

## **EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF COLLEGIATE SALES TRAINING AND EDUCATION ON EARLY SALESPERSON PERFORMANCE**

*By Megan K. Leasher, Christopher R. Moberg*

Sales organizations invest a tremendous amount of time and resources in the training of salespeople. While the impact of sales training has been studied in the literature, much less is known about the value of sales education and training in college before salespeople are hired. This research study collected data from recent graduates of a mid-sized, Midwestern university and found that students who participated in sales internships and graduated from the university's sales program reported higher levels of overall job performance and quicker ramp-up time early in their career when compared to students without extensive sales education and work experience. Implications of the results for colleges of business and sales organizations recruiting entry-level salespeople are discussed.

### **Introduction**

In a recent PBS Documentary entitled "The New Selling of America," it is argued that the selling profession will be instrumental in protecting the competitiveness and success of the United States economy in the complex, rapidly changing global marketplace (Think TV, 2008). In order to maintain the current size of the U.S. sales force at approximately 18 million salespeople, it is estimated that up to two million new salespeople must be added to the U.S. work force each year. Because many of these new salespeople will be recruited from universities, business schools can play a critical role in maintaining the competitiveness of the U.S. sales force by addressing student concerns and perceptions of sales careers and by better preparing and training students in sales education (e.g. Spillan *et al.*, 2007; Honeycutt and Ford, 1995; Stevens and Macintosh, 2002-03; Sojka and Gupta, 2000).

Given the strong demand for recent college graduates as entry-level salespeople, there has been a surprisingly poor response by higher education across the U.S. to provide sales training and education. Out of more than 2,000 business schools in the U.S., there were only about 40 universities at the end of 2008 that offered majors, minors, or certificates in sales. This small number of sales programs

means that only an estimated 2,000 of the two million new salespeople needed by corporations each year are arriving with any significant coursework or training in sales. (Please see Appendix 1 for a listing of University Sales Programs).

Because universities are not responding to market demand and are essentially leaving most training responsibilities for new salespeople to hiring organizations, opportunities are being missed to foster collaboration among universities and sales organizations to develop and support sales training for college students. More importantly, with the large demand for new salespeople and the apparent benefits of sales training for recent college graduates, it may be worthwhile to determine why many business schools are deciding not to provide sales education to their students. Successful and satisfied alumni can have a positive impact on business schools by making donations, recruiting future graduates, and by participating in many other service-related activities that support the college and university mission. Therefore, it is important for business schools to identify and overcome the barriers barring the implementation of sales training programs that can better prepare their students for successful careers.

One contributing factor to the low number of sales programs in the United States may be the public's negative perception of the sales profession and the view that many salespeople are untrustworthy and dishonest (Hartman, 2006; Spillan *et al.*, 2007). Another factor may be the common view by many faculty and administrators on university campuses that business schools provide professional training and that selling is a vocation rather than a true academic pursuit. Gaining approval for centers or degree programs in selling can be challenging in this type of environment.

One tool in overcoming the stereotypes of selling may be the documentation of more empirical evidence connecting college sales training to more successful careers for students and increased organizational productivity for hiring firms. However, there is currently scant research connecting collegiate sales training to improved on-the-job performance. Currently, most of the evidence about the value of sales training and internships in college is anecdotal and qualitative, as reported by faculty and program directors at universities with sales programs or by company recruiters (e.g. Weilbaker and Williams, 2006). Empirical research typically focuses on the perceived value of sales courses in college by students, faculty, and sales managers (e.g. Bristow *et al.*, 2006(a); Bristow *et al.*, 2006 (b)). While positive feedback from employers and graduates is encouraging, research is needed that empirically supports the relationship between university sales education and early career successes. Establishing a positive and significant relationship between university sales education and sales performance will pave the way for more sales programs to be added at other universities and provide additional support for ongoing programs.

Therefore, the main goal of this study is to empirically examine the value of sales training and internships during college to the early stages of sales careers. The paper will begin with a brief literature review on previous sales performance research, sales training research,

and collegiate sales education and training research. The paper will conclude with sections on research questions, method, results, and the implications for universities and sales firms.

## Literature Review

### Salesperson Performance

Salesperson performance is one of the most commonly researched topics in the sales literature. A wide variety of variables have been empirically examined in relation to improved salesperson performance. One commonly used taxonomy categorizes potential determinants of salesperson performance into five groups: personal, organizational and environmental factors; aptitude; skills; motivation; and role perceptions (Churchill *et al.*, 1985(a)). In a seminal meta-analysis examining the relationship between several factors and salesperson performance, Churchill *et al.*, (1985(b)) found that approximately 24% of the variance in salesperson performance could be explained by salesperson attributes (Role Perceptions – 9%; Skills – 7%; Motivation – 3%; Aptitude – 2%; Personal Variables – 2%; and Organizational and Environmental Variables – 1%). Since the publication of this meta-analysis, research on salesperson performance has continued to focus largely on the impact of those variables identified in the Churchill *et al.*, (1985(a)) taxonomy (Sharma *et al.*, 2007).

Recently, Sharman *et al.*, (2007) encouraged fellow researchers to move away from examining the impact of traditional categories of salesperson attributes on performance and to search for those determinants that may explain the other 75% of the variance in salesperson performance. They examined the impact of a salesperson's knowledge structures on performance. Knowledge structures "refer to salespeople's knowledge of their customers and the way in which the customer and selling knowledge is organized" (p. 170). Their

research discovered that knowledge structures accounted for 50.2% of the variance in salesperson performance in a retail setting, representing a much higher percentage of the variance than previously accounted for in traditional salesperson attributes (e.g., Churchill *et al.* 1985(a)). While the impact of knowledge structures needs to be examined in other settings, these results have implications for the importance of sales training because it is presumed that salesperson knowledge structures can be modified and improved through effective sales training and education, unlike many of the traditional categories of salesperson attributes often linked to performance.

### **Sales Training's Impact on Performance**

It is estimated that over \$14 billion a year is spent by U.S. firms on sales training and that over 70 days of training are provided to salespeople in their first year (Wilson *et al.*, 1998; Attia *et al.*, 2008). College-level sales training through coursework, role plays, and internships should lead recent college graduates to be better prepared for their first job in sales. Their on-boarding and early career performance should be better than those new salespeople without prior training. More effective training and stronger performance can be differentiating factors for companies as they compete in a global marketplace and can also save firms money in training and development costs during a salesperson's first year on the job.

The impact of sales training programs on individual and firm performance has been examined in the sales literature, but the focus has typically been on training after an employee has been hired, not before. One recent trend by some firms has been to adjust sales training programs to match the reality of today's expectations that a salesperson will serve as an advisor and problem-solver for their customers while striving to develop long-term relationships (e.g. Pelham, 2006;

Weitz and Bradford, 1999). Others argue that not enough firms have responded to the changing expectations of today's salesperson and that sales training programs remain transaction-based and ineffective (e.g., Chonko *et al.*, 1993; Pelham, 2006). Artis and Harris (2007) recently suggested that sales managers begin training salespeople to use self-directed learning in addition to traditional sales training. By developing a self-directed learning orientation, salespeople should be able to independently solve problems they encounter in their relationships, which should lead to better outcomes for the customer and improved firm performance (Artis and Harris, 2007).

While there are numerous studies that posit a relationship between the adoption of a relationship marketing orientation and improved firm or salesperson performance (e.g. Hunt and Morgan, 1994; Kalwani and Narayandas, 1995), there has been a lack of research that actually compares the effectiveness of sales training that incorporates relationship marketing and other important behaviors and skills to improved performance (Pelham, 2006). The relationship between learning orientation and performance has also been examined (e.g., Farrell, 2000; Slater and Narver, 2000), but the direct impact of training on a learning orientation has not been assessed. In conclusion, while some sales programs have adjusted the content and focus of their training, there is still a need to assess the impact of salesperson training on performance (Pelham, 2006).

One recent study attempted to examine the impact of sales training on performance. Pelham (2006) found that sales training that applied a consulting-oriented training approach combined with consulting-oriented evaluation processes was positively associated with customer retention, sales force efficiency, and profit growth. In a previous study, Pelham (2002) also found a connection between consulting-oriented training

programs and enhanced customer value. Leach and Liu (2003) evaluated four different methods of evaluating sales training and concluded that positive reactions by employees to training and knowledge retention were both related to more effective sales training outcomes. Another recent study recognized the need for sales training in an increasingly complex and competitive global marketplace, but concluded that many firms do not know how to evaluate the effectiveness of their training programs (Attia *et al.*, 2005). They proposed a three-stage model for training salespeople that identifies eight different assessment areas that sales managers can use to improve the impact of training on salespeople and the firm.

### College Sales Training

Even though there are indications that knowledge structures have an impact on performance (Sharma *et al.*, 2007; Weitz *et al.*, 1986), empirical research focused on the impact of collegiate sales training and education on performance is scarce, or purely anecdotal in nature. While there is a narrow stream of research in the sales literature that examines sales education and training at the collegiate level, the research does not connect training to improved performance.

In an early survey of collegiate sales programs, Weilbaker and Williams (2006) found that students from sales programs had higher placement rates and starting salaries than students without formal sales training. Qualitative research with recruiters also found that companies reported lower training costs and turnover rates with sales center students because of their sales coursework and experiences. These students also reported higher levels of satisfaction with sales positions (Weilbaker and Williams, 2006).

Several researchers have examined the perceptions of college students toward careers in professional selling (e.g., Sojka and Gupta, 2000; Honeycutt and Ford, 1995; Spillan *et al.*,

2007). In a study examining the perceived value of college sales courses for entry-level sales positions, Bristow *et al.*, (2006(b)) found that both sales managers and educators believed sales courses improved selling skills for graduating students. However, sales educators reported a higher level of perceived value from the sales courses than sales managers. In a comparison of perceptions between sales and non-sales students, Bristow *et al.*, (2006(a)) found that students who had taken a sales course held a much more positive perception of sales careers.

### Research Questions

Because there is scarce research examining the empirical connection of sales education and training with sales performance, this research is exploratory in nature. Due to the exploratory nature, the goals of the research are phrased as research questions rather than hypotheses.

**Research Question #1:** *What is the profile of a typical graduate from a sales program?*

With so little known about graduates from college sales programs, a profile of the typical graduating student, the types of jobs they are securing, their first-year job performance, and their average starting salaries can provide some initial insights. Employers may be able to use these profiles to target potential new hires and to develop competitive compensation packages and offers to college students.

**Research Question #2:** *Do college graduates who have completed the requirements of a university sales program perform better in their first sales job than college graduates without participation in a sales program?*

Anecdotal and qualitative evidence suggests that those students participating in sales programs arrive better prepared for their first sales job, proceed through training more quickly, display faster ramp-up time, and

perform significantly better achieving sales goals during the first two years of their careers than those students who do not participate in a collegiate sales program. The limited research in this area indicates that sales students see more value in sales training and feel more prepared and confident than non-sales students about their first entry-level sales job (Bristow *et al.*, 2006(a); Bristow *et al.*, 2006(b)). However, research in this area needs to move beyond the perceptions of sales students to examine the potential relationship between collegiate sales training and early sales performance.

**Research Question #3:** *Do college graduates who have completed a sales internship prior to graduation perform better in their first sales job than college graduates without a sales internship?*

With few sales programs currently existing in the U.S., many college students do not have the option to pursue extensive sales education in the classroom. However, students at all universities can pursue sales internships that

provide sales training and experience prior to graduation. Therefore, examining whether graduates who completed sales internships perform better than those who did not can generate additional information about the impact of sales training during college. The results may also provide colleges of business with some support to encourage sales internships for those students interested in sales careers even if they attend a university without a formal sales program.

### Method

A survey was developed to collect the empirical data needed to examine the research questions. In this section, the data collection method will be reviewed.

### Survey Development

The survey questions and response formats were designed by the authors. The first section of the survey asked respondents to answer several demographic questions, including school attended, major, graduation

**Table 1**  
**Performance-Related Variables**

Question	Response Format
What percentage of achievement did you attain in your financial sales goals (e.g. revenues, margins)?	Percentage entered
What percentage of achievement did you attain in your new customer goals?	Percentage entered
What percentage of achievement did you attain in your customer service goals (e.g. retention, delivery, overall satisfaction)?	Percentage entered
Compared to your peers in the same position, how would you rate your overall performance?	5-point scale: 1=Extremely Poor to 5=Excellent
Compared to your peers in the same position, how would you rate your ramp-up time in this position?	5-point scale 1= Much Slower to 5 = Much Faster

year, and a history of sales-related positions held since graduation. The next section asked respondents to rate their job performance on several dimensions. Respondents were asked to report the percentage of achievement in their financial, new customer attainment, and customer retention goals. They were also asked to compare their overall performance and ramp-up time to peers using semantic differential questions (See Table 1). Finally, respondents were asked to report their perceived preparation for their first sales job based on the coursework, interaction with faculty members, mentoring, and internships they participated in during college.

### Data Collection

Data was collected electronically using an internet-based survey software program. E-mail invitations were sent on three separate occasions to recent alumni of a mid-sized, Midwestern university with a sales program housed in the college of business. The final alumni list that served as the study's population was developed by combining the sales program's alumni database with a database of recent marketing graduates, resulting in a total of 580 potential respondents.

After three requests for participation, 142 people responded to the survey for a response rate of 24.4% (142/580). However, because the goal of the research was to examine early performance of graduates in sales jobs, only those who reported that their first post-graduation job was in a sales role were included in the study. After eliminating 28 respondents with a first job not in sales, there were 114 alumni in the final analysis sample. Thus, the effective response rate for the analysis dataset was 19.7% (114/580).

### Profile of Sample

Of the 114 respondents, 39 (34.2%) reported that they graduated from the sales program at the university. As expected, the vast majority ( $n = 98$ , 86.0%) of these graduates received a

degree in Marketing, with other commonly reported majors including Finance, Management, and Management Information Systems. The alumni graduated between 1999 and 2007, with the bimodal graduation years reported as 2002 and 2006 (25 graduates each year). Forty-six percent ( $n = 52$ ) of the alumni were female, with an overall average age of 26.99.

### Results

#### **Research Question #1:** *What is the profile of a typical graduate from a sales program?*

The first research question focused on identifying the profile of a typical graduate from a sales program. In this exploratory study, thirty-nine participants identified themselves as having graduated from the university's sales program. The graduates received their degrees from 1999 through 2007, with a mode of 11 in 2006. Of these graduates, a vast majority reported having received a degree in Marketing ( $n = 30$ , 76.9%). For the few that reported a second major ( $n = 9$ ), the most frequently cited were Finance, Management, and Management Information Systems (2 reported for each).

The sales program graduates reported taking, on average, just under six (5.8) sales-related courses while in school. Nearly all ( $n = 36$ , 92.3%) reported participating in an internship while in school, with thirty-one (79.5%) of these internships serving as paid internships. For their first sales job after graduation, the most commonly reported job titles were "Sales Representative," "Sales Manager," "Account Executive," and "Account Manager."

When asked for total annual income in the first full year of their sales position, the majority (60%) earned an annual income of \$30,000 to \$60,000 in their first position, but 21% earned \$60,000 to \$90,000 annually. Even though these income figures include base salary, commission, and bonuses earned throughout the year, these salary results are

impressive considering the National Association of Colleges and Employers reported an average starting salary of \$44,005 for recent graduates employed in sales roles in 2008.

When asked the percentage of goal attainment in three areas during their first sales job, graduates of sales program reported achieving 93.48% of their financial sales goals (revenues, margins), 80.68% of their new client attainment goals, and 82.67% of their customer service goals (retention, delivery, overall satisfaction). When asked to compare their early performance to peers in the same position, 83.7% of sales program graduates reported faster ramp-up times than their peers and 81.0% reported above average or much better overall job performance than their peers.

**Research Question #2:** *Do college graduates who have completed the requirements of a university sales program perform better than college graduates without participation in a sales program?*

The second research question compared on-the-job performance of sales program graduates (n=39) to college graduates that had not participated in the sales program (n=75). T-tests were conducted to compare the two groups on the five performance questions included in the survey. The results can be found in Table 2.

There were no significant differences found on the first three performance questions: financial goals, new customer goals, and customer service goals. However, sales program graduates did rate their overall performance and ramp-up time significantly higher than non-sales program graduates rated their own performance and ramp-up time.

**Research Question #3:** *Do college graduates who have completed a sales internship prior to graduation perform better than college graduates without a sales internship?*

The third, and final, research question again looked at on-the-job performance, but this

**Table 2**  
**Comparison of Sales Program and Non-Sales Program Graduates**

	<i>Sales Program Graduates</i>		<i>Non-Sales Program Graduates</i>			
<i>Item</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>
<i>Financial Goal Attainment</i>	93.48	33.60	87.63	37.94	84	0.70
<i>New Customer Goal Attainment</i>	80.68	36.08	79.59	48.20	80	0.10
<i>Customer Service Goal Attainment</i>	82.67	44.84	82.02	30.82	81	0.08
<i>Performance Compared to Peers</i>	3.14	0.71	2.81	0.81	110	2.08*
<i>Ramp-up Compared to Peers</i>	3.19	0.70	2.82	0.91	110	2.14*

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. Degrees of freedom vary due to unanswered questions.

**Table 3**  
**Comparison of Students Who Did and Did Not Participate In a Sales Internship**

	<i>Participated in an Internship</i>		<i>Did Not Participate in an Internship</i>			
<i>Item</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
<i>Financial Goal Attainment</i>	94.61	39.08	82.83	31.73	84	1.48
<i>New Customer Goal Attainment</i>	85.16	52.54	73.70	32.36	80	1.15
<i>Customer Service Goal Attainment</i>	82.98	38.24	81.27	31.63	81	0.22
<i>Performance Compared to Peers</i>	3.08	0.75	2.71	0.79	110	2.49*
<i>Ramp-up Compared to Peers</i>	3.11	0.85	2.73	0.84	110	2.34*

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation.  
 Degrees of freedom vary due to unanswered questions.

time compared graduates who had completed a sales internship prior to graduation ( $n=63$ ) to those who had not completed such an internship ( $n=51$ ). The t-tests are summarized in Table 3.

When comparing graduates who had completed an internship to those who had not, no significant differences were once again found on the first three performance questions. However, graduates with a sales internship similarly rated their overall performance and ramp-up time significantly higher than those who did not complete a sales internship.

### Discussion

This exploratory research revealed several insights on the impact of sales education and internships on the early job performance of recent college graduates. First, the profile of a typical graduate from the sales program at this university indicated reasonably high achievement of sales goals during their first

full year in a sales role (80.68-93.48%) and a majority reported higher performance and quicker ramp-up time than their peers in the same sales position. The results also suggest that total first-year compensation for sales graduates is above the national average for entry-level sales positions.

Although the percentage of goal achievement for sales graduates in their first year on the job was reasonably high, it was not significantly higher than those who did not graduate from a sales program. However, sales program graduates did report significantly higher overall performance and quicker ramp-up time than those students who did not participate in the sales program. The importance of sales experience before graduation was further supported by the comparison of students with sales internships to those without. The results demonstrated significantly higher overall performance and quicker ramp-up time for students who had completed sales internships.

The results of this research should be of particular interest to sales organizations and their recruiting teams. With the typical sales organization providing over 70 days of training for new salespeople in the first year (Kaydo, 1998) and investing up to \$100,000 in training costs for some positions (Johnston and Marshall, 2006), there is pressure to make good hiring decisions. Based on the results of this research, organizations should strongly consider recruiting at universities with sales programs and to use sales internship experiences as a key decision-making criterion when hiring at any university. Given the training investment made by sales organizations, they should be particularly interested in the quicker ramp-up time reported by students with sales education and internships.

This research can also be used by departments and colleges to support the value of adding sales education and programs to the curriculum at their respective universities. The HR Chally Group, a global sales research and consulting firm and sponsor of the University Sales Education Foundation, estimates that approximately 50% of all college graduates, irrespective of major, are hired into first jobs that are primarily sales positions. Even if this estimate is inflated, there can be no doubt that the vast majority of college graduates being hired as salespeople enter the workplace insufficiently prepared by their college education. If one part of the mission for a college of business is to adequately prepare students for successful careers in business, this research demonstrates the importance of sales training and experience in helping prepare college graduates for early success in their sales careers.

While the interests of students should clearly be the primary concern, there are factors that make the investment in sales education of financial interest to colleges of business. A quick review of the top sales programs in the

United States reveals that each is supported financially by corporate sponsors. From data that is available, it appears that annual sponsorships range from \$5,000 to \$25,000. Many corporations are also spending up to \$25,000 to sponsor national sales competitions organized by different entities. While these sponsoring organizations are clearly supporting the professional advancement of the sales profession, they are also gaining access to and developing relationships with those few students that are receiving sales education and training. Given the current state of the higher education industry and dwindling state support for public universities, the willingness of sales organizations to invest in sales education should not be ignored. New sales programs can be largely funded by corporate sponsors and provide new revenue streams for colleges of business.

### **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

In this pilot study, data was only collected from one university and one sales program. In addition, the majority of the respondents were marketing majors. At this university, marketing majors are required to take an introduction to sales course as part of the major. Therefore, even those graduates in this study who did not participate in the sales program had taken at least one required sales course. In fact, the respondents in the sample who had not participated in the sales program still averaged almost two sales courses taken while in school, which may partially explain why more significant differences were not found in this research. Clearly, future research on the impact of sales education should include multiple universities to improve the diversity and representativeness of the sample.

Increasing the number of universities included in the research would also address another limitation of this study, which was a relatively small sample size. While the response rate

from this sampling frame was acceptable (20%), the small size of this pool of graduates resulted in analysis samples of 39 sales graduates and 75 non-sales graduates. While these sample sizes are technically above the minimum needed ( $n=30$ ), future research should strive for larger sample sizes.

Another limitation of the research was the use of self-report data for the performance questions. Subjective, self-reporting questions are regularly used in business research, largely because it is often easier to collect data from individuals than it is to have supervisors rate multiple individuals objectively. However, future research needs to collect performance data directly from supervisors at several organizations that hire graduates from both sales and non-sales programs.

In addition to collecting performance and compensation data directly from supervisors, future research needs to include more performance and job-related variables. For example, perceived job fit was a variable that was not included in this research.. Because perceived job fit can be related to job performance, it is important that future research considers whether job fit, and other job-related variables, affects performance as much as sales training and education. And while there is a stream of research on college student perceptions of sales careers (e.g. Honeycutt and Ford, 1995; Spillan *et al.*, 2007), it would be interesting to measure the perceptions of sales as a profession from actual salespeople and determine whether the attitudes toward selling and levels of job satisfaction differ between those with college sales training and those without.

Future research should also include the traditional salesperson performance (e.g. Churchill *et al.*, 1985(a)) and knowledge structures variables (e.g. Sharma *et al.*, 2007) along with collegiate sales education variables so that the relative impact of all variables on salesperson and firm performance can be

evaluated. And while this research examined the early performance of salespeople, it did not measure turnover or length of time in sales positions. Practitioners are also keenly interested in turnover and length of service as key indicators of effective recruiting and training of salespeople, so future research should include turnover and tenure as variables.

## Conclusion

This research found significant differences in performance between sales-program graduates and non-sales program graduates. Sales graduates rated their comparative performance and ramp-up speed significantly higher than those who had not graduated from such a program. Similar results were found for students that had completed sales internships.

Taken together, this study is the first to assess and document the true benefits of pursuing university sales education and sales internships. Even with a small sample size, many significant differences between students with and without sales training were revealed. These results support the perceived benefits of sales programs for students and employers. Given the mutual interest shared by colleges and corporations in the successful launching of sales careers by young graduates, it is hoped that this research will spur more interest in and support of collegiate sales training and education.

## References

- Artis, A. B. & Harris, E. G. (2007) "Self-Directed Learning and Sales Performance: An Integrated Framework," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 9-24.
- Attia, A. M., Honeycutt Jr., E. D. & Leach, M. P. (2005) "A Three-Stage Model for Assessing and Improving Sales Force Training and Development," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 253-268.

- Attia, A. M., Honeycutt Jr., E. D. & Jantan, M. A. (2008) "Global Sales Training: In Search of Antecedent, Mediating, and Consequence Variables," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 181-190.
- Bristow, D. N., Gulati, R. & Amyx, D. (2006) "A Look at Professional Selling from the Students' Perspective: A Replication and Extension," *Marketing Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 88-103.
- Bristow, D. N., Gulati, R., Amyx, D. & Slack, J. (2006) "An Empirical Look at Professional Selling from a Student Perspective," *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 81, No. 5, pp. 242-249.
- Chonko, L. B., Tanner, J. F. & Weeks, W. A. (1993) Sales Training: Status and Needs," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 81-86.
- Churchill Jr., G. A., Ford, N. M. & Walker, O. C. (1985) *Sales Force Management*, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Churchill Jr., G. A., Ford, N. M., Hartley, S. W. & Walker Jr., O. C. (1985) "The Determinants of Salesperson Performance: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 22, May, pp. 103-118.
- Farrell, M. A. (2000), "Developing a Market-Oriented Learning Organisation," *Australian Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 201-222.
- Hartman, K. B. (2006), "Television and Movie Representations of Salespeople Beyond Willy Loman," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 283-292.
- Honeycutt, Jr., E. D. & Ford, J. B. (1995) "Guidelines for Managing an International Sales Force," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 135-144.
- Hunt, S. D. & Morgan, R. M. (1994) "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 20-38.
- Johnston, M. W. & Marshall, G. W. (2006) *Churchill/Ford/Walker's Sales Force Management*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Kalwani, M. U. & Narayandas, N. (1995) Long-Term Manufacturer- Supplier Relationships: Do They Pay Off for Supplier Firms?" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Kaydo, C. (1998) "Should You Speed Up Sales Training?" *Sales and Marketing Management*, Vol. 150, December, pg. 33.
- Leach, M. P. & Liu, A. H. (2003) "Investigating Interrelationships Among Sales Training Evaluation Methods," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 327-339.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers Salary Survey: <http://www.naceweb.org/press/display.asp?year=2008&prid=281>.
- Pelham, A. (2006) "Do Consulting-Oriented Sales Management Programs Impact Salesperson Performance and Profit?" *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 175-188.
- Pelham, A. (2002) "An Exploratory Model and Initial Test of the Influence of Firm Level Consulting-Oriented Sales Force Programs on Sales Force Performance," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 97-109.
- Sharma, A., Levy, M. & Evanschitzky, H. (2007) "The Variance in Sales Performance Explained by the Knowledge Structures of Salespeople," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 169-181.
- Slater, S. F. & Narver, J. C. (2000) "The Positive Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability: A Balanced Replication," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 69-73.
- Sojka, J. Z. & Gupta, A. K. (2000) "Student Perceptions of Sales Careers: Implications for Educators and Recruiters," *Mid-American Journal of Business*, Vol. 15, Spring, pp. 55-63.

- Spillan, J. E., Totten, J. W. & Ziemnowicz, C. (2007) "What are Students' Perceptions of Personal Selling as a Career?" *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 19-30.
- Stevens, C. D. & Macintosh, G. (2002-03) "Personality and Attractiveness of Activities Within Sales Jobs," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 23, Winter, pp. 23-37.
- Top University Sales Education Programs (2009), The University Sales Education Foundation, [www.saleseducationfoundation.org](http://www.saleseducationfoundation.org).
- Think TV, The New Selling of America, Documentary (2008), Think TV Productions.
- Weilbaker, D. C. & Williams, M. (2006) "Recruiting New Salespeople from Universities: University Sales Centers Offer a Better Alternative," *Journal of Selling & Major Account Management*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 30-38.
- Weitz, B. A., Sujan, H. & Sujan, M. (1986) "Knowledge, Motivation, and Adaptive Behavior: A Framework for Improving Selling Effectiveness," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 174-191.
- Weitz, B. A. & Bradford, K. D. (1999) "Personal Selling and Sales Management: A Relationship Marketing Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 241-254.
- Wilson, P., Strutton, D., & Farris, M. T. (2002) "Investigating the Perceptual Aspect of Sales Training," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 77-86.

---

### **Megan K. Leasher, Ph.D.**

Megan Leasher is a Senior Project Consultant with the HR Chally Group and holds a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from Wright State University. Her research has been published in several academic journals and presented at national conferences, including the

annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. She has won several awards, including the RHR International Outstanding Dissertation Award (on behalf of the Society of Consulting Psychology), the Society for Human Resource Management Foundation's Graduate Student Leader Award, and has been named to Who's Who in American Universities and Colleges. Megan currently serves on the Board of Directors for the Miami Valley Human Resource Association, where she has been an active member for the past four years.

Within Chally, her responsibilities include conducting validation research and training for clients, serving as an assessment law and statistical expert, overseeing internal research, developing research partnerships, and conducting continuous psychometric analysis of the Chally Assessment.

### **Christopher R. Moberg, D.B.A.**

Chris Moberg is Chair of the Marketing Department and the Robert H. Freeman Professor of Logistics Management at Ohio University. He is also the Director of External Relations for the Ralph and Luci Schey Sales Centre. He received a D.B.A. from Cleveland State University (2000), an M.B.A. from Miami University (1989), and a B.B.A. from the University of New Mexico (1988).

Professor Moberg teaches Marketing Strategy, Supply Chain Management, and Marketing Research Methods. His research interests include supply chain management, internal integration, service networks, professional services marketing, marketing and sales education, and student ethics. His research has been presented at several national conferences and has appeared in many journals, including the *Journal of Business Logistics*, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *International Journal of Logistics Management*, *Supply Chain Management Review*, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *Annals of Operations Research*, *Marketing Education Review*, *Journal of Services Marketing*, *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, and *Services Marketing Quarterly*.

### **APPENDIX Following**

### Appendix 1

#### University Sales Programs 2009

SCHOOL	LOCATION	STUDENTS
Athens University of Economics & Business	Athens, GRE	10
Ball State University	Muncie, IN	350
Baylor University	Waco, TX	115
Bradley University	Peoria, IL	40
California State University, Chico	Chico, CA	50
Central Michigan University	Mt. Pleasant, MI	60
College of St. Catherine	St. Paul, MN	180
DePaul University	Chicago, IL	700
Dublin Institute of Technology	Dublin, IRL	20
FH Wien Studiengage der WKW	Vienna, AUS	340
Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL	200
Georgia Southern University	Statesboro, GA	90
Groupe Clermont School of Management	Clermont-Ferrand, FRA	1,450
Illinois State University	Normal, IL	278
Indiana University	Bloomington, IN	175
Kennesaw State University	Kennesaw, GA	150
Michigan State University	Lansing, MI	33
Missouri State University	Springfield, MO	137
Montpellier 1 University	Montpellier, FRA	20
Nicholls State University	Thibodaux, LA	50
Northern Illinois University	Dekalb, IL	180
Ohio University	Athens, OH	250
Portsmouth Business School	Portsmouth, UK	140
The College of New Jersey	Ewing, NJ	20
University of Akron	Akron, OH	100
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR	60
University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL	40
University of Connecticut	Storrs, CT	250
University of Dayton	Dayton, OH	200
University of Houston	Houston, TX	180
University of Louisville	Louisville, KY	15

University of Nebraska at Kearney	Kearney, NE	214
University of Toledo	Toledo, OH	413
University of Washington	Seattle, WA	385
University of Wisconsin Eau Claire	Eau Claire, WI	100
Washington State University-Vancouver	Vancouver, WA	30
Western Carolina University	Cullowhee, NC	75
Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green, KY	160
Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo, MI	350
Widner University	Chester, PA	30
William Paterson University	Wayne, NJ	85

**Source: Top University Sales Education Programs 2009, HR Chally**