SITUATIONAL SALESFORCE LEADERSHIP USING SALES CONTROL AND TRUST

By Michael L. Mallin and Ellen Bolman Pullins

The authors propose a situational leadership framework using dimensions of sales control (outcome-based versus behavior-based) and managerial trust in the salesperson. They argue that a more parsimonious and comprehensive model of sales management, over existing models, can be constructed by taking into account both details of the sales environment and the sales manager – salesperson relationship quality. Six leadership styles emerge as being appropriate for managing salespeople in different environment: **Contingent**- (low trust; outcome-based control) these reps should be closely managed using outcome-based sales incentives to ensure performance. **Facilitating**- (moderate trust; outcome-based control) allows the manager to play the role of supporter whereby the onus of day-to-day decision-making and problem solving rests in the hands of the salesperson. **Delegating**- (high trust; outcome-based control) the salesperson and manager jointly decide on the problem, but decision-making is delegated to the salesperson to decide how to accomplish the goal. **Directing**- (low trust; behavior-based control) sales manager will provide much instruction, telling the salesperson what, how, and when tasks should be performed. **Coaching**-(moderate trust; behavior-based control) 2-way communication exists between the salesperson and sales manager in an attempt to engage in productive dialogue leading to ideas and suggestions for improved performance. **Sponsoring**-(high trust; behavior-based control) the salesperson provides the strategic direction on the account and the sponsoring sales leader supports the account plan. Certain managerial behaviors and actions stem naturally from each style and are reviewed in the article. Implications and strategies for sales manager implementation of each leadership style are presented, as well as suggestions for further research on the topic.

A Framework of Situational Salesforce Leadership Using Sales Control and Trust

Salesforce managers play a critical role in the success or failure of individual salespeople and collectively, the sales organization. In fact, Dubinsky (1999) claims that when salespeople fail, sales management is to blame. Studies supporting this notion show that a sales manager's mode of regulating the activities and outcomes of salespeople result in consequences affecting a salesperson's motivation, performance, and job satisfaction (Anderson and Oliver 1987; Oliver and Anderson 1994). However, how managers go about directing the activities of the salesforce to ensure the attainment of sales performance objectives remains a quintessential issue in salesforce management.

The sales management literature has addressed this issue by proposing distinct models of leadership centered on rewards for managing sales transactions (i.e., transactional; Bryman 1992), common sales goals (i.e., transformational; Bass 1985, 1990), or the quality of manager-salesperson relationships (i.e., leader-member exchange; Castleberry and Tanner 1986; Graen and Schiemann 1978; Lagace 1990). However, few academic works to date have combined aspects of all three.

The primary role of the sales manager is to ensure that the salesforce meets the firm's goals for the current planning period and to develop the people reporting to them (Dalrymple, Cron, and DeCarlo 2001). Although the role may seem clear, sales management involves the integration of many complex tasks, one of which is control over the activities required to accomplish organizational goals (Honeycutt, Ford, and Simintiras 2003). Managerial sales control may be delineated as outcome-based (i.e., toward the generation of outputs such as sales units,

revenue, profits, etc.) or behavior-based (i.e., managing the activities leading up to the sale such as sales calls, product demonstrations, customer service activities, etc.; Anderson and Oliver 1987; Cravens et al. 1993; Krafft 1999; Oliver and Anderson 1994). By itself, sales control is an effective means to ensure that salespeople work toward achieving organizational goals, however it fails to account for the interpersonal relationship between manager and salesperson. In addition, in any sales management situation, there is an additional alternative, that is to trust. To date, no one has considered trust as a complimentary dimension of salesforce leadership.

Consider the boundary-spanning role of the salesperson and the geographical dispersion of a salesforce. These factors add challenges to the role of the sales manager (Spiro, Stanton, and Rich 2003). Typically, salespeople work away from the company's main facility, thus a manager cannot directly supervise each individual's work in person on a regular basis. This physical separation from the salesforce may increase the difficulty to implement either sales control strategy (i.e., performance feedback and monitoring of outcomes/behaviors may not be feasible). In these cases, it becomes necessary to consider other (interpersonal) factors in choosing a managerial strategy. One such factor, trust, has received attention in the sales and management literature. Generally, trusted subordinates can be counted on to complete tasks and perform with little direct managerial involvement while untrustworthy workers pose a risk to the organization by acting opportunistically or shirking of their duties (Williamson 1996). As important as this may seem, existing sales leadership models limit the focus on using trust to enhance the relationship quality between sales manager and salesperson (Castleberry and Tanner 1986; Lagace 1990). Trust is all but ignored relative to its use as a complementary factor in the selection of an appropriate leadership style. This presents an opportunity to provide managers with an alternative approach to choosing a leadership strategy that suits *both* the type of sales control environment *and* the level of trust that she has in the salesperson. Thus the objective of this research study is to propose a sales management tool of situational salesforce leadership based on both managerial sales control and interpersonal trust in the salesperson.

BACKGROUND

To begin, we present an overview and review of models of leadership followed by a development of our proposed situational leadership framework using the research from salesforce control and sales trust literature.

Salesforce Leadership

Sales research has advanced two general views of sales leadership; these are *leadership style* and *leader-member exchange* hereafter referred to as LMX (Ingram, et al. 2005). Leadership style centers on the behaviors of the leader as either *transactional* (Bryman 1992) or *transformational* (Bass 1985, 1990). A transactional leadership approach calls for a manager to provide either positive (e.g., recognition and/or approval) or negative feedback (e.g., reprimands and/or disapproval) to salespeople contingent on their effort or performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich 2001). Alternatively, transformational leadership involves changing the way followers approach their work by altering their values, attitudes, beliefs, and goals (Bryman 1992). Whereby transactional leadership's focus is on instrumental compliance, transformational leadership's main source of influence is *internalization* or *identification* (Kelman, 1958). In sales, a manager practicing transactional leadership is likely to pay (or withhold) commission for sales output while the transformational leader may work closely with salespeople to hone their behaviors so that they may become better at identifying and responding to customer needs and building long-lasting customer relationships. Thus, a core construct in these leader styles is the performance dimension (outcomes versus behaviors).

An alternative model of leadership is LMX. The focus of LMX is on the sales manager - salesperson dyadic relationship (Castleberry and Tanner 1986; Graen and Schiemann 1978) and the differing treatment that salespeople receive from their manager depending on the strength and trust in the relationship. These relationships are defined based on the sales manager viewing the salesperson as a "cadre" or "hired-hand" (Castleberry and Tanner 1986; Lagace 1990). Cadres (also referred to as the "in" group) tend to receive more support and better training, territories, and quotas that are attainable. Due to higher levels of managerial trust in the salesperson, communication with the cadre tends to be frequent, positive, motivational, and intimate (Lagace 1990; Lagace, Castleberry, and Ridnour 1993). Alternatively, the hired-hand receives far less mentoring, favorable territories and quotas, and communication with the sales manager. Lower levels of trust in these salespeople are indicative of these relationships (Lagace 1990).

Individually, the transactional/transformational approach and LMX do not adequately combine the task and relationship dimensions of leadership. The focus of the former is on either outcome or behavior performance whereby the latter centers on the quality of the relationship. A situational leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) seems to better accomplish this integration. By focusing on the combination of directing subordinate activities and building personal relationships with subordinates, they argue that leadership styles should vary from situation to situation. This leadership model has evolved to its present form where four leader styles (delegating, supporting, coaching, and directing) are defined relative to the leader's levels (low-high) of exhibiting *directive behavior* and *supportive behavior*. Higher levels of directive behavior are the extent to which a leader engages (with a subordinate) in one-way communication, is highly prescriptive with direction, and closely supervises performance. Higher levels of supportive behavior are characterized by two-way communication, listening, facilitating interaction and subordinate involvement in decision-making (Blanchard 1985). Furthermore, the model suggests that the subordinate's level of maturity (combining competence and commitment) determines which of the four leader styles should be used. A criticism of this model is that a manager may not always be in a position to accurately assess a subordinate's level of competence and commitment (i.e., maturity). In the salesforce management domain for example, a new-hire or agency rep may have had limited exposure to his manager. Although these salespeople may indeed be mature, without prior verification, the sales manager cannot personally account for their competence or commitment levels. Trust, on the other hand is in the perception of the sales manager. Therefore, from a practical standpoint, for the sales manager who believes his instincts, trust can be easily assessed and developed with exposure to the salesperson. This should be clearer to the manager than trying to understand particularly, a salesperson's internal commitment.

An alternative situational leadership model can be proposed by suggesting that sales managers consider aspects of both sales control and trust when choosing a leadership approach. Doing so would enable managers to account for the both the selling environment as well as the interpersonal nature of the manager – salesperson relationship. In order to make this leap, a discussion of both sales control and trust are necessary in order to ground the reader in definitions and applications to sales.

Sales Control Considerations in Salesforce Leadership

Sales managers use sales control to ensure the attainment of desired organizational objectives (Challagalla and Shervani 1996). Sales managers will use various control systems in order to increase the likelihood that the salesforce will perform the necessary functions in order to produce the required sales output to meet the

sales organization's goals. Anderson and Oliver (1987) developed a series of research propositions suggesting that managers should choose strategies to manage their salespeople using a balance of outcome-based and behavior-based sales control systems. Outcome-based control systems involve relatively little monitoring of salespeople, relatively little managerial direction of salespeople, and objective measures of results (e.g., sales, revenue, profits.) Alternatively, behavior-based sales control systems require considerable monitoring of activities and results, high levels of managerial direction and involvement in sales activities, and subjective methods of performance evaluation. In addition, performance measures are usually centered about the salesperson's job inputs (call planning, making sales calls, sales proposals). Thus, managers must choose a sales control strategy on the basis of organizational objectives, organizational structure, and compensation system dimensions.

Based on this conceptualization, sales control can be viewed as similar to directive behavior (as used in Hersey and Blanchard's leadership models). Using sales control as a dimension of situational salesforce leadership provides more versatility over directive behavior in that it (sales control) includes aspects of managerial evaluation, reporting, supervision, and compensation and as such enables managers to more strategically pick leadership options. Outcome-based sales control's focus on less monitoring, supervision, and measurements based on outputs is close in the description of low levels of directive behavior. Likewise, behavior-based sales control centered on higher levels of monitoring, supervision and measures of sales activities seems close in nature to high levels of directive behavior. Thus, we propose that the sales control continuum of outcome-based to behavior-based can be used to describe one dimension of situational salesforce leadership.

Trust Considerations in Salesforce Leadership

Trust has been shown to be a major building block in the relationship between salesperson and sales manager (Brashear, Boles, and Brooks 2003; Castleberry and Tanner 1986; Lagace 1990; Rich 1998). The trust a sales manager develops in his salesperson is likely to result from shared values and goals (Brashear, Boles, and Brooks 2003; Morgan & Hunt 1994), a belief in the salesperson's integrity (Brower, Schoorman and Tan 2000; Butler & Reese 1991; Nooteboom 1997; Whitener et al. 1998), and the willingness to have open/honest communication (Brashear, Boles, and Brooks 2003; Hawes, Mast, and Swan 1989; Rich 1998). In turn, managerial trust in a salesperson has positive effects on cooperation, shared values, commitment, and satisfaction and negative effects on conflict, uncertainty, and opportunistic behavior (Jones and George 1998; Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman 1995; McCallister 1995; Morgan and Hunt 1994). However, to date, most of this literature looks at how the trust of the sales manager impacts the salesperson and all but ignores trust as the mechanism for doing so. Clearly, since trust represents the extent to which the sales manager can depend on the salesperson, the sales manager can adjust his or her behavior when more trust is present, thus strategically accruing these benefits, while safeguarding the fact that the salesperson's performance must not suffer. In this light, a limitation in the leadership models discussed to this point is the under-utilization of managers using trust to assist them in choosing a leadership style, with appropriate behaviors. Recognizing this, we propose the second dimension of salesforce leadership to be the level of trust that the sales manager has in the salesperson.

Trust is fundamentally a psychological construct and it has been widely applied in psychology, sociology, economics, management, and sales research. From the psychology literature, trust is an expectancy, held by one individual that

another individual can be relied upon based on past experiences (Rotter 1967, 1971, 1980). From an economics point of view Williamson (1996) defines trust generically as a manager's expectation that a subordinate will perform as required coupled with his assignment of the probability that the subordinate will fulfill desired actions. Based on these two views, the implication to sales management is that a manager may trust a salesperson if previous interactions between the two have resulted in favorable outcomes. Granted, there are infinite number of scenarios and interactions that a sales manager could consider when trusting a salesperson (e.g., engaging in ethical behavior with customers, consistent in fulfilling administrative responsibilities, engaging in activities required to meet organizational goals, to mention a few). Seeing that the primary function of sales management is to direct the activities of the salesforce toward meeting organizational goals and objectives (Ingram, et al. 2004), we settle on a single definition of a sales manager's trust in a salesperson as his *expectation* and *confidence* that the salesperson will achieve his future performance goals and will not behave opportunistically.

A manager may operationalize this by reflecting on previous transactions with the salesperson to make a trust assessment. This appraisal will be based on both a cognitive and affective component of trust formation (Lewis and Wiegert 1985). Thus a sales manager will base his trust in the salesperson on what he takes to be "good reasons" based on evidence *as well* as considering the emotional ties that link the two individuals (McAllister 1995). For example, if the salesperson historically delivers on forecasted sales, generates high levels of customer satisfaction, and is honest and loyal, the manager has a stronger basis for trusting the salesperson. Conversely, if the manager has had limited exposure to the salesperson or has witnessed undependable or dishonest behavior, then trust is likely to be low. Obviously this is a continuum, and not a set of absolutes.

Northern Illinois University

An example of this would be the sales manager's expectation that a salesperson make ten sales calls a day. In a high trust situation (based on that salesperson's history of hard work), the sales manager can be almost certain that at the end of the week, fifty calls will be made by that salesperson. There are no required call reports to turn it. The mechanism to ensure compliance of this task is merely trust. Obviously, under these conditions, the sales manager is vulnerable. If the salesperson decides to shirk or lie about the number of calls made, little can be done by the sales manager to verify performance. As a result, sales may suffer. However, if the salesperson is true to his word and makes fifty calls that week, the salesperson will likely be trusted in the weeks to come. We argue that using trust as a dimension of salesforce leadership provides for a versatile situational leadership style framework. First, managers are able to assess levels of salesperson trust based on cognition (e.g., "this salesperson has delivered in the past so will likely continue to do so in the future") as well as affect (e.g. "this salesperson is an honest and loyal person"). Second, by including trust with sales control, a broad set of leadership options become available to managers.

A sales manager's trust formation in the salesperson can be impacted by many factors, including the salesperson's direct reporting relationship to the manager, salesperson tenure with manager, managerial span of control, and managerial physical proximity to salespeople, among others. Such factors inevitably impact the frequency and type of transactions that occur between sales manager and salesperson resulting in a range of relationships (from agency representative to company hired/direct reporting salesperson). The following section illustrates and describes our integrated framework of approaches to sales leadership using sales control and trust.

A SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP MODEL

Table 1 illustrates our proposed model of

situational sales leadership utilizing the constructs of sales control and trust. The model suggest that sales managers can choose from six sales leadership styles dependent on the type of sales control they choose to employ (given constraints from the environment they operate within) and the level of trust they have in the salesperson. In the following section, we describe each leadership style. We tend to use extreme examples, anchoring the continuum of sales control; however we recognize that a manager might move more toward one style or another as the specific account objectives and the manager's own comfort level varies. While some may be genuinely using a combination of control mechanisms, we believe most individual relationships will actually be characterized as more in one direction or the other.

Sales Leadership When Sales Control is More Outcome-based

Sales control considered to be more outcome-based is one in which managers will use relatively little monitoring and direct supervision of salespeople. This is because typically more commission (than salary) is used to drive and reward performance (Anderson and Oliver 1987; Oliver and Anderson 1994). Performance is based on objective sales output that includes

units, revenue, profit margin, and market share; usually tied to organizational objectives. In some cases, the salesperson may not be vertically integrated within the salesforce (i.e., an outsourced resource). These selling resources may be manufacturer's reps, distributor reps, or independent agents. In addition, implementation issues force distance between salespeople and managers, due to large proximities and increasing span of control. Based on the level of trust that a manager has in the individual salesperson, leadership style may be *contingent, facilitating, or delegating.* The extent to which the manager trusts the salesperson will vary across these styles. Each type is further defined.

A *contingent* sales leadership style is delineated based on low levels of trust that the sales manager has in the salesperson and an orientation to outcome-based controls. Much like in a transactional leadership approach, a manager will provide either positive (e.g., recognition and/or approval) or negative feedback (e.g., reprimands and/or disapproval) to salespeople contingent on their effort or performance (House 1971; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich 2001; Yammarino, Spangler, and Dubinsky 1998). A likely example would be an agency representative or a salesperson reporting to a manager with a large

Table 1: Situational Salesforce Leadership Using Sales Control and Trust

	LEADERSHIP STYLE	
High Trust	Delegating	Sponsoring
Moderate Trust	Facilitating	Coaching
Low Trust	Contingent	Directing
	More Outcome-based sales control	**More Behavior-based sales control**

span of control. It could also occur with a new or low trusted salesperson in a system characterized by outcome-based performance metrics. In this selling environment, one manager may be responsible for a large territory covered by many representatives. Here, the manager has little (if any exposure) to many of the reps, thus making it difficult to assess any level of trust other than low. This scenario is addressed in the literature (Anderson and Oliver 1987; Williamson 1996) by suggesting that, in order to reduce transaction costs and the risk of opportunism, these reps should be closely managed using outcome-based sales incentives to ensure performance. Less reliance on behavior monitoring, evaluation, and direct supervision will be needed since a pay for performance (e.g., commission) compensation plan will drive results.

A *facilitating* sales leadership style is one in which moderate levels of trust in the salesperson exists, and an outcome-based control style is used. Limited transactions with the salesperson, a mix of positive and negative encounters, or a particular rep could be in the process of earning her "stripes" could cause trust to be moderately assessed. Overall, the environment is not conducive to close relationships with the manager or organizational objectives focus the salesforce on outcomes. A direct report salesperson whose skills are developed and has a modest track record of performance may fall into this category. Because of the outcome-based sales control environment, this salesperson may travel a lot trying to meet sales goals, yet still needs some monitoring and support from his manager to address increasingly complex sales opportunities. A facilitating sales leadership style allows the manager to play the role of supporter whereby the onus of day-to-day decision-making and problem solving rests in the hands of the salesperson. The primary role of the sales manager is to help break down barriers and provide encouragement to the salesperson, while monitoring and rewarding outcomes to assure goals are met.

Northern Illinois University

High levels of managerial trust in the salesperson, accompanied by an outcome-based orientation typify a *delegating* sales leadership style. Per the definition of trust, past transactions with the salesperson had been positive providing the manager with high levels of confidence that future transactions will continue to be as well. The manager may be in a situation where other demands on his or her time make outcome-based control more practical. For example, these might be the sales organization's top performers in that they consistently produce sales outputs, period over period. Similar to the definition provided by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), a delegating leadership style calls for the salesperson and manager to jointly decide on the problem definition. Decision-making is then delegated totally to the salesperson to decide how to accomplish the goal. Due to high levels of trust in the salesperson, the manager has confidence in the salesperson's ability to consistently produce sales and rewards based on continued output. Outcome-based tracking can be relatively automated and need not be closely monitored.

Sales Leadership When Sales Control is More Behavior-based

When sales control is more behavior-based, managers use higher levels of behavior monitoring and supervision of salespeople. Here, more salary (than commission) compensation is often used because salespeople are paid for demonstrating the behaviors or activities that lead up to the sale (Anderson and Oliver 1987; Oliver and Anderson 1994). Performance is based on subjective assessments such as pre-call planning efforts, the quality of sales proposals, and various customer service/ satisfaction activities; usually derived from organizational objectives and implementation considerations. These salespeople tend to be members of the direct salesforce and could be assigned various selling roles from territory sales rep (managing a large number of smaller accounts) to strategic account manager

(responsible for one or few large accounts). Based on the level of trust that a manager has in the individual salesperson, leadership style may be *directing, coaching,* or *sponsoring.* Each type is further defined.

Lower levels of managerial trust in the salesperson, with higher levels of behavior-based control, characterize the *directing* sales manager. A new-hire, for example, may pose a situation where the manager has not yet formed trust in the salesperson. Due to undeveloped skills, limited opportunities to perform, and position on the learning curve, trust formation at this stage of the salesperson-sales manager relationship is difficult. From the leadership style of Hersey and Blanchard (1982), the directing sales manager will provide much instruction, telling the salesperson what, how, and when tasks should be performed, consistent with behavior-based control.

As this salesperson continues to develop his skills, practice his trade, and demonstrate to the manager that he can fulfill organizational goals, moderate levels of managerial trust may evolve (i.e., the manager is starting to see a pattern of consistency emerge). In an environment conducive to behavior-based control, at this point, the manager may progress to a *coaching* sales leadership style. Coaching, as described by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), involves more 2-way communication between the salesperson and sales manager in an attempt to engage in productive dialogue leading to ideas and suggestions for improved performance. Based on growing trust levels, the sales manager may feel that the salesperson's observations and ideas may provide valuable insight to compliment those of the manager's.

High levels of trust in the salesperson, combined with behavior-based control systems, lead to a sales leadership style of *sponsoring.* Typically, a sales manager will entrust the organization's most prized customer opportunities to those salespeople that can be counted on to preserve, grow, or win-over customer relationships. Thus,

the objective of these salespeople may be to retain and grow a substantial revenue stream or make gradual progress toward winning a competitor's revenue within an account. In this case, the salesperson provides the strategic direction on the account and the sponsoring sales leader plays the role necessary to support the account plan. The role of the sales manager may be to build a relationship with executives within the customer organization, allow for budget to host customer positioning events, or to arrange for dedicated resources (customer service, technical support, RFP response team, etc.) to support the account. These are more behavior-based in orientation and require a high level of trust in the salesperson.

The six sales leadership styles described in the integrated (sales control – trust) framework provide sales managers with an expanded array of managerial choices given the sales environment and their unique relationship with each salesperson. The following discussion presents implications for sales research and ideas for implementation by sales managers.

DISCUSSION & MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The most significant contribution of this framework of situational sales leadership is that it is the first to provide a unified way to combine dimensions of sales control and trust in defining leadership options for sales managers. In doing so, we provide managers with a more comprehensive array of managerial options based on *both* the selling environment and the sales manager – salesperson relationship. Previous well-researched traditional models (transactional/transformational leadership, LMX, and situational leadership) focus *either* exclusively on the sales environment (e.g., transactional/transformational leadership) or the relationship between sales leader and salesperson (e.g., LMX theory). Although the Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1982) leadership models do address issues of leader direction and support, their approach is somewhat limited in that it

Table 2: Characteristics of Sales Control Type

	More outcome-based	**More behavior-based**
Characteristics	Minimum supervision Little reporting Formal evaluation Evaluation of objective outcomes Incentive compensation (commission)	Maximum supervision Much reporting Informal reviews Evaluation of subjective behaviors Fixed compensation (salary)
Mechanisms Used	Sales quotas Performance metrics Performance reviews Employment contracts	Sales call plans Activity tracking logs Coaching Trust

implies that managers will always exhibit some degree of salesperson supportive behavior (which becomes difficult to assess in a new relationship). Furthermore, existing leadership models require an assessment of salesperson developmental level (a relatively complex construct assessed by a combination of salesperson competence, confidence, and motivation) in order to select the appropriate leadership style.   The underlying assumption here is that the manager is able to accurately assess these traits (which is not always the case.)

From a managerial implication point of view, this manuscript provides sales management with a practical tool for customizing leadership strategies at the individual salesperson level. To assist in the implementation of this tool, Table 2 is offered as a guideline for managers to assess their sales control strategy based on the degree of salesperson monitoring, supervision, and types of measurements used to evaluate salespeople. As pointed out in the literature (Oliver and Anderson 1994), sales control will more than likely take on a hybrid form (i.e., combination of outcome-based and behavior-based).   Seeing this, sales managers much recognize that they may operate somewhere in the middle of the sales control continuum. Therefore, judgment must be used when

choosing a leadership style or combining aspects of multiple styles. Furthermore, when assessing salesperson trust levels, managers should ask themselves questions relative to their relationship with the specific salesperson (e.g., "Based on her previous actions, can I expect the same behaviors/outcomes in the future?" "Is he an honest person?" "Do I trust her?") To assist managers in carrying out each leader style, Table 3 is offered as guidelines to sales managers for implementation.

Several important managerial implications can be derived from this framework.   First, by integrating *both* the interpersonal relationship (i.e., trust) with the salesperson and the constraints of the organizational environment (i.e., sales control), sales managers can more strategically identify and implement a specific leadership strategy designed to achieve specific organizational goals and objectives.   For example, if bottom line results are the goal then a manager has three (outcome-based) leadership strategies to choose between (depending on the quality of their relationship with each salesperson). Likewise, if customer relationship building is desired, then three other (behavior-based) leadership strategies may be considered.

Secondly, by using the interpersonal relationship

Table 3: Guidelines for Implementing Sales Leadership Style

If sales leadership style is:	*Use these implementation strategies:*
Contingent	Communicate quotas and sales goals in writing Use commission, sales contests, and spiffs Require daily performance tracking
Facilitating	Actively work to remove obstacles and barriers to salesperson success Support salesperson's efforts but don't take on outcome ownership Reward outcome performance with commission and incentives
Delegating	Discuss with salesperson what needs to be accomplished (ID problem) Make it clear that implementation is up to them (how, when, where) Empower salesperson to "run the show" and reward success
Directing	Be empathetic to salesperson's relative newness and inexperience Be patient, salesperson "may not yet know what he/she doesn't know" Embrace and encourage salesperson's enthusiasm Provide clear and specific direction Ask questions to ensure understanding of task(s) Closely supervise and monitor progress toward task completion
Coaching	Discuss sales call plans, objectives, and strategies prior to sales calls Make joint sales calls with salesperson and observe selling behaviors Discuss sales call performance; point out successes and areas needing improvement Lead by example; demonstrate selling skills where appropriate Listen
Sponsoring	Discuss and agree upon an account plan and strategy with salesperson Set medium, and long range goals for strategic accounts Discuss how performance and progress will be measured and evaluated Understand / execute the leadership role appropriate for each account Recognize small accomplishments leading up to longer range goals

factor of trust to choose a leadership strategy, managers are likely to impact salesperson motivation and reduce turnover. Motivation may focus a salesperson's effort toward attaining external rewards (e.g., compensation, recognition, etc.) or internal rewards (e.g., pride, job-fulfillment, career development, etc.). Given an understanding of what types of rewards drive an individual salesperson's effort, a sales manager may be able to more easily assess levels of trust (in the salesperson). In turn, this higher quality trusting relationship is likely to result in higher levels of job satisfaction and reduce the likelihood of salesperson turnover.

There seem to be two particular applications

where this framework may be most usefully applied. First, we see this as a key diagnostic tool for a sales manager who is struggling with one or more salespeople in his or her span of control. The manager may be misapplying leadership behaviors. Take for instance the salesperson that may have been under this sales manager for an extended period of time. While a low trust supervision style may have initially been appropriate, over time the salesperson may have repeatedly demonstrated his trustworthiness and may be dissatisfied that he is not rewarded with more autonomy and responsibility. Application of this framework may help the manager identify the issue and subsequently alter her leadership approach with the salesperson. Further, a manager could be ineffectively attempting to use more behavior or outcome based control that the organization or external environment allows. Careful consideration of this may allow the manager to adapt to the most operative leadership style.

The second application that stems from this framework is one of training and evaluation. For the new manager, unsure how to respond to the various individuals and situations, this can provide a useful training tool to initially aid in the selection of appropriate management styles. Senior management may also use it to assess and evaluate new managers as they transition into their role.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of our research was to suggest that by using sales control and trust as leadership framework dimensions, a parsimonious and comprehensive model of sales management can be constructed taking into account details of the sales transaction (i.e., outcome versus behavior based sales environment) and the relationship quality between sales manager and salesperson. In doing so, six leadership styles emerge as being appropriate for managing salespeople in diverse resource environments. The distinction between the two is important because selling goals may differ depending on how performance is

measured and evaluated as well as the extent of salesperson monitoring and supervision required of the sales manager.

Also, with today's selling environment becoming more complex, it is critical that sales managers lead their salesforce to exhibit the selling behaviors required to build long lasting customer relationships. The first step toward this goal is to ensure that salespeople are committed, motivated, and rewarded to do so. One way for managers to accomplish this is to select governance strategies tailored to the specific salesperson situation. By choosing a leadership style best suited for the selling environment and the belief that a salesperson will meet the demands and expectations of their selling goals, sales managers can be confident in their own ability to best serve their customers, salespeople, and the sales organization.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Erin and Richard L. Oliver (1987), "Perspectives on Behavior-Based Versus Outcome-Based Salesforce Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing,* 51 (Oct), 76-88.

Bass, Bernard M. (1985), *Leadership Beyond Expectations,* New York: Free Press.

-------- (1990), "Personal Selling and Transactional/Transformational Leadership," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 27 (3), 19-28.

Blanchard, Kenneth, H. (1985), "SLII: A Situational Approach to Managing People," *Blanchard Training and Development Manual,* 1-10.

Brashear, Thomas G., James S. Boles, and Charles M. Brooks (2003), "An Empirical Test of Trust-Building Processes and Outcomes in Sales Manager – Salesperson Relationships," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 31 (2), 189-200.

Brower, Holly H., F. David Schoorman, and Hwee Hoon Tan (2000), "A Model of Relational Leadership: The Integration of Trust and Leader-Member Exchange," *Leadership*

Quarterly, 11 (2), 227-250.

Bryman, Alan (1992), *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations,* London: Sage.

Butler, John K. Jr. and Richard M. Reese (1991), "Leadership Style and Sales Performance: A Test of the Situational Leadership Model," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 11 (3), 37-46.

Castleberry, Stephen B. and John F. Tanner, Jr. (1986), "The Manager-Salesperson Relationship: an Exploratory Examination of the Vertical-Dyad Linkage Model," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 6 (November), 29-37.

Challagalla, Goutam N. and Tasadduq A. Shervani (1996), "Dimensions and Types of Supervisory Control: Effects on Salesperson Performance and Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing,* 60 (1), 89-105.

Cravens, David W., Thomas N. Ingram, Raymond W. LaForge, and Clifford E. Young (1993), "Behavior-Based and Outcome-Based Salesforce Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing,* 57 (4), 47-59.

Dalrymple, Douglas J., William L. Cron, and Thomas E. DeCarlo (2001), *Sales Management, 7th ed.,* Jeff Marshall and Patricia McFadden eds., Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Dubinsky, Alan J. (1999), "Salesperson Failure – Sales Management is the Key," *Industrial Marketing Management,* 28 (1), 7-17.

Graen, George and William Schiemann (1978), "Leader-Member Agreement: A Vertical Dyad Linkage Model Approach," *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 63 (April), 206-212.

Hawes, Jon M., Kenneth E. Mast and John E. Swan (1989), "Trust Earning Perceptions of Sellers and Buyers," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 9 (1), 1-8.

Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard (1969), "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership," *Training and Development Journal,* (May), 6-34.

-------- and -------- (1982), *Management of Organizational Behavior,* 4th Edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.Honeycutt, Earl D., John B. Ford, and Antonis C. Simintiras (2003), *Sales*

Management, A Global Perspective, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, NY London.

House, Robert J. (1971), "A Path Goal Theory of Leaders Effectiveness," *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 16 (3), 321-333.

Ingram, Thomas, N., Raymond W. LaForge, Ramon A. Avila, Charles H. Schwepker, and Michael R. Williams, Jr. (2005), *Sales Management, Analysis and Decision Making,* 6th Edition, Southwestern Publishing.

Jones, Gareth R. and Jennifer M. George (1998), "The Experience and Evolution of Trust: Implications for Cooperation and Teamwork," *Academy of Management Review,* 23 (3), 531-546.

Kelman, Herbert C. (1958), "Compliance, Identification, and Internalization: Three Processes of Opinion Change," *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 2 (1), 51-60.

Krafft, Manfred (1999), "An Empirical Investigation of the Antecedents of Sales Force

Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing,* 63 (3), 120-134.

Lagace, Rosemary R. (1990), "Leader-Member Exchange: Antecedents and Consequences of the Cadre and Hired Hand," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 10 (February), 11-19.

--------, Stephen B. Castleberry, and Rick E. Ridnour (1993), "An Exploratory Salesforce Study of the Relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and Motivation, Role Stress, and Manager Evaluation," *Journal of Applied Business Research,* 9 (4), 110-119.

Lewis, J. D. and A. Wiegert (1985), "Trust as a Social Reality," *Social Forces,* 63 (1), 967-985.

MacKenzie, Scott, B., Philip M. Podsakoff, and Gregory A. Rich (2001), "Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Salesperson Performance," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 29 (2), 115-134.

Mayer, Roger C., James H. Davis, & F. David Schoorman (1995), "An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust," *Academy of Management Review,* 20 (3), 709-734.

McCallister, Daniel J. (1995), "Affect- and

Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations," *Academy of Management Journal,* 38 (1), 24-59.

Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing,* 58 (3), 20-38.

Nooteboom, Bart, Hans Berger, and Niels G. Noorderhaven (1997), "Effects of Trust and Governance on Relational Risk," *Academy of Management Journal,* 40 (2), 308-338.

Oliver, Richard L. and Erin Anderson (1994), "An Empirical Test of the Consequences of Behavior- and Outcome-Based Sales Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing,* 58 (Oct), 53-67.

Rich, Gregory A. (1998), "The Constructs of Sales Coaching: Supervisory Feedback, Role Modeling and Trust," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management,* 18 (1), 53-63.

Rotter, Julian B. (1967), "A New Scale for the Measurement of Interpersonal Trust," *Journal of Personality,* 15 (1), 651-665.

-------- (1971), "Generalized Expectancies for Interpersonal Trust," *American Psychologist,* 26 (1), 443-452.

-------- (1980), "Interpersonal Trust, Trustworthiness, and Gullibility," *American Psychologist,* 35 (1), 1-7.

Spiro, Rosann L., William J. Stanton, and Gregory A. Rich (2003), *Management of a Sales Force, 11th ed.,* Gary Baner and Barret Koger eds., McGraw Hill Irwin.

Whitener, Ellen M., Susan E. Brodt, M. Audrey Korsgaard, and Jon M. Werner (1998), "Managers as Initiators of Trust: An Exchange Relationship Framework For Understanding Managerial Trustworthy Behavior," *Academy of Management Review,* 23 (3), 513-530.

Williamson, Oliver E. (1996), *The Mechanisms of Governance*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Yammarino, Francis J., William D. Spangler, and Allan Dubinsky (1998), Transformational and Contingent Reward Leadership: Individual, Dyad, and Group Levels of Analysis," *Leadership Quarterly,* 9 (1), 27-38.

Northern Illinois University

Michael L. Mallin *is an Assistant Professor of Sales and Marketing at University of Toledo.*
E-mail: Michael.Mallin@utoledo.edu
Ellen Bolman Pullins *is an Associate Professor of Marketing at University of Toledo.*
E-mail: Ellen.Pullins@utoledo.edu