer of items moving well in other drug stores.

R I DK U A prepares a written list of pharmaceuticals that are low for the retailer.

R I DK U A checks the pharmacist to determine the speed at which pharmaceuticals are moving.
SECTION III

This section of the questionnaire is to determine how you, as a salesman, actually act in your selling activities with (Name of Retailer).

Respond as accurately as you can. Indicate how you actually act in the above mentioned retailer's place of business in the situation presented in the item. Circle the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior indicated:

R Rarely or never
I Infrequently
DK Don't know or it doesn't matter
U Usually
A Always or almost always.

Thus, if in your dealings with the above retailer, you never carefully check the retailer's shelf and inventory stock, you would respond as follows:

IN DEALING WITH THE ABOVE FIRM, I, AS A SALES MAN . . .

R I DK U A carefully check the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY.

IN DEALING WITH (Name of Retailer), I, AS A SALES MAN ACTUALLY . . .

R I DK U A present the merchandise or "deals" before giving the retailer a chance to ask questions about them.

R I DK U A suggest the item to be tried by the retailer when uncertain about item turnover.

R I DK U A keep trying to make a sale if the retailer balks at the first proposal.

R I DK U A contact manufacturer's representatives to handle problems in stores beyond my scope.

R I DK U A call at regular intervals on the retailers.

R I DK U A allow larger returns from retailers who make a greater percentage of their purchases from me than from other salesmen.

R I DK U A use a relaxed, easy approach in selling.
IN DEALING WITH __________________________, (Name of Retailer)
I, AS A SALESMAN ACTUALLY ...

R I DK U A ask for questions from the retailer during sales presentations.

R I DK U A complete as much of the saleswork as possible before beginning to talk to the retailer.

R I DK U A know what the retailer sells.

R I DK U A offer selling hints to retail store personnel.

R I DK U A give advance notice of special manufacturer's promotions to permit the retailer to coordinate his own promotional activities.

R I DK U A inform the retailer of price changes on fast moving items.

R I DK U A inform the retailers about pharmaceuticals and other items being detailed.

R I DK U A obtain extra credits for retailers whenever possible, i.e., he may take back merchandise that the retailer does not want in the store even though it is still good merchandise.

R I DK U A suggest items or promotions that will fit in with the character of the store.

R I DK U A check shelf and inventory stock without consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A send new "deals" to the retailer without consulting him.

R I DK U A move shelf stock to a more prominent shelf position.

R I DK U A take more returns from my larger customers.

R I DK U A advise on store layout to move products.

R I DK U A have an aggressive sales approach.

R I DK U A try to sell the retailer without regard to his (the retailer's) mood at the time.

R I DK U A continue talking about the merchandise after the retailer has decided to buy.
WHEN DEALING WITH (Name of Retailer)
I, AS A SALES MAN ACTUALLY . . .

R I DK U A try to tell the retailer about all the items the wholesaler carries in his inventory.

R I DK U A offer "deals" and specials before suggesting other items.

R I DK U A tell the druggist how many items are needed to fill shelf inventory.

R I DK U A inform the retailer when delivery will be made if the wholesaler cannot fill an order.

R I DK U A inform drug retailers about local business trends.

R I DK U A accept returns from retailers without question.

R I DK U A take care of credits and returns to the wholesaler before discussing any business.

R I DK U A permit several retailers to split a high cost order so that they may save on the quantity discount.

R I DK U A help the retailer plan special store promotions.

R I DK U A carefully check the retailer's shelf and inventory stock.

R I DK U A check inventory after consulting the retailer.

R I DK U A inform the retailer of items moving well in other drug stores.

R I DK U A prepare a written list of pharmaceuticals that are low for the retailer.

R I DK U A check with the pharmacist to determine the speed at which pharmaceuticals are moving.

Please return to: BUREAU OF BUSINESS RESEARCH, 1775 South College Road
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, Columbus, Ohio 43210
APPENDIX D
FACTORS USED BY COOPERATING FIRMS TO DESCRIBE OR EVALUATE SALESMEN'S JOBS

COMPANY A

Job Requirements with Regard to Wholesale Drug Salesmen

PRODUCTS

Replenish stocks regularly
- Call on customers at proper frequency to build regular buying habits.
- Check stocks to suggest items and quantities to re-order.
- Develop effective customer habits in use of Want Book.
- Develop effective customer habits in telephone ordering.
- Provide telephone order writers with data for effective telephone selling.

Increase orders with merchandising
- Sell manufacturer deals and promotions.
- Push items currently being detailed.
- Push long inventory lines with idea selling.
- Suggest volume merchandising on high-profit lines.
- Advise on effective pricing, shelf position, display, and advertising.

Sell new and additional lines
- Watch for stock replenishment opportunities on lines not now purchased from us.
- Be prompt in offering new and different items.
- Suggest profit and merchandising opportunities on lines not now carried.

Obtain Additional Customers
- Study territory for new outlets.
- Analyze potential and buying habits of outlets now not being sold.
- Call on potential customers with enough frequency for cumulative effect from sales efforts.
- Determine which lines offer the best opportunity for first orders, and concentrate on them.
SERVICES

Sell the Services of the House

- Help customers to know and like more of the unseen people who serve them.
- Sell the benefits you want your customers to have and then offer the services which provide those benefits.
- Explain policies as benefits, if possible, and as equitable, if necessary.

Help Increase Your Customers' Business

- Suggest merchandising methods which attract more customers.
- Suggest ways to adapt to modern trends.
- Advise customers of pertinent competitive activities.

Help Build Your Customers' Departments

- Supply product information to those who need it.
- Offer selling hints to make their personnel more effective.
- Suggest effective department layouts, display, promotion, and pricing.
- Provide useful literature.

Help Develop Efficient Operations

- Suggest effective systems to prevent any out-of-stock conditions.
- Suggest fast, accurate, and legible price-marking methods.
- Suggest systems for prompt re-stocking from storeroom.
- Suggest efficient storeroom systems for proper control and stock rotation.

Protect Product Quality

- Suggest shelf and storage conditions which are not harmful to products.
- Handle returns and unsalable items according to the policy of the house and the manufacturer.

PROFITS

Attain Optimum Territory Utilization

- Study and determine the buying potential of all customers and prospective customers.
- Route and schedule calls according to volume and potential with minimum non-productive time.
- Perform non-selling tasks during non-selling time.
- Suggest methods for changing territory boundaries and/or customers to obtain greater total sales from all customers.

**Keep Adequate Records**

- Maintain reminder systems to assure doing all possible selling and customer development on each call.
- Transfer information accurately to servicing members of your company.
- Have data available to guide those who handle your customers during vacations or illness or for anyone who takes over the territory.

**Interpret Trends and Activities to Management**

- Watch for new shopping centers and commercial buildings to learn about prospective tenants or available leases.
- Report business attitudes and conditions among key customers.
- Report competitive activity among non-buying retailers.
- Report competitive activities of other wholesalers.
- Report activity with lines not carried by your company.

**Protect and Improve Selling Ability**

- Keep informed on product changes, new products, and new uses.
- Watch advertising and merchandising activities to learn more ways of increasing sales and using selling ideas.
COMPANY B

A Portion of the Field Sales Manager's Evaluation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Grooming</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward position</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward customers</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Sales Material</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of Automobile</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Credits &amp; Adjustments</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent customer confidence in you</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that you control your accounts</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is book organized as House suggests?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is review sheet utilized?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is book used as an effective sales tool?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are customers reminded about the value of this service and importance of keeping their books up to date?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a continuing effort made to &quot;sell&quot; this service to those who can qualify (old and New) but are not taking advantage of its potential?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Surgical Pharmacy catalogue organized and utilized as a selling tool?</td>
<td>Yes__No__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION IN SPECIAL AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want Book Administration</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Check Procedures</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of DSC Buying Guides</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Market Letter</td>
<td>G_F_P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field Sales Manager's Evaluation Report (Cont.)

Use of Customer Analysis Form

Effort to create business-like atmosphere.

Effort to secure Narcotic business.

Effort to promote "Customer Benefits" in making presentations.

Effort put forth to secure agents' orders.

Effort to secure telephone and recorder service business.

Effort to offer merchandising assistance and/or sell-through aids.

Coordination of sales effort with daily report sheet.

Pre-evaluation of customer needs.

Cooperation and coordination with the Accounts Receivable Dept. on past due accounts.
APPENDIX E
PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

Name of Rater _____________________

Please list below in the left hand column the salesmen you supervise.

This rating sheet is an attempt to evaluate them. Indicate your personal evaluation of how successful each salesman has been.

Place an X in the appropriate column to indicate the quality of his performance with respect to each of the areas below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of Retailer's Problems</th>
<th>Understanding of His Own Merchandise</th>
<th>Familiarity with Selling Technique</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NAME)
### RAW DATA CRITERIA GROUPS

#### 1. Gross Volume Contributed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $399,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 699,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700,000 - and above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Percentage of Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% - 19%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% - 39%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% and above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Performance Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Number of Suppliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
RAW DATA DIFFERENCE SCORES BY CRITERION

The following tables present raw data difference scores used in the analysis of variance.

Table 17

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) minus the Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Percentage of Business Criterion, Hypothesis I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1% - 19%)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(20% - 39%)</td>
<td>(40% and above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 29, 34, 36, 36,</td>
<td>23, 26, 29, 30, 30,</td>
<td>32, 33, 35, 39, 39,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37, 39, 40, 41, 42,</td>
<td>32, 35, 37, 37, 38,</td>
<td>39, 39, 40, 40, 41,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 42, 42, 43, 45,</td>
<td>39, 39, 40, 42, 42,</td>
<td>42, 45, 47, 48, 48,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 46, 46, 46, 49,</td>
<td>44, 44, 44, 44, 45,</td>
<td>49, 51, 53, 54, 56,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51, 53, 53, 54, 56,</td>
<td>45, 48, 48, 51, 52,</td>
<td>58, 58, 59, 63, 66,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 58, 58, 76, 85,</td>
<td>54, 54, 55, 55, 55,</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56, 56, 59, 60, 63,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64, 65, 66, 68, 69,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Denotes Criterion grouping, see Appendix F.

<sup>b</sup> Denotes actual range, see Appendix F.

<sup>c</sup> Denotes matched pair N's in each group.
Table 13

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) minus the Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Number of Suppliers Criterion, Hypothesis I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (1 - 10)</th>
<th>2 (11 - 20)</th>
<th>3 (21 and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32, 35, 36, 37, 37,</td>
<td>26, 29, 30, 32, 35,</td>
<td>23, 29, 30, 33, 34,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 39, 40, 40, 40,</td>
<td>38, 39, 39, 39, 40,</td>
<td>37, 39, 39, 42, 42,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 42, 45, 48, 49,</td>
<td>42, 43, 44, 44, 44,</td>
<td>42, 45, 45, 45, 46,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51, 53, 54, 54, 56,</td>
<td>45, 46, 47, 48, 49,</td>
<td>46, 48, 48, 51, 51,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 58, 60, 65, 66</td>
<td>52, 55, 56, 59, 63,</td>
<td>53, 53, 54, 55, 55,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64, 66</td>
<td>56, 58, 58, 63,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68, 69, 76, 78, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Raw Data Difference Scores for Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Percentage of Business Criterion, Hypothesis II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1% - 19%)</th>
<th>2 (20% - 39%)</th>
<th>3 (40% and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30, 30, 33, 34, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 40, 40, 41, 41, 42, 43, 43, 46, 47, 47, 49, 51, 51, 52, 52, 54, 54, 56, 58</td>
<td>27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 34, 35, 36, 36, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 39, 39, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 57, 57, 59, 59, 61, 62, 74</td>
<td>22, 31, 32, 32, 32, 34, 37, 38, 40, 40, 43, 43, 45, 47, 47, 48, 48, 50, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30) (41) (26)
Table 20

Raw Data Difference Scores for Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Number of Suppliers Criterion, Hypothesis II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 20</th>
<th>21 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22, 27, 32, 32, 32, 35, 36, 36, 36, 38, 38, 40, 41, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 50, 50, 52, 56, 56, 59, 60</td>
<td>31, 36, 37, 37, 38, 38, 40, 40, 40, 40, 41, 44, 47, 47, 48, 48, 49, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 54, 55, 55, 57, 61, 62</td>
<td>29, 30, 32, 33, 33, 34, 34, 34, 34, 35, 35, 36, 37, 40, 40, 40, 40, 40, 41, 42, 43, 43, 43, 43, 45, 46, 46, 47, 47, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 59, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Percentage of Business Criterion, Hypothesis III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1% - 19%</th>
<th>20% - 39%</th>
<th>40% and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14, 15, 15, 15, 25,</td>
<td>00, 07, 13, 15, 16,</td>
<td>02, 07, 16, 19, 20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25, 26, 27, 28, 31,</td>
<td>18, 20, 20, 22, 24,</td>
<td>22, 24, 24, 25, 28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32, 33, 34, 35, 37,</td>
<td>24, 25, 25, 26, 27,</td>
<td>30, 31, 31, 35, 35,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38, 39, 43, 46, 47,</td>
<td>30, 32, 33, 34, 34,</td>
<td>39, 42, 46, 48, 50,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47, 48, 49, 50, 53,</td>
<td>35, 35, 35, 39, 40,</td>
<td>54, 59, 62, 65, 69,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54, 56, 58, 59, 70</td>
<td>41, 42, 43, 44, 44,</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer with Number of Suppliers Criterion, Hypothesis III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1 - 10)</td>
<td>00, 20, 50, 31, 31, 50, 50, 51,</td>
<td>50, 30, 50, 50, 51,</td>
<td>20, 20, 40, 30, 51,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32, 22, 33, 13, 44, 44, 44, 44,</td>
<td>43, 53, 43, 43, 43,</td>
<td>43, 53, 43, 43, 43,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35, 36, 26, 26, 16, 16, 16, 16,</td>
<td>25, 65, 16, 16, 16,</td>
<td>25, 65, 16, 16, 16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 47, 48, 49, 49, 49, 49, 49,</td>
<td>27, 47, 28, 28, 28,</td>
<td>27, 47, 28, 28, 28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39, 39</td>
<td>39, 39</td>
<td>39, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Percentage of Business Criterion, Hypothesis IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1% - 19%)</th>
<th>2 (20% - 39%)</th>
<th>3 (40% and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>02, 04, 05, 05, 06, 07, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22, 34, 35, 38, 45, 67</td>
<td>00, 01, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 36</td>
<td>00, 01, 06, 06, 07, 07, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 22, 35, 36, 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30) (41) (26)
Table 24

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Number of Suppliers Criterion, Hypothesis IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 - 10)</td>
<td>(11 - 20)</td>
<td>(20 and above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00, 01, 05, 05, 06,</td>
<td>01, 04, 04, 07, 07,</td>
<td>00, 02, 04, 06, 06,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06, 07, 08, 13, 14,</td>
<td>08, 16, 16, 16, 17,</td>
<td>06, 07, 07, 07, 07,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14, 14, 15, 16, 16,</td>
<td>17, 19, 19, 20, 22,</td>
<td>07, 09, 10, 10, 11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 17, 19, 19, 20,</td>
<td>24, 26, 28, 30, 33,</td>
<td>12, 12, 13, 14, 15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21, 22, 33, 35, 67</td>
<td>34, 35, 35, 36, 36,</td>
<td>15, 17, 18, 20, 21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38, 45</td>
<td>21, 22, 22, 24, 25,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27, 27, 28, 29, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) minus the Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Gross Volume Criterion, Hypothesis V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($1-$399,999)</td>
<td>($400,000-$699,999)</td>
<td>($700,000 and above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 29, 34, 36, 39,</td>
<td>23, 29, 29, 30, 30,</td>
<td>32, 33, 39, 41, 45,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 40, 42, 42, 42,</td>
<td>32, 35, 35, 36, 37,</td>
<td>48, 48, 51, 53, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 51, 54, 54, 54,</td>
<td>37, 37, 38, 39, 39,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56, 58, 58, 58, 59,</td>
<td>39, 39, 40, 40, 40,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59, 63, 66, 76, 85,</td>
<td>41, 42, 42, 42, 42,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43, 44, 44, 44, 44,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45, 45, 45, 45, 45,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 46, 46, 48, 48,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49, 49, 50, 51, 52,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53, 53, 54, 55, 55,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55, 56, 56, 56, 57,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 58, 58, 60, 63,</td>
<td>64, 65, 66, 66, 68,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 78, 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) (68) (10)
Table 26

Raw Data Difference Scores for
Actual Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Salesman) minus
the Actual Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Customer) with
Supervisor Rating Criterion,
Hypothesis V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 - 13)</td>
<td>(14 - 16)</td>
<td>(17 - 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Raw Data Difference Scores for
Ideal Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Customer) minus
the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Salesman) with
Gross Volume Criterion,
Hypothesis VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 ($1-$399,999)</th>
<th>2 ($400,000-$699,999)</th>
<th>3 ($700,000 and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32, 33, 35, 38, 39,</td>
<td>22, 27, 29, 30, 30,</td>
<td>31, 33, 36, 37, 40,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 40, 41, 42, 43,</td>
<td>31, 32, 32, 32, 34,</td>
<td>40, 41, 43, 48, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 45, 47, 48, 50,</td>
<td>34, 34, 34, 34, 35,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 54, 56, 56, 57,</td>
<td>35, 36, 36, 36, 36,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 58, 61, 62, 62</td>
<td>37, 37, 38, 38, 38,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39, 40, 40, 40, 40,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40, 41, 41, 42, 42,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42, 43, 44, 45, 46,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 47, 47, 47, 47,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48, 49, 49, 50, 50,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50, 51, 51, 52, 52,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52, 53, 54, 54, 55,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55, 57, 59, 59, 59,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60, 74, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) (68) (10)
Table 28

Raw Data Difference Scores for
Ideal Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Customer) minus
the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman
(perceived by the Salesman) with
Supervisor Rating Criterion,
Hypothesis VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (10 - 13)</th>
<th>2 (14 - 16)</th>
<th>3 (17 - 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31, 33, 34, 38, 39,</td>
<td>27, 29, 30, 30, 31,</td>
<td>22, 32, 33, 36, 36,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40, 40, 41, 41, 42,</td>
<td>32, 32, 32, 34, 34,</td>
<td>37, 38, 39, 40, 40,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43, 43, 46, 47, 48,</td>
<td>34, 34, 35, 35, 35,</td>
<td>43, 44, 47, 48, 50,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48, 50, 53, 54, 56,</td>
<td>36, 36, 36, 37, 37,</td>
<td>52, 52, 54, 56, 57,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56, 58, 61, 62, 62,</td>
<td>38, 38, 40, 40, 40,</td>
<td>59, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74, 75</td>
<td>40, 40, 41, 41, 42,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42, 42, 43, 43, 45,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46, 47, 47, 47, 49,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49, 50, 50, 51, 51,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52, 53, 54, 55, 55,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57, 57, 59, 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) (54) (22)
Table 29
Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Gross Volume Criterion, Hypothesis VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 ($1-$399,999)</th>
<th>2 ($400,000-$699,999)</th>
<th>3 ($700,000 and above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02, 15, 19, 23, 24,</td>
<td>00, 07, 07, 13, 13,</td>
<td>20, 24, 25, 28, 32,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 25, 31, 32, 33,</td>
<td>14, 15, 15, 15, 16,</td>
<td>46, 48, 51, 59, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 35, 35, 35, 38,</td>
<td>16, 18, 18, 20, 20,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 41, 43, 47, 49,</td>
<td>22, 22, 24, 25, 25,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51, 54, 54, 58, 62</td>
<td>25, 26, 26, 27, 27,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28, 30, 30, 31, 31,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33, 34, 34, 34, 35,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35, 36, 37, 39, 39,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40, 42, 42, 43, 44,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44, 44, 46, 46, 46,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47, 48, 49, 50, 50,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50, 50, 53, 56, 57,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59, 64, 65, 66, 69,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70, 71, 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) (68) (10)
Table 30

Raw Data Difference Scores for Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Customer) with Supervisor Rating Criterion, Hypothesis VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14 - 16)</td>
<td>00, 07, 13, 13, 14, 15, 15, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 25, 26, 28, 34, 42, 44, 46, 46, 48, 50, 50, 51, 59, 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17 - 20)</td>
<td>07, 16, 16, 18, 18, 20, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 34, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 50, 51, 59, 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) (54) (22)
Table 31

Raw Data Difference Scores for Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Sales Manager) minus the Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Supervisor Rating Criterion, Hypothesis XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10-13)</td>
<td>(14-16)</td>
<td>(17-20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12)        (37)       (17)
Table 32

Raw Data Difference Scores for Ideal Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Sales Manager) minus the Actual Behavior of the Salesman (perceived by the Salesman) with Supervisor Rating Criterion, Hypothesis XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10 - 13)</td>
<td>(14 - 16)</td>
<td>(17 - 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 35, 35, 36, 37, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 48, 59</td>
<td>23, 35, 36, 36, 37, 37, 41, 41, 44, 44, 44, 44, 47, 47, 48, 48, 48, 49, 50, 51, 51, 51, 53, 55, 57, 61, 72, 73</td>
<td>27, 29, 30, 30, 31, 32, 35, 43, 44, 45, 50, 63, 64, 64, 71, 76, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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