



Report on the

Validity and Reliability of

Objective Management Group's

Suite of Sales-Specific

Evaluations and Assessments

November 21, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: History of Instrument Development	Page 1
Section II: Description of Application of Current Instrument	Page 5
Section III: Description of Instrument Scales	Page 7
Section IV: Distribution of Item Scores	Page 9
Section V: Distribution of Primary Scales and Correlation to Hirable and Sales Quotient	Page 10
Section VI: Core Competencies and Derivation of Sales Quotient	Page 12
Section VII: Discriminant Validity	Page 15
Section VIII: Other Section Distributions and Indices	Page 16
Section VIII: Confidence Rating (Internal Validity)	Page 18
Section X: Predictive Validity	Page 19
Section XI: Adverse Impact Analysis	Page 21
Appendix: Distribution of Job Applicant Responses	Page 23

Section I: History of Instrument Development

Objective Management Group's (OMG) evaluations were originally developed in 1990, following several years of research into the elements that contribute to sales success, and more importantly, failure. Through this research, Dave Kurlan identified five major weaknesses which, when present in certain combinations, prevent salespeople from executing key sales behaviors. The identification of these weaknesses, along with the assessment of four crucial elements for success, became the foundation of the present assessment tool. The Objective Management Group, Inc. was then founded for the sole purpose of continuing this important research and bringing the OMG evaluations to market as the first sales specific assessment tool of its kind. Since that time, OMG's tools have been used to evaluate more than 750,000 salespeople and sales managers from thousands of companies in more than 200 industries and around the world.

The premise of OMG's tools is based upon Kurlan's 1989 insight that every salesperson has hidden weaknesses, not obvious to either themselves or others. Certain combinations of these weaknesses will interfere with a salesperson's ability to execute necessary sales behaviors. Kurlan also noted that a salesperson's Desire, and Commitment toward sales success, and outlook can be analyzed in order to determine their incentive to change, and ultimately their growth potential.

This research took an approach that was rather unorthodox in the field at the time. Most early studies looked at successful salespeople in order to determine what factors they had in common, a process known as benchmarking. Kurlan instead attempted to identify the factors responsible for sales failures. Surprisingly, he discovered that the pre-existence of selling skills had little or no effect on actual sales performance. Instead, he found that people who possessed particular weaknesses performed less consistently and less effectively than individuals who lacked those weaknesses. He also determined that there were certain important elements whose absence seriously hindered sales success.

Initially, Kurlan determined that there were four factors or Crucial Elements which were necessary for sales success. The absence of any of these factors greatly increased the likelihood of sales failure. The Four Crucial Elements are:

- 1) **Desire** – How badly a salesperson wants to succeed in sales is the most important element. When a salesperson lacks strong desire, their incentive to do anything difficult is not very compelling.
- 2) **Commitment** – Strong Commitment is one's willingness to do whatever it takes to succeed. Many salespeople have only conditional commitment – they will do what it takes only if it is not too difficult or scary, and they agree in principal with what they are being asked to do. When salespeople lack strong commitment, their incentive to do anything difficult is again not very compelling.
- 3) **Outlook** – Outlook encompasses attitude about the company, job, career, and self. When Outlook is not as strong as it could be, as is often true with candidates looking for a new position, it can affect desire and commitment, cause excuse-making and a bevy of other conditions which negatively impact sales performance.
- 4) **Responsibility** – When salespeople take responsibility for their results, or lack thereof, they are more likely to become more effective in the future. Salespeople who make excuses will seldom improve, as they fail to see the part that they played in their own sales failures.

This same research also identified five major weaknesses, which strongly hinder an individual from achieving sales success. The Five Major Weaknesses identified in this research and assessed by OMG's tools are:

- 1) **Need for Approval** – Many people choose sales after being told they have a perfect personality for selling. While that could be true, many of those same people feel complete only when people like them. Salespeople who are easily liked have a great advantage, but salespeople who need their prospects to like them often make that a priority over getting the business. Salespeople with need for approval

usually have difficulty asking tough questions, often have a fear of rejection, and avoid confrontation.

- 2) **Tendency to Become Emotionally Involved** – Salespeople that think, analyze, create, strategize or otherwise talk to themselves when prospects catch them by surprise become emotionally involved instead of remaining in the moment. When they are emotionally involved, their listening skills tend to be self-focused rather than prospect-focused, causing them to miss important points and lose control of the interaction.
- 3) **Self-Limiting Beliefs** – Every salesperson has as many as sixty beliefs that either support the selling process (“I have the ability to be effective with company presidents”) or sabotage it (“I don’t like making cold calls”). Ineffective salespeople often have ten or more of these self-limiting beliefs, while more effective salespeople have very few.
- 4) **Non-Supportive Buy Cycle** – Buy Cycle refers to the way that a salesperson makes a major purchase for himself or herself. When one buys in a way that supports the selling process, it is a Supportive Buy Cycle. Most ineffective salespeople have Non-Supportive Buy Cycles. They comparison shop, shop for the lowest price, perform research, or think that a relatively small amount of money is a lot. When their prospects wish to engage in this behavior, the salesperson understands (has empathy) and thus techniques for handling stalls and put-offs are either not employed, or used ineffectively.
- 5) **Discomfort with Issues Involving Money** – Many salespeople are uncomfortable escalating a question about budget or affordability to the next level. Their discomfort prevents them from helping a prospect figure out how to pay or where to find the money for a purchase. When prospects don’t have a budget, can’t envision increasing a budget, or don’t know where to find the money for a purchase, the salesperson empathizes rather than digging deeper,

asking questions and making suggestions to solve the monetary shortage.

The Crucial Elements and Major Weaknesses uncovered by the instrument are combined with other indicators of incentive to change (also evaluated by OMG's tools) in order to calculate an individual's Growth Potential – the percentage of improvement that could be expected from an appropriate development program that focused on eliminating the weaknesses listed above.

In 1992 OMG began to test candidates for sales positions. Research using these early administrations indicated that having just one set of criteria for sales success across industries was inappropriate. The demand characteristics of a position selling retail shelf space in a route sales position were simply not the same as those of a position selling six-figure custom-engineered capital equipment. As a result of this research, OMG incorporated a sliding scale based on the difficulty of the position for hiring criteria into the assessment process.

Over time, through a long process of observation and experience, varying weights were determined for each weakness, based upon the limiting effects of that weakness on sales performance. These weights were then incorporated into the calculations of each subscale, in order to produce a more accurate prediction of a candidate's capacity for sales success.

The major findings and recommendations of OMG's candidate assessments identify the Sales Quotient of an individual and contain a performance prediction. The current version of this instrument features a measure of market and environment compatibility - a factor which influences ramp up time in a new hire. Based on these factors, an accurate hiring recommendation can be made.

Section II: Description of Application of Current Instrument

The OMG assessments are self-administered online. The candidate taking the assessment answers a series of 61 multiple-choice questions designed to assess the existence of the Four Crucial Elements, the Five Major Weaknesses, and 6 sets of Sales Competencies as determined by prior research. Each question has four possible answers. Both the questions and the answers to each question are presented to the candidate in random order. A candidate's response on each question is scored according to its similarity to the ideal response identified for that question.

In addition to the core Sales Force Profile, there are two supplementary sets of questions that are commonly included when profile administration is geared toward job candidate screening:

The *Salesperson's History* consists of 25 multiple-choice questions assessing the candidate's sales predilections and attitudes toward prior sales experiences.

The *Questions Regarding Performance* consists of four multiple-choice questions directly assessing the prior sales experience of the candidate.

The *Elements* consist of 11 multiple choice questions for a global self-assessment key sales related personality and behavioral dimensions.

The *Sales Selling Attributes* consist of 14 multiple-choice questions that assess the candidate's general approach to the sales process.

The *Sales Selling Practices* consist of 11 multiple-choice questions that evaluate the candidate's tactical approach to the sales process and related challenges.

The *Intangibles* consists of 27 multiple-choice questions that evaluate the candidate's potential intangible qualities that could further contribute to sales success.

There are currently two major applications for OMG's Evaluations and Assessments:

- 1) The Tool is used to assess the suitability of job candidates for sales positions. For this application, it is recommended that all applicants be administered the instrument immediately after the submission of a resume indicating an interest in job candidacy.

The **Confidential Sales Candidate Assessment** serves as the output for this application of the instrument. This candidate assessment offers a direct hiring recommendation, which indicates the candidate's sales potential within the identified company.

This extensive report includes an assessment of candidates and candidate-company fit across several dimensions.

- 2) OMG's evaluations are used to assess the strengths and weaknesses of an organization's current sales force. The feedback offered by the instrument can be used to help the organization's existing salespeople capitalize upon their selling strengths and learn how to overcome any major weaknesses that they may possess.

The Salesperson's **Evaluation** serves as the report for this application of the Profile. This assessment provides an extensive explanation of the salesperson's strengths and weaknesses, along with recommendations for positive change.

Data collected from the combined Salesperson Evaluations are analyzed and used collectively in the Sales Effectiveness and Improvement Analysis, a comprehensive report on the capabilities of an entire sales force.

Section III: Description of Instrument Scales

The current instrument is analyzed in order to yield two sets of core scales, the Will to Sell (Crucial Elements) and sales DNA (Major Weaknesses) described above. Two of the four Crucial Elements are derived from single item responses. However the remaining two, Desire and Commitment, as well as the five Major Weaknesses, are derived through an aggregation of responses to multiple items. The psychometric properties of these scales will be addressed below.

In addition to the core subscales, the OMG tool offers information in several different areas:

- Recommendations of candidate **Trainability** are derived using a weighted combination of several individual items.
- An evaluation of candidate **Compatibility** is derived by comparing a candidate's responses on the historical surveys to the company's stated needs.
- A candidate's **Potential for Growth** is computed by taking a weighted combination of the candidate's weaknesses and trainability evaluation.
- A candidate's **21 Core Competencies** are computed using a weighted combination of several individual items.
- A candidate's **Sales Quotient** is derived using a normalized weighted combination of the 21 Core Competencies.
- A candidate's **Sales Competencies** are presented in the form of a checklist offering responses to particular items.
- A **Confidence Score** is calculated to determine whether the candidate responded to the questionnaire honestly and consistently.

- Finally, a **Hiring Recommendation** is made for the application to job applicant populations. This is calculated by comparing the candidates' scores on the core subscales with a sliding scale determined by the size and nature of the industry of the hiring firm.

Section IV: Distribution of Item Scores

The data described in the following sections (IV-VII) that cover the distribution of survey items, internal reliability, and item and scale validity are drawn from 133,746 job applicant surveys conducted from 2011 through 2013. The Appendix for this document also reflects this data.

The distribution of scores for the core questions as presented to Job Applicants, are presented in Appendices. Throughout the development process of this instrument, care was taken to create items with a good range of distributions in order to help distinguish one current or potential salesperson from another. A few items were included that have almost universal endorsement (80% or more of respondents will endorse), the absence of which are potential indicators of significant future difficulty as a salesperson. For example, these three questions each had one option, which was endorsed more than 80% of the time for job applicants:

- **(07) I believe prospects:** Should trust and/or respect me (Option C – endorsed by 88% of job applicants);
- **(51) If a selling situation called for a confrontation I would:** Do it tactfully, regardless of the circumstances (Option D – 87%); and
- **(59) When a prospect becomes upset:** Try to comfort and ask why they're upset (Option D – 87%).

Most of the items, however, had multiple options that might be endorsed by salespersons with reasonably high frequency. The responses to these items are ultimately the greatest differentiators when determining the employability of job applicants.

Section V: Distribution of Primary Scales and Correlation with Hirable and Sales Quotient

The mean scores or frequency of categorization for the four Crucial Elements and five Major Weaknesses among job applicants is displayed in the first column of data in Table 1. Higher scores indicate better performance on that dimension. Attribute means of the 7 scales scored on a 0 to 100-scale range from a high of 81.8 (Lack of Desire) to a low of 18.9 (Self-Limiting Beliefs), with a wide distribution of the other 5 scales in between. Strong Outlook scores are observed in 74% of candidates while strong Making Excuses scores are only observed in 40% of candidates. This distribution reflects the intent to include in the assessment a few behaviors or attitudes that are quite common (i.e. would be expected of any salesperson, such as strong desire), some that are rare (i.e. are generally seen in only the strongest salespersons, such as a small number of self-limiting beliefs) and a large number that are fairly normatively seen in the population.

For job applicants (second column of data in Table 1), Trainability is highly related to the primary scales upon which it is based (Desire and Commitment), most notably driven by Commitment (i.e., if a respondent indicates the presence of Commitment to sell that candidate is more likely to be targeted as Trainable). Trainability again shows good discriminant validity against those 6 scales, which do not contribute to it, indicating that Trainability and each of these constructs are distinguishable from one another.

The Sales Quotient is also correlated with the individual subscales (final column of Table 1). Here one sees mostly moderate correlations, which are an index of the contributions of each subscale to the overall Sales Quotient score (a score with a maximum potential value of 173). Yet no individual correlation is so high as to make any subscale redundant with the overall Sales Quotient. In other words, the Sales Quotient is composed of many of the constructs inherent in the subscales but is not defined by any single one of them.

For both Trainability and Sales Quotient, note that the correlations are negative. As the incidence of these negative indices increases, an applicant's Sales Quotient (or

Trainability Score) tends to decrease. Conversely, the absence of these negative signs is related to an increase in the Sales Quotient or Trainability score.

Table 1
Job Applicant Screening Primary Scales: Percentage of Respondents and
Correlation with Overall Indices

Primary Scales	Average Score on scale of 100 or Percentage Strong	Correlation with Trainable	Correlation with Sales Quotient
Lack of Desire	81.8	-.46	-.47
Lack of Commitment	60.8	-.82	-.57
Poor Outlook (% Strong)	74%	-.05	-.11
Makes Excuses (% Strong)	40%	-.08	-.37
Need for Approval	23.0	-.13	-.37
Does Not Control Emotions	18.9	-.10	-.29
Money Weaknesses	39.8	-.13	-.58
Self-Limiting Beliefs	19.4	-.23	-.69
Non-Supportive Buy Cycle	57.5	-.09	-.42

Section VI: Core Competencies and Derivation of Sales Quotient

Over time, resellers of the OMG tools began to offer a context in which to view the overall strength of a salesperson. They called this the 21 Core Competencies. The Core Competencies were composed of one or more items in the instrument, and gave employers more specific sales strength and weakness information for those salespeople assessed. In 2001, OMG created a measure of the direct relationship between the competencies and the overall findings of the assessments. OMG called this measure the Sales Quotient.

Four steps are involved in arriving at the Sales Quotient:

1. Each Core Competency is generated through the responses to one or more items in the instrument;
2. Competency scores are then normalized to a maximum value of 10;
3. A weight factor is applied to each competency; and
4. Weighted values are added to arrive at the Sales Quotient.

The Sales Quotient has a maximum value of 173. Due to the proprietary nature of the generation of the core competency scores and weighting system used in creating the sales quotient, the specifics of this information is not published in this document. Please direct any inquiries into the specifics of these scoring systems to the Objective Management Group.

Cronbach's coefficient alpha provides a measure of the internal reliability of a scale based upon the average inter-correlation of the items. The coefficient reflects the extent to which items measure the same characteristic. Among job applicants (Table 2), the Cronbach's alpha is .69 for the 21 core competencies.

Positive Attitude has the highest mean score (9.8) and Supportive Buy Cycle the lowest (4.2). The average Core Competency score for job applicants is 7.0. As one would expect, scores are slightly elevated for applicants attempting to make a good impression at the point of hire. Nonetheless, there remains a robust spread of scores from the average score out to the high and low bounds.

When considering how each individual Core Competency correlates with the overall sales quotient, one sees a relatively equal distribution of scores. Correlations range from a low of .09 (Early Bonding and Rapport) to high of .62 (Supportive Beliefs) with the vast majority falling between .20 and .45. These correlations are again supportive of the individual contributions of each core competency to the overall Sales Quotient.

Table 2
Job Applicant Screening Primary Scales: Core Competency Means
And Correlation with Sales Quotient

Primary Scales	Mean of Respondents	Standard Deviation from Mean	Correlation with Sales Quotient
1. Has Written Goals	7.3	2.4	.37
2. Follows Written Goals with a Plan	7.7	3.0	.34
3. Has Positive Attitude	9.8	0.7	.15
4. Takes Responsibility	5.2	3.9	.36
5. Strong Self-Confidence	9.4	0.9	.29
6. Supportive Beliefs	5.2	1.9	.62
7. Controls Emotions	8.3	0.8	.27
8. Doesn't Need Approval	8.2	1.3	.37
9. Recovers from Rejection	8.1	1.2	.20
10. Comfortable Talking About Money	5.6	3.6	.58
11. Supportive Buy Cycle	4.2	2.4	.42
12. Consistent Effective Prospecting	9.6	1.4	.21
13. Reaches Decision Makers	6.1	1.8	.20
14. Effective Listening and Questioning	5.8	1.3	.36
15. Early Bonding and Rapport	7.6	2.6	.09
16. Uncovering Actual Budgets	6.3	1.8	.25
17. Discovering Why Prospects Buy	6.1	1.6	.36
18. Qualifies Proposals and Quotes	6.1	1.2	.28
19. Gets Commitments and Decisions	5.1	1.5	.32
20. Strong Desire for Success	8.3	1.5	.29
21. Strong Commitment to Success	7.6	2.7	.47

Section VII: Discriminant Validity

The Crucial Elements and Major Weakness Subscales show excellent discriminant validity when assessed for job applicants completing the Profile (Table 3). The four Crucial Elements and five Major Weakness Subscales are again clearly tapping into discrete aspects of the prospective employee's makeup. The Self-Limiting Beliefs subscale is the one subscale that shows any notable relationship with other subscales. Among job applicants, Self-Limiting Beliefs appears to be moderately related to the "Money Weakness" ($r = .471$), "Buy Cycle" ($r = .440$), "Makes Excuses" ($r = .323$), and "Approval" ($r = .303$) subscales. The Money Weakness and Buy Cycle subscales both tap into core beliefs/behaviors, which could sabotage the individual's selling process. It is also not surprising to see that having self-sabotaging beliefs would be related to making excuses for poor sales performance. These items are only mildly to moderately inter-correlated. Self-Limiting Beliefs still has a considerable amount of variance which is not explained by the other four subscales.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix of Job Applicant Crucial Elements
and Major Weakness Subscales

	Lack Desire	Lack Commit- ment	Poor Outlook	Makes Excuse	Approval	Emotions	Money Weak- nesses	Self- Limiting Beliefs	Buy Cycle
Lack Desire		.192	.079	.095	.137	.116	.184	.279	.102
Lack Commitment			.049	.081	.174	.199	.136	.269	.113
Poor Outlook				.001	.028	.052	.052	.063	.048
Makes Excuses					.052	.049	.075	.323	.098
Approval						.123	.232	.303	.106
Emotions							.150	.216	.082
Money Weaknesses								.471	.197
Self-Limiting Beliefs									.440
Buy Cycle									

Section VIII: Other Section Distributions and Indices

In Table 4, the 11 Elements measured show varying distributions. For a few Elements (e.g., Commitment, Desire, and Bravery), the majority of applicants rate themselves as being currently fully actualized. At the opposite end, Satisfaction is seen as needing some level of improvement by the vast majority of applicants. The varying distribution of the measures show the degree to which applicants are providing a nuanced and thoughtful self-evaluation of their subjective current global attitudinal and behavioral status.

Table 4
Job Applicant Screening Elements: Percentage of Respondents Who
Responded to Each Option

Elements	Needs Dramatic Improvement	Needs Significant Improvement	Room for Improvement	Needs Fine Tuning	No Need for Improvement
Destination	0.2%	1.0%	13.5%	53.3%	32.0%
Compass	0.3%	1.5%	16.2%	51.8%	30.3%
Self-Limiting Beliefs	0.2%	0.6%	11.0%	41.2%	47.1%
Outlook	0.7%	3.0%	21.8%	42.1%	32.3%
Commitment	0.2%	0.5%	4.2%	22.2%	73.0%
Desire	0.2%	0.5%	3.8%	18.3%	77.1%
Exercise Program	0.3%	1.3%	13.7%	46.5%	38.3%
Style	0.1%	0.3%	6.3%	43.2%	50.0%
Bravery	0.2%	0.4%	4.9%	24.3%	70.3%
Satisfaction	5.4%	13.7%	46.0%	26.6%	8.3%
Results	0.8%	2.5%	18.9%	49.1%	28.6%

Six Sales Competency metrics are calculated from combinations of individual responses and scored on a 0 to 100 scale. These include being a Hunter (mean of 73.3), a Closer (29.3), a Farmer (32.5), a Consultative Seller (24.0), an Account Manager (53.3), and The Sales Posturing Index (43.5).

There are also several custom metrics that are calculated when appropriate. These include being a High Ticket Seller (meets criteria 70% of time), a Value Seller (86%), a Resistance Proof Seller (5%), a Sells to Top Executives individual (56%), Competition Resistant (4%), an Evangelist, an Entrepreneurial Mindset, a One-Call Closer (32%), and an Able to Work Remotely employee (63%).

Section IX: Confidence Rating (Internal Validity)

The OMG Evaluation and Assessment have a built in Confidence Rating which helps to assess how honestly and accurately a job candidate has approached the assessment. The Confidence Rating considers five separate types of information:

- Normative Data – How far do the candidate’s responses deviate from norms of others completing the assessment;
- Consistency – Whether the candidate answers certain sets of similar questions in a consistent manner;
- Ideal Answers – The percentage of candidate answers that mirrors the ideal response; and
- No Goals – If a candidate admits to a lack of personal goals, this is seen as an indication that he is approaching the assessment honestly.
- Time Required to Take the Assessment – If a candidate time to assess falls outside the normal range of 15 to 41 minutes, this is seen as an indication that he may have conducted research, asked for help, or rushed through the process.

A high Confidence Rating is produced when the candidate offers responses that fall within the norm, answers items consistently, chooses the ideal answer a reasonable percentage of the time, and/or admits to a lack of personal goals.

The confidence score is rated on a scale of 2 to 10. A score below 3 indicates that the candidate did not approach the assessment honestly. Ratings between 3 and 6 indicate that the employer should use caution in interpreting the assessment results. Ratings above 6 indicate that the respondent approached the assessment openly and honestly.

Section X: Predictive Validity

In 2003 OMG gathered predictive validity information for the OMG assessment related specifically to the hiring recommendation among applicants for sales positions. The sample was drawn from employers who had requested the testing of 500 candidates for evaluation of their appropriateness in sales during the hiring process. One year after hiring, these employers were sent a questionnaire which asked them to indicate how many hires had been retained for the past year, whether they had been recommended by OMG or not, and one year performance outcomes for these hires.

As shown in the Table 5, 95% of the candidates who were recommended were retained for at least one year and 92% of those were performing in the top half of the employer's sales force. Alternately, only 25% of the candidates who were not recommended had been retained, and of those only 2 (33%) ranked in the top half of the sales force at the end of a year.

**Table 5
Results of 2003 Predictive Validity Assessment**

Number of Candidates Tested	500
Number of Candidates Recommended	273
Screen to Hire Ratio	55%
Candidates Recommended and Hired	129
Retained	122
Retention Rate	95%
Ranked in Top Half after One Year	112
Accuracy of the Hirable Recommendation	92%
Ranked in Bottom Half after One Year	5
Quit or Terminated	5
Candidates Not Recommended but Hired	24
Retained	6
Retention Rate	25%
Ranked in Top Half after One Year	2
Ranked in Bottom Half after One Year	4
Quit or Terminated	18

In 2014, OMG gathered one-year follow-up information on an additional 146 applicants who had been assessed by OMG for sales positions and then hired by one of several companies. Ninety (90) of those assessed had been recommended. Of the 90, 79 continued to be employed by the organization and were performing at or above expectations for an accuracy rate of 88%. Of the 56 who had not been recommended but were hired, 42 had either not been retained or were performing poorly at time of follow-up for an accuracy rate of 75%. These percentages are very consistent with those from 10 years earlier providing further support for OMG's Assessments being a stable predictor of on the job performance in sales roles.

Section XI: Adverse Impact Analysis

In 1996, Correlation Research conducted an analysis of the Adverse Impact of the Kurlan Sales Force Profile upon “protected groups.” According to the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, the primary protected groups are women, minorities, and individuals over 40 years of age. According to EEOC guidelines, written tests used to select employees may not discriminate against any of these protected classes of individuals.

There are two main criteria that are routinely applied to decide whether further analyses are warranted. The first is the 4/5ths Rule, which is based on the ratio of “pass rates” between protected and majority classes. The percentage of individuals in a protected class who “pass” the screen must be at least 4/5ths (or 80%) of members in the majority class who pass the test.

The second criterion is whether the difference in pass rates for the protected and majority groups reaches statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. A level of significance of $p < .05$ indicates that differences between the groups are unlikely to be the result of random variation.

For the Kurlan Sales Force Profile, information on age, sex, and minority status of a random sample of 491 individuals was collected (Table 8). For each individual, the Profile conclusion of “Growth Potential” was also noted. The results were analyzed by Correlation Research.

Table 6
Results of 1996 Adverse Impact Analysis

Class	Growth Potential	Total Sample	% Growth	% Protected/ Majority
GENDER				
Male	228	351	65.0%	
Female	82	140	58.6%	90.1%
ETHNICITY				
Non-Minority	295	467	63.2%	
Minority	15	24	62.5%	98.9%
AGE				
Under 40	242	386	62.7%	
40+	68	105	64.8%	103.3%

For all three of these comparisons, the protected group's percentage found to have Growth Potential substantially exceeded the 4/5th rule. In addition, none of the differences between the groups reached statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. There thus appears to be no adverse impact by the Dave Kurlan Sales force Profile on any protected group in regards to its findings of Growth Potential.

Appendix: Distribution of Job Applicant Responses

Item	A	B	C	D
(01) A major purchase in my life is anything that is:	\$100 or less	\$500 or less	\$1000 or less	\$1000 or more
	2.5%	14.8%	12.6%	70.1%
(02) For a major purchase (other than a car) I usually shop:	At least six stores	At least three stores	At least two stores	Only one store
	7.2%	52.9%	35.6%	4.3%
(03) Once I find what I want I usually	Talk it over with someone I trust	Think it over for a few days	Sleep on it	Buy it right then and there
	24.7%	19.5%	12.0%	43.7%
(04) With regard to price, when I buy something I usually	Find the lowest price	Find a good price	Shop for a good value	Don't care that much about price
	3.2%	11.4%	82.7%	2.8%
(05) My research for a major purchase usually consists of	Educating myself	Reading Consumer Reports	Looking through sale ads or catalogues	I don't really do any research
	81.8%	12.9%	4.4%	0.9%
(06) For a major purchase it usually takes me	Six months or more	A month or more	A few days or more	Less than a day
	3.8%	31.4%	58.0%	6.8%
(07) I believe prospects	Have to be my friends	Must like me	Should trust and/or respect me	I don't care whether they like me or not
	1.1%	6.2%	88.0%	4.7%
(08) My values with regard to money are that	It's not that important	I need enough to survive	It's important	I want to be financially secure
	0.7%	1.4%	22.8%	75.1%
(09) When a prospect catches me by surprise I usually	Freeze	Become defensive	Recover and handle it	Ask them why they threw it
	0.2%	0.3%	84.4%	15.2%
(10) If I had to find new customers today I would	Do research	Send out letters of introduction	Network for leads	Make cold calls
	17.8%	4.9%	42.0%	35.3%
(11) With regard to personal goals I	Don't really have them	Have them but they are not in writing	Have them in writing but I do not have an accomplish by date	Have them in writing with and accomplish by date and can produce the document
	0.9%	44.5%	17.4%	37.2%
(12) With regard to a written goals management plan, I	Don't have one	Have one but it's rather vague	Have one but it's not in writing	Have one in writing and I can produce the document
	16.6%	6.2%	28.6%	48.5%
(13) As for a tracking system that monitors my progress, I	Don't have one	Keep track in my mind	Have one but it does not hold me accountable	Have one in place and it holds me accountable
	9.0%	10.9%	8.0%	72.1%
(14) In order to reach my personal goals on a daily basis, I	Don't know exactly what I must do	Have some idea of what I must do	Don't really need to know what I must do	Know exactly what I must do
	0.6%	13.1%	0.4%	85.9%
(15) I know I'm in control of the selling process when	I'm dominating the conversation	I'm presenting	The prospect is asking questions	I know what will happen next
	2.6%	6.0%	67.2%	24.2%

Item	A	B	C	D
(16) In order to get an account or sale, the single most important thing that I do is	Make a proposal	Ask questions	Uncover the actual budget	Get a commitment
	8.1%	55.9%	4.8%	31.3%
(17) On a typical sales call I do about	90% of the talking	70% of the talking	50% of the talking	Less than 30% of the talking
	2.2%	19.0%	49.6%	29.2%
(18) I would describe my level of enjoyment in sales as	It's a job	It's something I have to do	It's something I enjoy	It's a blast
	1.2%	1.4%	49.8%	26.9%
(19) I would describe my level of comfort on sales calls as	I don't have to be comfortable because of my ability	I lack confidence	My comfort level varies from prospect to prospect	I enjoy proving I can succeed at sales
	5.2%	0.5%	11.1%	20.7%
(20) I spend <i>most</i> of my time during sales calls	Talking about the company	Talking about the product or service we provide	Talking about solutions	I'm very comfortable with almost everyone
	0.5%	19.3%	20.2%	83.2%
(21) My boss describes my organizational skills as	What organizational skills	Needing work	So so	Under control
	0.7%	3.5%	2.5%	93.3%
(22) During most sales calls it usually seems like	My prospect has all the power	I attempt to control the call	There is give and take	I get the prospect to do whatever I want
	1.2%	20.4%	71.4%	6.9%
(23) The reasons my prospects should buy from me are usually	Related to them by me	Assumed by both of us	Discussed and agreed on	Related to me by them
	18.2%	4.7%	70.4%	6.7%
(24) The basis on which my prospects will make a buying decision is	Related to them by me	Assumed by both of us	Discussed and agreed on	Related to me by them
	10.3%	4.9%	74.4%	10.4%
(25) When my prospects lie to me I usually	My prospects don't lie to me	Know it but ignore it	Know it and end the call	Know it and confront the prospect
	10.8%	52.0%	4.6%	32.6%
(26) Purchasing agents and buyers	Beat me up pretty badly	Are prospects I handle OK	Are asked whom else I can see in the company	Are prospects that I never call on or it's not applicable
	0.3%	65.9%	18.5%	15.4%
(27) Before I attempt to close a prospect I always	Prepare	Make a presentation	Review their needs	Get them to agree to make a decision
	15.5%	3.5%	60.4%	20.6%
(28) My boss describes my prospecting activity as	Hardly ever does it	Starts but rarely finishes	Does it once in a while	Often and consistent
	1.4%	0.4%	5.9%	92.2%
(29) When a prospect states an objection I usually	Freeze	Handle it	Dodge it	Ask why they're objecting
	0.1%	67.9%	0.4%	31.6%
(30) When my prospects want a lower price I usually end up	Giving it to them	Negotiating	Selling value	Holding firm
	0.4%	32.0%	62.6%	4.9%

Item	A	B	C	D	
(31) Developing a strong relationship with a prospect is something I usually	Don't need in order to sell them	Don't accomplish	Take two visits or more to accomplish	Have during the first appointment or call	
	5.3%	0.2%	40.7%	53.9%	
(32) When the prospect becomes real tough I often	Leave	Evaluate the situation	End up wasting my time	Hang in anyway	
	0.3%	76.3%	0.3%	23.1%	
(33) Asking my prospects how much money they have is	None of my business	Not necessary	Something I try to do	A normal part of my routine	
	13.8%	29.9%	14.6%	41.8%	
(34) Prior to closing the sale, the amount of money my prospect will actually spend is	Usually unknown to me	Usually suggested by me	Sometimes not what they first told me	Usually known to me	
	6.1%	20.8%	17.5%	55.5%	
(35) I'm usually talking with prospects who	Can't say yes	Just need to get an approval	Are one of the decision makers	Are the final decision makers	
	0.5%	2.8%	38.9%	57.8%	
(36) When I attempt to close, my prospects usually	Think it over	Assure me that we'll do business	Have to compare proposals	Make a yes or no decision	
	6.3%	29.1%	11.3%	53.3%	
(37) My presentations	Are great	Help close the accounts	Need some work	Aren't a necessary part of my sales calls	
	21.1%	66.2%	6.7%	5.9%	
(38) My prospects usually tell me that	They like me	I'm good at selling	They learned a lot	I can solve their problem	
	20.6%	9.1%	17.8%	52.5%	
(39) If I phone for appointments the secretary usually	Takes the information from me	Won't put me through	This question doesn't apply to me	Puts me through	
	12.1%	0.6%	17.9%	69.4%	
(40) If I try to book appointments with prospects I usually	Have to send literature first	Have to call back/didn't get the appointment	This question doesn't apply to me	Get the appointment	
	4.9%	3.0%	9.5%	82.6%	
(41) When I don't get an appointment it's usually because	The prospects are too busy	It doesn't apply to me	The prospects are happy with their current vendor	The prospects don't think they need what I'm selling	
	17.8%	21.0%	25.9%	35.3%	
(42) When I can't close the account it's usually because	Of price	Of an existing vendor relationship or competition	I'm not effective enough	The prospect doesn't need what I'm selling	
	13.1%	37.2%	14.5%	35.2%	
(43) My prospects would say that my questions are	Infrequent	Very threatening to them	Very non-threatening to them	Frequent and to the point	
	0.6%	0.4%	27.5%	71.6%	
(44) I'm committed to success in sales because I'm	Loyal to the company	Focused and trying as hard as I can	Willing to make an investment in my career	Doing everything possible to succeed	
	4.2%	16.3%	28.2%	51.3%	
(45) I desire success in sales because	It's not that important to me	I would like to be recognized	I want to be the very best	I want to be financially secure	I have something to prove
	0.4%	6.2%	55.3%	35.1%	2.9%

Item	A	B	C	D
(46) If I'm asked to "call back" after attempting to close I	Back off and follow up	Ask why and follow up	Give it a few more tries right there and then follow up	Don't end the call until I have a decision
	19.4%	35.5%	39.1%	5.9%
(47) I believe that most prospects	Are honest	Try to be honest	Don't realize that they're lying	Frequently lie about money, interest, timing and competition
	28.2%	58.3%	4.3%	9.2%
(48) I believe that prospects who think it over will	Eventually do business with me	Keep me in mind	Make me lucky once in a while	Not do business with me
	70.5%	13.2%	7.2%	9.0%
(49) My single greatest asset is my ability to	Make friends	Educate and present	Be persistent	Ask questions
	14.6%	34.7%	29.5%	21.2%
(50) People do the strangest things and I	Don't know why	Think it's great	Don't really care	Ask them why
	11.9%	30.3%	14.9%	43.0%
(51) If a selling situation called for a confrontation I would	Not do it	Get someone else to do it	End the call	Do it tactfully, regardless of the circumstances
	10.9%	2.0%	5.0%	82.1%
(52) After I finish with a prospect who needs to think it over I	Make some follow up calls	Follow up on the strongest of them	Don't make follow up calls	Don't have any "think it overs"
	59.1%	33.3%	0.3%	7.3%
(53) The number of referrals and introductions I receive from my clients are	Not any	Not enough to replace cold calls	Plentiful	Enough to replace cold calls
	3.0%	37.0%	41.1%	18.8%
(54) After a prospect says they're not interested I	Need some recovery time	Feel like I didn't do a very good job	Move on without a thought	Hang in and try another approach
	1.5%	3.8%	14.4%	80.3%
(55) My selling system usually gives me	Poor results	Unpredictable results	Decent results	Consistent and effective results
	0.1%	2.2%	13.3%	84.3%
(56) The time I spend with prospects who don't do business with me is	Significant	Measurable	Not too bad	Insignificant
	16.9%	41.5%	22.1%	19.6%
(57) Any lack of results I may from time to time be burdened with is mostly due to	The economy or the marketplace	The policy or mindset of my firm	The activities of my competition	My own ineffectiveness
	42.7%	5.8%	11.6%	39.9%
(58) With regard to the proposals I generate	The more the better	I have to make them to get the account	I don't make them	They're OK if I know I'm going to win the business
	52.1%	35.6%	4.6%	7.6%
(59) When a prospect becomes upset I	Feel pressure	It never happens	End the call	Try to comfort and ask why they're upset
	1.7%	10.8%	1.0%	86.5%
(60) The best way to describe the way I feel about myself is	My life is a mess	Nobody understands me	I'm OK	I'm happy with me
	0.2%	0.2%	10.0%	89.6%
(61) With regard to how I feel about my income I'm	Very satisfied	Able to live comfortably	Not where I want to be	Extremely dissatisfied
	3.9%	22.4%	69.5%	4.2%