of ten and then we expect specific results from him. We expect him to do the difficult thing, but we pay him for doing the easy thing; and being human he does the easiest thing. The grocery salesman who is paid for his volume of sales, sells sugar. The typewriter salesman who is paid for his volume of sales and has his exchanges counted in the volume, favors exchanges. He buys old, second-hand machines for his company. He becomes a buyer and not a seller; and I have seen cases where the buying was seventy-nine per cent of the entire business. He is paid a flat commission of 12½ per cent for buying an old typewriter at about twice what it costs to build a new one; then it is rebuilt and sold to the public for five dollars more than the allowance and the 12½ per cent paid to sell it, and we think we have made a great deal of money out of that transaction. You could prove that by any salesman of the company. They infer that that is the profitable end of the business because it is so easy for the salesman.

Just as soon as a new sales policy made it unprofitable to the salesman to do that, the proposition changed,—changed just as soon as the reward was based not on a flat commission but on a share of the net profits on each transaction. In the transaction where there was no profits there was a minimum reward; in the transaction where there was a maximum profit there was a maximum reward. Instead of paying a 12½ per cent commission on a typewriter sale, for instance, the commission ran from $2.50 to as high as $28.00 or $30.00 on a high grade cash sale. The man had to sell so many machines on exchange for $2.00 to make up for what he could get by making cash sales that it became interesting to go out and get a cash sale. Instead of going where the machines were, he got them "where they ain't," and he brought the results in.

There is another aspect to this proposition which must be taken into consideration. That is the quality of imagination. It seems to me that the division between men with respect to their relative capacities, their relative sizes in the world, depends on one quality and one quality alone, granting of course a normal amount of industry to a man and a normal degree of intelligence. I believe that there is very little difference between the normal intelligence of the average man and the maximum intelligence. But I believe the difference in imagination between men is as wide apart as the poles.

The man who makes a mark on the world in any sphere of life is the man whose goal is twenty-five years away, or a life-time ahead. The man who is content to work day in and day out for a goal in the very distant future is a man of destiny. There are other men who will work for a goal five years away. Still more who will work for a goal one year away. They are all big men. Then you come down to the rank and file of men you get as salesmen because you can get them at a price; they have to have their goal directly in front of them. If you can arrange the reward so that a man can make up his own pay-roll every night on the work that he has done for that day and know how much he has made, and if you can train that man to think about being a ten dollar a day or a fifteen dollar a day or a twenty dollar a day or a twenty-five dollar a day man, you have done an infinitely big thing for your organization; you have stimulated the imagination of the little man to the point where he brings in big results; you have given him his reward at a point where he can see it. (And let me say I have never yet seen a business where, by careful planning this daily reward plan could not be worked out.)

It seems to me that the secret of the popularity of golf is that there are eighteen victories or defeats in each round. If one had to play a whole round before one had a score, I don't believe that one man in ten who now plays golf would play. But because each hole is a new contest, each a new day, we are tremendously interested; and we start over again with every hole, and no matter what the cataclysm has been on the past hole or in the past bunker or brook, we start fresh and we may arrive at boggy.

It is the same thing with a man who can be given an opportunity to measure his own work in dollars and cents at the end of each day. There is another slant on that. I think it is far more difficult to get a salesman to make reports than it is to get him to work. But if a salesman in making a report is making his payroll, after he has missed one day's pay by not putting in a report, he rarely misses another one. I can assure you of that.

The analysis of what a salesman should do is a very big factor in the success of a problem. What would you sit down and figure out for yourself? What would you like to do for a customer to make that customer's connection with you profitable and successful? Take the little retail merchant, for example, the little general store up in a small country town. If you could be there yourself and have a direct contact with that little general store-keeper who

is struggling along to make a living against all the competition that there is from the mail order houses and from the big department stores in the nearby cities, what would you do to help him, to help him make money on your product? Sit down and figure out what you would do for that fellow and then pay your salesmen for doing it and he will do it. It is simple. I have had cases where I have had a direct reward for washing windows. You will be surprised how many windows ought to be washed in a country dealer's store and if the salesman will wash a dealer's window he has made a friend. That dealer will display your goods in that window. After it is washed, it is very simple to get your product into that window and get the advertising that comes from it. It seems as if that were a great deal to ask a salesman to do, but he doesn't mind doing it if he is paid for it and if he is shown just what it will do for him.

I know that some of the oldest and best friends I have made in my business career are those I made as a cub salesman when I used to work the back country on the Harlem Railroad. I spent many an evening keeping books for the different store-keepers who were my customers in the towns I visited, trying to bring their books up to date for them and get their collections in and show them how to collect. And I don't think that there is any product I could possibly want to sell that those men could possibly buy, that they wouldn't buy of me today. I haven't seen any of them for eighteen or twenty years, but I hear from them often enough to know they have not forgotten the fact that they were once helped.

I like to think of a salesman as a business missionary, as a business teacher; and if a man takes that attitude toward his customers, the attitude of service, he doesn't have very much of a price problem before him. Such a salesman has demonstrated his interest in the customer's business and has shown the customer that his purpose is to make money for him, and that customer will cooperate to make money for the salesman. He never has to argue with the customer at any length on the question of making special products, or has to fight special, finicky notions or make changes in the line to suit that customer's desires, because that customer can be made to recognize the value of standardization; can be made to recognize it every time.

Of course, you can carry standardization too far. It is equally as wrong for a factory organization to dominate its selling organization to the exclusion of new lines for which there is a distinct reason, as it is for the factory to be dominated by the sales organization for the putting on of lines for the sake of getting an order. One is just as bad as the other.

IV. DISCUSSION

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we shall find our most profitable discussion either the direct study of the salesman's job—the job analysis of selling—or the general subject of coordination of sales and factory effort. I am going to ask two or three men to speak, beginning with Mr. E. St. Elmo Lewis.

E. ST. ELMO LEWIS[1]: In facing the problem of the sales manager's job we have the two major subsidiary problems brought out by Mr. Freeland and Mr. Bruce,—sales planning or engineering and sales operations or actual selling. In neither are sales managers today strictly scientific.

When we find an executive of production experience dominating the entire activities of a business, we find, as Mr. Freeland has suggested, an attitude of mind for standardization of the product; on the other hand, when we find that dominating executive one of past sales experience, we are likely to find a multiplicity of products. And if there is no dominating point of view, which is too frequently the case, we are likely to find both sales and production out of harmony. Such a situation, of course, creates immense problems for both production and selling.

The attendance here indicates that the sales managers have come to realize their problem, and are beginning to think about coordinated production and selling, and about how the splendid methods developed by production managers can be of use for the sales managers. I understand the Taylor Society did not expect more than twenty-five or thirty sales executives at this meeting, and there are over a hundred! Such attendance indicates that although it is asserted that nine out of ten salesmen say science hasn't anything to do with selling, there are a number of sales executives who are inclined to push the inquiry.

The sales manager must get more of the factory approach to the problem, the mental attitude of dealing in realities and not merely intuitions, hunches and opinions; and the factory manager must get more of the idea that the business exists, not merely for the

[1] Campbell-Ewald Co., New York.