

INDUSTRIAL BUYERS' ASSESSMENTS OF SALES BEHAVIORS

DAVID A. REID, *The University of Toledo*
RICHARD E. PLANK, *Western Michigan University*
ANN P. MINTON, *University of South Carolina*

A number of surveys and much anecdotal material exist regarding what purchasing professionals prefer in sales presentations. This study provides new insights by examining what kinds of salesperson behaviors actually are preferred by buyers in terms of the people they choose to do business with. From an information perspective, sales behaviors can be divided into three basic types, those that get information, those that use that information, and those that give information. The data suggests that a salesperson's ability to use the information gathered is most important to purchasing agents followed by their ability to get that information and lastly the giving of information. These findings have very specific implications for the training and development of salespeople and show the importance of adaptive behaviors in business-to-business selling.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies (Cohen and Allison 1990; Hayes and Hartley 1989; Morris 1995; Morgan 1992, 1995; *Sales & Marketing Management* 1985) have described what purchasing personnel look for in a good salesperson. These studies have suggested, for example, that salespeople should be problem solvers, well prepared, honest, dependable, know the buyer's business, and be good listeners. In addition, they have also suggested that good salespeople should be credible, reliable, and responsive. At the same time, researchers have also pointed out what buyers dislike about salespeople such as being pushy, wasting the buyer's time, knocking the competition, and being late or ignoring appointments (*Sales & Marketing Management* 1985; Hayes and Hartley 1989). While interesting, these studies have tended to look at only the general characteristics associated with successful versus unsuccessful salespeople rather than the specific things that these salespeople actually do (behaviors). Furthermore, most previous studies have

been based on buyers' overall impressions of the quality of salespeople. There has been no systematic research examining the specific behavioral differences between more and less successful industrial salespeople.

In fact, only limited research (Lamont and Lundstrom 1974; Moncrief 1986) has attempted to address salespeople's actual behaviors, despite their obvious importance to buyer-seller relationships. Moreover, most of these studies were focused on determining the nature of different selling jobs and were not designed to examine differences in behaviors and their impact on the purchasing process. While there is an extensive body of research on sales performance literature, the notion of sales behaviors as a predictive link to performance has been largely ignored. A noteworthy exception, however, is a recent article by Plank and Reid (1994) that explicitly incorporates sales behaviors into a model of sales performance and suggests that salesperson behaviors lead directly to sales performance.

The purpose of this paper is to report on an empirical project that sought to reconcile the research that has defined buyers' perceptions of good salespeople with that of the sales performance literature from the

perspective of linking behaviors to sales performance. Since purchasing personnel have specific ideas about what a good salesperson is, those salespeople who exhibit behaviors in line with those perceptions are more likely to be successful.

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The basic question being examined in this study is whether successful industrial salespeople exhibit different sales behaviors than less successful salespeople. In this study, successful is defined as the recipient of a recent order while unsuccessful is defined as a person who did not get an order.

Sales behaviors have been defined by Walker, Churchill, and Ford (1979) as "what people do (the tasks they expend effort on) in the course of working." The notion of what we mean exactly by behaviors can be characterized in many ways. Plank and Reid (1994) have suggested two types of behaviors: customer interaction behaviors or those performed with the customer's and noncustomer interaction behaviors, those performed outside the presence of the customer. These authors review extensively the work done on sales behaviors and selling performance. Their focus is primarily on specific sets of individual behaviors that salespeople actually do.

Research on sales behaviors has generally focused on the kinds of behaviors that define the nature of the selling job. Lamont and Lundstrom (1974) and Moncrief (1986) are the major examples of selling job definition. These authors identify very specific micro behaviors on the part of salespeople such as handling an objection or planning a call. Behrmann and Perreault (1982) have developed a measure of sales performance that in essence incorporates the notion of behaviors and the performance of those behaviors. Moore, Eckrich, and Carlson (1986) have examined the importance of eighty-two selling competencies, many of which are essentially sales behaviors as they relate to sales performance.

However, there are other ways to think about behaviors. The notion of selling styles provides another way to think about behaviors and to categorize them. Merrill and Reid (1981) offer one such system

that was recently used by Gambino (1992) to examine sales effectiveness. Buzzotta, Lefton and Sherberg (1982) offer a similar model. In both cases the idea is to match salesperson behavior patterns to those of the customer. Behavior patterns are primarily thought of in terms of communication. Very similar work has been done by McIntyre and Meloche (1994) who utilize Jungian psychology, the buyer-seller interaction model of Sheth (1976) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (McCaulley 1981).

Another way to think about behaviors is to consider effort rather than specific behaviors. A number of authors (Bartkus, Peterson, and Bellinger 1989; Chonko 1986; Lavenka and Jung 1991; Roberts, Lapidus, Chonko 1994), have examined effort and some aspect of sales performance. In particular Roberts, Lapidus and Chonko (1994) have found strong evidence that effort of the salesperson impacts on sales performance. Their measurement of sales effort was a three-item scale that was general and seemed to relate to the quantity of the work performed.

For this study behaviors were operationalized following the lead of several authors. The notion of specific behaviors (e.g., Lamont and Lundstrom 1974; Moncrief 1986) was coupled with the model posited by Plank and Reid (1994), which suggested two types or sets of behaviors, customer interaction and noncustomer interaction. In addition, a model suggested by Miller and Heiman (1987) involving getting information, giving information, and gaining commitment was modified and integrated into the behavioral operationalization. This particular model suggests that gaining commitment involves a particular set of behaviors. The authors here suggest that commitment is an outcome and gaining commitment is based on the ability of the salesperson to gather information, use that information to construct an appropriate solution and then communicate that solution to the buyer. It is the buyers' understanding of the solution as the best approach for their situation that is likely to generate commitment.

This approach was taken for a number of reasons. For one, it has been argued as important by Plank and Reid (1994) that researchers carefully define their behavior measurement schema. They argue that behaviors can be measured as being existent or not, measured in terms of quantity, and that the quality of the behaviors may be measured. Effort, for example, is primarily a quantity measure, but does not address the quality of the effort measured. The measures used by selling style advocates are able to type respondents and rely on matching buyer and seller. They argue that selling performance is enhanced by the seller matching the specific style required by the buyer. Thus in order to use this approach both buyers and sellers must be contacted. Specific discussion of the actual scale development follows.

Fundamentally, buyers and sellers engage in communication processes that include obtaining information, using information, and giving information. The salesperson, for example, gets information about the prospect's company and its needs, and their own and their competitors' products. He or she then uses that information to formulate a solution and presents that solution to the buyer. The buyer attempts to find out various types of information, uses the information in making decisions and communicates back to sales people during the sales process. Thus, while both buyer and seller engage in a variety of activities during the actual face-to-face sales process, most of these activities or behaviors can be viewed as getting information, using that information, and giving information. Examining sales behaviors from this perspective provides a more parsimonious view of selling as it has only three categories of behaviors and these behaviors essentially capture the heart of the face-to-face selling process, that is, communication.

RESEARCH METHOD

The questionnaire for this study was developed via a multistep process. First, interviews with a number of purchasing agents on the topic of what makes for good sales encounters were conducted. A review of the marketing literature on the nature of sales behaviors was also completed. This was followed by an extensive questionnaire development process. A

preliminary questionnaire was then constructed and delivered to 180 area purchasing agents in a Midwestern state, with 111 responding. Based on the analysis of these results, minor modifications were made to the questionnaire, minor changes in wording and some changes in directions within the questionnaire.

The National Association of Purchasing Management supplied a computer generated random listing of 5000 members from all fifty states and Puerto Rico which was used as the sample frame. From this list, 2324 names were randomly selected and mailed a final questionnaire. A single wave mailing with no pre-notification or second reminder was used due to the study's budget limitations. Historically, NAPM members have responded well to most questionnaires with most response rates being over 20%. Of the total mailings, only nine were undeliverable, making the list 99.6% deliverable. Of the 2315 actually delivered, 568 completed usable questionnaires were received for a response rate of 24.5%. Most questionnaires were complete with fifty-five having minor cases of missing data, mostly of a demographic nature or resulting from situational measures. In order to explore possible nonresponse bias a comparison was made of early (first quartile) and late (last quartile) respondents in terms of their demographic profile and on responses to behavioral questions. The resulting Chi-square and ANOVA tests showed no significant differences, which suggests a lack of nonresponse bias (Armstrong and Overton 1977).

Two questionnaires were developed. Both were identical with respect to the questions asked, the only difference was that one questionnaire asked the buyer to evaluate a salesperson from a recent negotiation who was successful and got the business, while the other asked the buyer to rate an unsuccessful salesperson defined as one who did not get the business. An equal number of both types were sent out by randomly dividing the sample and assigning the two types of questionnaires. The rationale for this design was to minimize respondent fatigue since having a respondent evaluate a successful and an unsuccessful salesperson at the same time would have substantially increased the length of time needed

to complete the questionnaire. In addition, having respondents evaluate both successful and unsuccessful salespeople from the same sales encounter might have resulted in a biased response pattern due to the automatic tendency to rank successful people higher than unsuccessful people. Out of the 568 questionnaires returned, 291 (51.2%) were responses about successful salespeople and 277 (48.8%) were responses about unsuccessful salespeople.

The questionnaire contained 31 items related to sales behaviors. Appendix A lists the 31 behaviors exactly as they were stated in the questionnaire. Thirteen of those questions were related to getting information and included such activities as the use of listening and asking various types of questions. The next six behaviors were indicative of using information. Since using information represents primarily mental processes, items such as the salesperson understood my needs and how my firm creates value were used to gauge the degree to which salespeople actually used information to formulate solutions. The final twelve questions related to presentations or giving information. All 31 questions used a six-point response scale asking respondents to rate the quality of the behavior from one for low quality to a five for high quality. The sixth point in the response scale allowed the respondent to indicate that the salesperson did not use this behavior. Thus, the scale allowed for both a quality rating and an indication of whether or not the behavior was demonstrated.

The list of behaviors studied was developed by presenting a long list of behaviors (77) as used by Moncrief (1986) and textbooks, to a series of small groups of part time currently employed graduate students supplemented by individual interviews with three professional purchasing agents. This resulted in a reduced set of forty-two behaviors. The revised list was then presented to four graduate classes (sixty-four students in two universities) consisting primarily of employed students with both buying and selling backgrounds.

Individuals were first asked to categorize each question into one of three groups, getting information, using information, and giving information. The participants were asked to choose the "best" category

since in some cases it would be possible to place the items into more than one group. Each of the forty-two items was then examined for the consistency of classification. Only those items that were consistently classified 90% of the time by the students into the same category were included in the next set. This resulted in thirty-four items being included. The students then went through each item at another class discussion. Several items were removed because it was felt that they overlapped with other measures or that they were not as clear as another measure. This resulted in a final list of thirty-one behavioral items. Of these thirty-one items, two were included to test the validity of the overall set of questions. The first of these two questions dealt with the use of emotionally charged questioning while the other dealt with the use of close-ended questions. Neither was expected to differentiate between the types of salespeople. In fact, the use of emotionally charged questioning items was actually expected to be associated with unsuccessful salespeople.

The sample of thirty-one questions was then pretested using a convenience sample of 180 buyers in a local Midwest area. A total of 111 individuals responded. The results of this preliminary study indicated that the questions were understandable and that the above mentioned questions operated as expected, including the two questions included as validity checks. In addition to completing the survey, respondents were asked to comment as to problems with the questionnaire. Nineteen respondents did so. Other than three comments on the question dealing with the use of emotionally-charged questions, no comments were made about the variables used in this analysis.

Besides the usual types of demographic questions, a final question asked respondents to divide 100 points among the three types of sales behaviors (getting information, using information, or giving information) in terms of which behaviors they perceived as more important to successful selling. The purpose of this question was to permit comparison of what was perceived by respondents as important versus which sets of behaviors better predicted success from failure.

STUDY RESULTS

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the demographic profile of respondents and indicates which questionnaire they responded to.

The sample respondents appear typical of NAPM membership. Respondents represented a broad range of experience and companies of different sizes. In general, the respondents for both successful and unsuccessful salespeople were similar on the various demographic items, which suggests that there is no bias in these dimensions that might affect their responses to other questions. This was confirmed by a formal two-tailed test of proportions done on the percentage responses in Table 1. This indicated no differences between respondents who reported on successful versus unsuccessful sales encounters.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the mean responses for each of the thirty-one behavior questions by overall category of behavior and for the individual items relating to each behavior. The category analyses were derived by summing the responses to each question in the category and then using analysis of variance on the summed means. It should be noted that for the getting information category, the questions on asking loaded questions and the question on asking closed-category questions were not included in the summed scale. The reason for not including the former was that this kind of question was expected to be viewed negatively by most respondents and was inserted only as a validity/reliability check. As expected, the ratings on this question were very low and unsuccessful salespeople had higher ratings on it than did successful salespeople. The reason for not including the latter question was that, as shown in Table 2, it did not differentiate between successful and unsuccessful salespeople. As noted above, both findings were as expected. The coefficient alphas for each of the summed scales were .94 for the getting information scale (eleven items), .90 for the using information scale (six items), and .92 for the giving information scale (twelve items).

The findings suggest that how salespeople use information is the most critical determinant of whom purchasing does business with. This is followed by

getting information and then by giving information. Of the thirty-one separate items, only the question dealing with asking closed category questions failed to differentiate successful from unsuccessful salespeople.

In the using information category, all indicators had F scores over 100 and thus were clearly statistically significant. The most important indicators were being able to differentiate the product/service from the competitors', doing their homework and understanding the customer, and linking product/service attributes to buyers' needs. Understanding needs, understanding buyer business processes, and value creation were also important.

In terms of getting information, purchasing agents indicated first and foremost that they want the salesperson to listen and, judging from the study's results, those that did were more successful than those that did not. This corroborates many case studies and interviews that have pointed out the frustration buyers have with salespeople who do not listen. Asking good problem, situation, and clarification questions were also indicated as important. As expected, the use of emotionally loaded questions was rated very low for successful people. Unsuccessful salespeople were rated higher on this variable.

In the giving information category, which ranked the lowest overall, there were still some indicators that were very important. In fact, working well with others in the buying group was the most important indicator of all twenty-nine. Answering questions, handling objections, and tailoring the presentation (i.e., adaptive selling) was also important. Being charismatic, using audiovisuals, and making good demonstrations were seen as much less important.

In spite of the care taken in the construction of the measures, it was not expected that the individual items would factor out into a three-factor model. This was in part due to the large number of items. A preliminary analysis on the 111 pretest responses also indicated a three-factor model was not apparent. A factor analysis on the final data set using maximum likelihood with an oblique rotation

TABLE 1
Demographic Profile of Respondents, Full Sample and by Type of Questionnaire

Demographics	All Respondents	Questionnaire 1 Successful Salespeople	Questionnaire 2 Unsuccessful Salespeople
Gender			
Male	375 (66.5%)	188 (65.3%)	187 (67.8%)
Female	139 (33.5%)	100 (34.7%)	89 (32.2%)
Certification			
Certified	252 (44.7%)	132 (45.8%)	120 (43.5%)
In Process	156 (27.7%)	71 (24.7%)	85 (30.8%)
Never Attempted	156 (27.7%)	85 (29.5%)	71 (25.7%)
SIC Code			
Manufacturing	317 (56.3%)	164 (56.6%)	153 (56.0%)
Transportation, Communication and Utilities	50 (8.9%)	20 (6.9%)	30 (11.0%)
Retailing	32 (5.7%)	13 (4.5%)	19 (7.0%)
Other	164 (29.1%)	93 (32.1%)	71 (26.0%)
No. of Employees			
100 or Under	134 (24.0%)	70 (24.4%)	64 (23.5%)
101-999	278 (49.7%)	143 (49.9%)	135 (49.7%)
1000 or over	147 (26.3%)	64 (25.7%)	73 (26.8%)
Purchasing Experience (Years)			
5 or less	88 (15.6%)	40 (13.9%)	48 (17.3%)
6-10	137 (24.2%)	68 (24.4%)	69 (24.9%)
11-20	238 (42.1%)	125 (43.4%)	113 (40.8%)
Greater than 20	102 (18.9%)	55 (19.1%)	47 (17.0%)

produced a seven-factor model. Items were assigned to factors based on a score of at least .4 and a difference from another factor of at least .1. Of the seven factors, two of the factors were single indicators and another factor included only two items, numbers 8 and 9, which dealt with the implication and need payoff questions associated with the SPIN framework (Rackham 1987). The first factor consisted of items 25 through 31, which were all

presentation items. The second factor consisted of items one through four, six, seven, and eleven and all dealt with asking questions. The fourth factor was items 16 through 19, all of which dealt with using information. The third factor was somewhat mixed, consisting of item 5 and item 13, which were the listening items and items 21, 23 and 24 that dealt with handling objections, answering questions, and working well with other people in the purchasing

TABLE 2
Analysis of Variance of Behaviors by Success of Salesperson

Sales Behavior	Mean Success	Mean Unsuccessful	F Value*
Getting Information Summed Scale	43.33	32.68	137.87
Asked questions	4.20	3.45	86.76
Asked probing questions	3.85	2.96	77.97
Asked situation questions	4.11	2.99	148.74
Used questions to assess needs	3.96	3.00	117.32
Listened to me	4.26	3.10	155.54
Asked open ended questions	3.56	2.84	61.06
Asked closed category questions	2.95	3.01	0.42**
Asked implication questions	3.55	2.50	107.49
Asked need payoff questions	3.51	2.56	79.40
Asked problem questions	3.41	2.41	111.38
Asked clarification questions	4.00	3.01	139.66
Asked loaded questions	1.75	2.35	29.81
Listened very carefully	4.07	2.78	199.02
Using information Summed Scale	23.65	16.54	274.81
Understood my needs	4.16	3.14	142.61
Linked attributes to needs	4.25	3.14	170.77
Differentiated from competition	3.95	2.66	201.12
Understood how we create value	3.90	2.84	114.52
Understood my business processes	4.05	3.10	103.74
Did their homework	4.25	3.02	192.23
Giving information Summed Scale	34.86	24.85	94.42
Made a charismatic presentation	3.25	2.42	68.60
Handled objections I raised	3.81	2.66	166.94
Provided literature	4.07	3.22	79.64
Answered all of my questions	4.21	3.04	176.95
Worked well with other people	4.28	2.95	201.96
Got me to participate	3.07	2.26	57.57
Performed demonstrations	3.20	2.43	37.19
Presentation gave me insight	3.64	2.58	102.67
Tailored presentation to me	3.82	2.61	134.32
Used analogies and similes well	3.31	2.48	55.22
Was expert in supporting position	3.41	2.53	56.02
Used exhibits and audio visuals	3.15	2.43	28.13

*All values are $p \leq .0001$ unless otherwise noted.

** Not significant $p \leq (.5178)$.

group. One possible explanation for the existence of this factor is that all the activities involve listening. Answering objections well requires good listening as does answering questions and working well with other group members. While not perfect, the factor analysis was surprisingly accurate.

Table 3 provides an analysis of the responses to the importance of the three information behaviors. Specifically, this question asked respondents to identify how important to a successful sales call each of the three types of behaviors were by dividing 100 points among the three categories. The purpose of this question was to determine the purchasing professionals' overall view of the importance of the three behaviors and to compare those responses with those obtained for the individual items for successful versus unsuccessful salespeople as reflected in Table 2.

TABLE 3
Analysis of Three Types of Behaviors

Variable	Mean	Std Deviation	Range
Get Information	34.04	11.59	5-85
Use Information	29.00	11.14	5-80
Give Information	36.71	13.56	10-90

Variables	T Statistic	P
Get and Use	6.60	.0001
Give and Get	2.81	.0051
Give and Use	8.35	.0001

The respondents indicated that giving information was the most important, followed by getting information, and lastly using information. T-tests indicate that the differences in means among the three categories are significant. Therefore, from Table 3, we can conclude that despite indicating otherwise when talking about successful versus unsuccessful industrial salespeople, purchasing

professionals believe that giving information is the most important behavior salespeople engage in. Getting information was second in importance while using information was least important.

This finding is somewhat surprising since the analysis of variance results in Table 2 indicated that using information was the largest differentiator between successful and unsuccessful salespeople, followed by getting information and then giving information. The difference in results, however, may be due to difficulties respondents may have in making such overall assessments of broad categories of sales behaviors. The result may also be a reflection of the choice of actual behaviors measured.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings are interesting and informative for several reasons. From a theoretical perspective they suggest that taking a communication-information approach has value in understanding the nature of buyer-seller interactions and what leads to successful transactions or relationships. It also provides more empirical evidence for the importance of adaptive selling (Weitz 1981). From a more pragmatic perspective, the results point out not only important skills salespeople must possess, but also offer important insights for purchasing.

To better serve their buyers, it is clear that salespeople need to improve their ability to use the information they get within the sales process. Salespeople need to understand their customers' needs, how they can create value for their customers, the business processes used by their customers and how their product/service applies to those processes, and to be able to differentiate their product/service from the competition. The bottom line suggested by this research is that effectively using information is critical to a salesperson's ability to adapt his/her offering and provide the best solution for the buyer.

Salespeople obtain information from a variety of sources. In this study the focus was on information generally obtained directly from the buyer or company during face-to-face selling. As would be expected, and has been argued in the sales literature

(Castleberry and Shepard 1993; Bond 1993), listening is the most important behavior. Questioning and the ability to ask appropriate kinds of questions was also important, with problem, situations and clarification types of questions being the most important. Loaded or leading questions were viewed as the most negative. Giving information was found to be the least important sales behavior, yet most sales training (Dubinsky and Barry 1982; Erffmeyer, Russ, and Hair 1991; Honeycutt, Harris, and Castleberry 1987) seems to focus on product knowledge and presentation skills. While giving information was considered least important, the ability to work well with other members of the buying group was viewed as the most important part of the actual presentation process. Answering questions and handling objections, typical presentation training topics, were also very important.

From a purchasing perspective these findings suggest that reverse marketing can play an important role in improving buyer-seller relations. Reverse marketing is the notion that purchasing needs to play a proactive role in buyer-seller interaction (Bergsman 1991; Leenders and Blenkhorn 1988). While the idea of reverse marketing has many facets, it centers around the idea that buyers should give suppliers complete information on all their needs as customers and then objectively evaluate the suppliers in terms of their ability to meet those needs.

The ability of the salesperson to provide a viable solution hinges not only on their ability, but also on the role purchasing plays in the process. If purchasing makes it easy to get the information, and plays an active role in the solution designed by each competitor, the overall quality of the solutions presented will likely increase. What this suggests is that purchasing professionals must continue to be proactive, to monitor and know the abilities of their suppliers and potential suppliers, and to fashion a more open relationship.

As firms continue to downsize suppliers and supplier bases, the ability of salespeople to effectively use information in providing buyers with the best possible solutions to their needs will become even more critical. Direct consideration of measures of

the responsiveness of suppliers and their ability to provide better solutions are increasingly becoming integral components of vendor evaluation systems and facilitating better assessments of vendor performance. Thus, the quality of the supplier's suggested solution becomes the critical issue and the actions of both parties should be focused on using information to come up with creative solutions. This is clearly consistent with current themes in the sales and purchasing literature (Dumond 1991; Ingram 1996).

The differences in perception as to what is important as indicated by Table 3 versus Table 2 suggests perhaps the need for firms to reevaluate their sales training programs and the behaviors they encourage and train their people to use in face-to-face interactions. While presentation skills will always play a role for both parties in any negotiation, the "substance" of the solution being presented, not the presentation itself, is the key to solving the problem. Firms need to insure that their salespeople give more attention to providing solutions and the using information behaviors in the selling process and less attention to how it is delivered.

As previously mentioned, understanding buyers' business processes and how these processes create value for their customers are critical. Many sales training programs provide explicit training on product knowledge, but that knowledge is only as good as the ability of the salesperson to integrate it into a solution for the buyer. Sales training needs to focus more on creative methods to link the product/service knowledge so that it has meaning to customers from their value perspective.

CONCLUSION

This study found that purchasing professionals at a global level still feel that the presentation is the most important aspect of the sales process. The findings, however, show that it is how salespeople use information that makes for a successful salesperson. This has obvious implications for various aspects of the sales management process, including training and supervision.

REFERENCES

- "PAs Examine the People Who Sell to Them," *Sales & Marketing Management*, 135, (November 11, 1985), 38-41.
- Armstrong, S. J. and T. S. Overton (1977), "Estimating Nonresponse Bias in Mail Surveys," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (August), 396-402.
- Bartkus, K.R., M. F. Peterson, and D. N. Bellinger (1989), "Type A Behavior, Experience, and Salesperson Performance," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 9 (Summer), 11-18.
- Behrmann, D.N., and W.D. Perreault (1982), "Measuring the Performance of Industrial Salespersons," *Journal of Business Research*, 10 (September), 355-370.
- Bergsman, S. (1991), "Reverse Marketing in 1991," *NAPM Insights*, 2 (July), 26-27.
- Bond, B. (1993), "Listening as a Sales Function," *Telephone Engineer & Management*, 93 (May), 70.
- Buzzotta, V.R., R. E. Lefton, and M. Sherberg (1982), *Effective Selling Through Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Associates.
- Castleberry, S. and D. Shepherd (1993), "Effective Interpersonal Listening and Personal Selling," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 13 (Winter), 35-48.
- Chonko, L. B. (1986), "Organizational Commitment in the Sales Force," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 6 (November), 19-27.
- Cohen, E. and M.S. Allison, "Salesmanship: A View for the Other Side," *Sales & Marketing Management*, 142, (June 1990), 108-120.
- Dubinsky, A. J., and T. E. Barry (1982), "A Survey of Sales Management Practice," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 11, 128-140.
- Dumond, E. (1991), "Performance Measurement and Decision Making in a Purchasing Environment," *Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*, 27 (Spring), 21-31.
- Erfmeyer, R. C., R. K. Russ, and J. F. Hair (1991), "Needs Assessment and Evaluation in Sales-Training Programs," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 11 (Winter), 17-30.
- Gambino, F., *Adaptive Leadership Style and Sales Management: A Test of the Social Style Model*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University.
- Hayes, M.H., and S.W. Hartley (1989), "How Buyers View Industrial Salespeople," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 18, 73-80.
- Honeycutt, E.D., C. E. Harris, and S. B. Castleberry (1987), "Sales Training: A Status Report," *Training and Development Journal*, 41 (May), 42-45.
- Ingram, T. N. (1996), "Relationship Selling: Moving from Rhetoric to Reality," *Mid-American Journal of Business*, 11 (Spring), 5-14.
- Lamont, L.M. and W.J. Lundstrom (1974), "Defining Industrial Sales Behavior: A Factor Analytic Study," in 1974 *Combined Proceedings*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, 493-498.
- Lavenka, N. M., and A. F. Jung (1991), "The Effects of Retail Competition on the Personal Selling Effort of New Car Salespeople," *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 7 (Summer), 110-115.
- Leenders, M., and D. Blenkhorn (1988), *Reverse Marketing: The New Buyer-Supplier Relationship*, The Free Press, New York.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1981), "Jung's Theory of Psychological Types and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator," in *Advances in Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 5, Paul McReynolds, ed., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 294-352.
- McIntyre, R.P., and M. S. Meloche (1994), "Psychological Determinants of Effective Sales Presentations," *The Journal of Marketing Management*, 4, 23-36.
- Merrill, D. and R. Reid (1981), *Personal Styles and Effective Performance*, Radnor, PA: Chilton Books.
- Miller, R. B. and S. E. Heiman (1987), *Conceptual Selling*, New York: Warner Books.
- Moncrief III, W.C. (1986), "Selling Activity and Sales Position Taxonomies for Industrial Salesforces," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23 (August), 261-270.

- Moore, J.R., D. W. Eckrich, and L. T. Carlson (1986), "A Hierarchy of Industrial Selling Competencies," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 8 (Spring), 79-88.
- Morgan, J.P., "How the Top Ten Measure Up," *Purchasing*, 112, (October 1992), 62-63.
- _____, "Best Sales Reps Have Ideas and a Desire to Succeed," *Purchasing*, 119, (November 1995), 45-49.
- Morris, L., "Critical Sales Behaviors," *Training and Development*, 49, (January 1995), 60-61.
- Plank, R.E. and D.A. Reid (1994), "The Mediating Role of Sales Behaviors: An Alternative Perspective of Sales Performance and Effectiveness," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 14 (Summer), 43-56.
- Rackham, N. (1987), *Spin Selling*, New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Roberts, J. A., R. S. Lapidus, and L. B. Chonko (1994), "An Exploratory Examination of Situational Variables, Effort, and Salesperson Performance," *The Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, 2 (Summer), 70-93.
- Sheth, J. N. (1976), "Buyer-Seller Interaction: A Conceptual Framework," in *Proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research*, Cincinnati, OH: Association for Consumer Research, 382-386.
- Walker Jr., O.C., G.A. Churchill Jr., and N.M. Ford (1979), "Where Do We Go from Here? Some Selected Conceptual and Empirical Issues Concerning the Motivation and Performance of the Industrial Salesforce," in *Critical Issues in Sales Management: State of the Art and Future Research Needs*, G. Albaum and G.A. Churchill, eds., University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 10-75.
- Weitz, B. A. (1981), "Effectiveness in Sales Interactions: A Contingency Framework," *Journal of Marketing*, 45 (Winter), 85-103 .

APPENDIX A Behaviors Questionnaire

This next part will list a series of behaviors, or in some cases outcomes of behaviors, that a salesperson may have done in the process of making sales calls to you. Again, you are being asked to rate only the successful salesperson. The response pattern is a one (1) to a five (5). A one (1) indicates you felt the behavior or outcome of the behavior was of low quality. A five (5) indicates high quality. Responses of two (2), three (3) and four (4) indicate in-between levels of quality. If a successful salesperson did not exhibit the behavior in your presence or there was no outcome please circle an eight (8).

SUCCESSFUL SALESPERSON BEHAVIOR

QUALITY RATING

	LOW				HIGH	NONE
1 This salesperson asked questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
2 This salesperson asked probing questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
3 This salesperson asked situation questions to try and understand what my needs were	1	2	3	4	5	8
4 This salesperson used questioning to assess my needs	1	2	3	4	5	8
5 This salesperson listened to me	1	2	3	4	5	8
6 This salesperson asked open-ended questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
7 This salesperson asked closed category questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
8 This salesperson used questions to help me see the implications of solving my problems	1	2	3	4	5	8
9 This salesperson used questioning to help me see the payoff to solving my questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
10 This salesperson asked questions to determine my problem	1	2	3	4	5	8
11 This salesperson asked clarification questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
12 This salesperson asked loaded emotionally charged questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
13 This salesperson listened very carefully to me	1	2	3	4	5	8
14 This salesperson indicated to me that they understood my needs	1	2	3	4	5	8
15 This salesperson was able to link his/her product/service attributes to my needs	1	2	3	4	5	8
16 This salesperson could differentiate his/her product/service from the competition	1	2	3	4	5	8
17 This salesperson understood how my firm creates value for our customers	1	2	3	4	5	8
18 This salesperson understood the processes in my organization related to this purchase situation	1	2	3	4	5	8
19 This salesperson did his/her homework prior to seeing me	1	2	3	4	5	8
20 This salesperson made a charismatic presentation	1	2	3	4	5	8
21 This salesperson handled objections I raised	1	2	3	4	5	8
22 This salesperson provided product/service literature and information as I needed it	1	2	3	4	5	8
23 This salesperson answered all of my questions	1	2	3	4	5	8
24 This salesperson worked well with other members who were involved in the purchase	1	2	3	4	5	8
25 This salesperson got me to participate and get involved in the sales presentation	1	2	3	4	5	8
26 This salesperson did product/service demonstrations	1	2	3	4	5	8
27 This salesperson's presentation gave me insight into the benefits of the product/service to my situation	1	2	3	4	5	8

Industrial Buyers' Assessments of Sales Behaviors

Reid, Plank and Minton

	LOW				HIGH	NONE
	1	2	3	4	5	8
28 This salesperson tailored the presentation to my needs						
29 This salesperson used analogies and similes in his/her presentation to help me see how it related to my situation	1	2	3	4	5	8
30 This salesperson supported his position with expert testimony	1	2	3	4	5	8
31 This salesperson used exhibits and audiovisuals in his/her presentation	1	2	3	4	5	8