

An Empirical Analysis of Demographic Differences in Buyer-Supplier Ethical Relationships

Bodh Raj Sharma

*Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: drbodhsharma@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The study explores empirically the effect of demographic variables, viz. age, qualification, experience and types of products sold on the buyer-supplier ethical relationship in retail sector. The study is based upon the data obtained from 32 manufacturing firms supplying goods directly to retailers, through a specifically designed schedule based upon demographic variables along with items measuring buyer-supplier ethical relationships. All the demographic variables, viz. age, qualification, experience and types of products depict insignificant mean differences in the perceptions of manufacturers regarding the ethical behaviour of retailers. Further, manufacturers viewed retailers unethical in terms of making payments on time and even not paying the exact amount as agreed upon. In the extant literature, there is not even a single study on demographic differences in the perceptions of manufacturers about the buyer-supplier ethical relationship. This study thus fills the gap in literature on retailing ethics.

Keywords: Ethics, Manufacturer Retailers, Demographics, Merchandise

INTRODUCTION

The buyer-supplier ethical relationship is of great significance for the effective supply chain management (Sharma and Sharma, 2013) and logistics. Through such ethical relationship, buyers (retailers) and manufacturers become more accountable and responsible in adjusting product assortment, promotion efforts and adequate sales services leading to trust, commitment and long-term relations with each other (Fynes and Voss, 2002; Humphreys et al., 2001). It is a fact that the product moves through several channels before reaching the ultimate customers. However, sometimes the manufacturers prioritise one level channel, i.e., selling through retailers and thus exclude all other middlemen in the supply chain (Murry and Heidy, 1998; Arbuthnot, 1997; Weitz and Sandy, 1995; Ganesan, 1993; and Dwyer et al., 1987) in order to reduce the overall cost in the distribution of products. Moreover, to strengthen the buyer-supplier ethical relationships (Sharma and Sharma, 2013, Whysall, 1998), retailers need to be ethically sound towards behaving with manufacturers in a fair, honest and sincere manner for gaining the trust, loyalty and reputation of the retail store (Kujala, 2001; Whysall, 2000 Mallen, 1996 and Walters, 1989).

CONCEPTUAL THEORY AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

In the previous literature on retailing ethics from the last few decades, there are several research studies discussing one or the other aspect of retailing ethics. However, none has studied the demographic differences in the buyer-supplier ethical relationship. An overview of the earlier studies manifests that Dawson (1997) concluded that ethical standards change with the age experience. Whysall (1998) studied the ethical relationship in retailing theoretically. The study by Abratt et al. (1999) examined the ethical beliefs of the executives, managers and retail salesperson and Whysall (2000) constructed a framework of various stakeholders in retailing and cited several ethical issues in retailing. In addition, Honeycutt et al. (2001) investigated the perceptions of automobile salespeople about ethical behaviour and found its relationship with the age, education and the method of compensation. The study by Kujala (2001) recommended a framework to analyse the managers' orientation towards various moral issues in the stakeholder relation. Further, Ergeneli and Ankan (2002) witnessed the insignificant difference in the ethical perceptions based on the gender while the female

salespeople having stronger ethical score than their male counterparts of two age groups, viz. below 20 years and age group of 40–49 years. Similarly, Dubinsky et al. (2004) opined some guidelines for the retail managers regarding how to address the ethical issues and Lavorata and Pontier (2005) highlighted the relevance of ethical policy in retailing perspective. Indeed, in the Indian context, Sarma (2007) addressed the ethical beliefs of retail salespeople and opined salespeople facing various ethical dilemmas in their relation to various stakeholders. Further, Sharma and Sharma (2009) in an empirical study witnessed the highly educated and aged retailers as highly ethical as compared to their less educated and younger counterparts. In another attempt, they studied the ethics of retailers handling the convenience goods (Sharma and Sharma, 2011). Further, Sharma and Sharma (2012) found retailers dealing in shopping goods were moderate in observing legal norms and ethics, and highlighted the need for the active role of regulatory bodies in promoting legal norms and ethical values and giving stringent punishment to the lawbreakers and publicising the unethical practices of retailers. Furthermore, Sharma and Sharma (2013) empirically assessed the manufacturer's perceptions about the various ethical practices of the retailers. Finally, the study by Sharma (2014) depicts no significant demographic difference in the perceptions of wholesalers about ethical retail practices. Based upon the aforesaid theory, the study is based upon the following hypotheses and objectives:

- There is no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different age groups regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.
- There no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different educational backgrounds regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.
- There is no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different experience groups regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.
- There is no significant difference among

manufacturers dealing with different products regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.

The objectives of the study are as under:

- To explore the buyer-supplier ethical relationship in the retail sector.
- To examine the difference in the perceptions of manufacturers belonging to various demographic groups, viz. age, qualification, experience and types of products.
- To provide insights to future researchers on the wholesaler-retailer ethical relationships.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

For collecting primary data from manufacturers, an instrument was developed specifically for the study under reference by reviewing the needed literature (Sarma, 2007; Lavorata and Pontier, 2005; Dubinsky et al., 2004; Kujala, 2001; Whysall, 2000) and discussion with the experts on the subject. The schedule comprised of nine items of demographic and general information and 37 other items based on five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 to 1, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree. The demographic and general information comprised of the age, qualification, experience, type of business, number of employees, monthly sales and profit of the manufacturers, being selected as respondent. All other items represented the ethical values of retailers in their dealings with manufacturers. The final survey was conducted on 40 small manufacturing firms supplying goods directly to the retailers in Jammu city. Out of 40 manufacturing firms, 32 responses were collected selecting a manager/owner from each manufacturing unit. The average age of the respondents came to be 45 years through arithmetic mean, and more than half (56%) of the respondents have age less than 45 years. About 76% of total respondents were a graduate and above graduate.

Table 1: Demographics

Variables	N	%	Variables	N	%
Age			Experience		
Below average	18	56	0-10	15	47
Average	03	09	11-20	08	25
Above average	11	35	21-30	06	19
Qualification			Above 30	03	09
Matriculate	03	09	Sales		
Under graduate	05	15	Median: Rs 60,00,000		
Graduate and above	24	76	Range (79,80,000)		
Type of Products			Minimum: Rs 20,00,000		
Milk	02	06	Maximum: Rs 1,00,00,000		
Oil	03	09	Profit		
Steel	05	16	Median: Rs 10,00,00		
Others	22	69	Range (Rs 29,70,000)		
			Minimum: Rs 30,000		
			Maximum: Rs 30,00,000		

About 47% of the respondents possessed less than 10 years of experience as a manufacturer and manufacturers were categorised according to the product produced as milk (6%), oil (9%), steel (16%) and others (69%). The monthly sale of the respondents ranges from Rs 20 Lakhs to Rs 1 Crore, and profit ranges from Rs 30,000 to Rs 30 Lakhs (Table 1).

DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS

This section comprised of reliability and validity, exploratory factor analysis, univariate analysis of variance and testing of hypotheses.

Reliability and Validity

To check the reliability, i.e., degree of consistency between multiple measurements of a construct, (Hair et al., 2009, p. 161), Split half and Cronbach Alpha have been worked out (Malhotra, 2008, p. 285) by dividing the respondents into two equal halves. The data were found to be reliable as mean values of both halves were quite satisfactory (Group I = 3.64 and Group II = 3.32). Moreover, Cronbach Alpha values also proved reliable which have been above 0.7.

Similarly, validity (the extent to which a scale or set of measures accurately represent the concept under review) can be assessed in terms of content, convergent and

discriminant measures (Hair et al., 2009, p. 161). Content validity has been worked out by reviewing the literature and discussions with the experts and researchers working on similar topics. Convergent validity (the degree to which two measures of the same concept are correlated) was found to be satisfactory (Malhotra, 2008, p. 286) as the correlations between items were significant and their values have been > 0.5 . Moreover, the commonalities of all the items came above 0.5, indicating convergent validity. Discriminant validity is the degree to which two conceptually similar concepts are distinct. For proving this type of validity, the correlation between two constructs should be low, demonstrating that one construct is sufficiently different from the other similar dimensions (Hair et al., 2009, p. 162). Discriminate validity has been proved as the correlations between most of the dimensions were < 0.3 .

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The technique of factor analysis has been used through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 17 Version) with principal component analysis along with varimax rotation. Factor analysis examines the underlying patterns or relationship for condensing the whole data into minimum meaningful factors (Hair et al., 2009, p. 128). The items having factor loading less than 0.5 and Eigenvalue less than 1 were ignored for

the subsequent analysis. With the application of factor analysis, the data converged into six factors, with 77.47% of variance explained Table 2. The six factors

are F1 (Fairness), F2 (Billing), F3 (Outdated products), F4 (Gifts), F5 (Price) and F6 (Mutual interest).

Table 2: Dimensions-wise Mean and Correlation Values

Dimensions	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fairness	3.60	1					
Billing	2.93	.385*	1				
Outdated Products	3.69	-.080	-.015	1			
Gifts	3.43	.461**	.235	.083	1		
Price	3.60	.095	.100	.162	-.031	1	
Mutual Interest	3.06	.269	.010	-.230	.097	.026	1

* Correlation is significant at the 5% and ** Correlation is significant at 1%

Univariate Analysis of Variance

The data so obtained from manufacturers have been further analysed through Univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for finding out the effect of different factors like age, qualification, experience and type of product on the perceptions of manufacturers about the ethical behaviour of retailers. ANOVA depicts the differences in mean scores of ethical values on the part of respondents belonging to different demographic categories. Each one of these groups has been discussed as under:

Age-wise Analysis

On the basis of age, respondents have been classified into three categories, viz. below average, average and above

average. The average age of respondents is 45 years. Out of the total respondents, more than half (56%) have below-average age. About 35% have above average age and only 9% fall in the average age group (Table 1). To find out the mean differences among different age groups regarding ethical retail practices, univariate ANOVA has been applied. On the whole, ANOVA reveals insignificant mean differences in ethical retail practices among the respondents belonging to different age groups (F = 0.643, Sig. = 0.533, Table 3). Further, in different age groups regarding individual factors constituting the overall construct of ethical retail practices, insignificant mean differences have been found in all the six factors, viz. F1 (Fairness: Sig. = .633), F2 (Billing = .743), F3 (Outdated products = .318), F4 (Gifts = .208), F5 (Pricing = .657) and F6 (Mutual Interest = .819, Table 3).

Table 3: Age-wise ANOVA Results

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age*F1	Between Groups	.547	2	.274	.464	.633
	Within Groups	17.091	29	.589		
	Total	17.638	31			
Age*F2	Between Groups	.940	2	.470	.300	.743
	Within Groups	45.445	29	1.567		
	Total	46.385	31			
Age*F3	Between Groups	.370	2	.185	1.191	.318
	Within Groups	4.505	29	.155		
	Total	4.875	31			
Age*F4	Between Groups	2.883	2	1.441	1.661	.208
	Within Groups	25.172	29	.868		
	Total	28.055	31			
Age*F5	Between Groups	.634	2	.317	.426	.657
	Within Groups	21.585	29	.744		
	Total	22.219	31			

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age*F6	Between Groups	.299	2	.150	.201	.819
	Within Groups	21.576	29	.744		
	Total	21.875	31			
Age*Overall	Between Groups	.265	2	.133	.643	.533
	Within Groups	5.986	29	.206		
	Total	6.252	31			

Qualification-wise Respondents

To find out the effect of qualification on the ethical retail practices, respondents have been grouped into matriculating (09%), undergraduate (15%), graduate and above (76%) qualification groups (Table 1). ANOVA portrays insignificant mean differences in the responses of manufacturers having different educational backgrounds

($F = .223$, $Sig. = .801$, Table 4). Further, to examine the significant mean difference in different qualification groups regarding individual factors constituting the overall construct of ethical retail practices, insignificant mean differences have been found in all the six factors, viz. F1 (Fairness: $Sig. = .286$), F2 (Billing = .496), F3 (Outdated Products = .994), F4 (Gifts = .887), F5 (Pricing = .358) and F6 (Mutual interest = .801, Table 4).

Table 4: Qualification-wise ANOVA Results

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Qualification*F1	Between Groups	1.458	2	.729	1.307	.286
	Within Groups	16.179	29	.558		
	Total	17.638	31			
Qualification*F2	Between Groups	2.190	2	1.095	.719	.496
	Within Groups	44.195	29	1.524		
	Total	46.385	31			
Qualification*F3	Between Groups	.002	2	.001	.006	.994
	Within Groups	4.873	29	.168		
	Total	4.875	31			
Qualification*F4	Between Groups	.232	2	.116	.121	.887
	Within Groups	27.823	29	.959		
	Total	28.055	31			
Qualification*F5	Between Groups	1.519	2	.759	1.064	.358
	Within Groups	20.700	29	.714		
	Total	22.219	31			
Qualification*F6	Between Groups	.269	2	.134	.180	.836
	Within Groups	21.606	29	.745		
	Total	21.875	31			
Qualification*Overall	Between Groups	.095	2	.047	.223	.801
	Within Groups	6.157	29	.212		
	Total	6.252	31			

Experience-wise Respondents

On the basis of experience, respondents have been classified into four groups, viz. respondents having experience up to 10 years (47%), 11 to 20 years (25%),

21 to 30 years (19%) and finally above 30 years (09%) experience as a manufacturer (Table 1). For exploring the mean differences among different experienced groups of manufacturers regarding ethical retail practices, univariate ANOVA has been applied. On an overall basis, ANOVA

portrays insignificant mean differences regarding the ethical retail practices among the respondents belonging to different experience groups ($F = .532$, $Sig. = .664$, Table 5). Further, factor-wise analysis also reveals insignificant

mean differences in all the six factors, viz. F1 (Fairness: $Sig. = .616$), F2 (Billing = .584), F3 (Outdated Products = .448), F4 (Gifts = .145), F5 (Pricing = .708) and F6 (Mutual Interest = .637, Table 5).

Table 5: Experience-wise ANOVA Results

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Experience*F1	Between Groups	1.078	3	.359	.608	.616
	Within Groups	16.560	28	.591		
	Total	17.638	31			
Experience*F2	Between Groups	3.059	3	1.020	.659	.584
	Within Groups	43.326	28	1.547		
	Total	46.385	31			
Experience*F3	Between Groups	.433	3	.144	.911	.448
	Within Groups	4.442	28	.159		
	Total	4.875	31			
Experience*F4	Between Groups	4.846	3	1.615	1.949	.145
	Within Groups	23.208	28	.829		
	Total	28.055	31			
Experience*F5	Between Groups	1.058	3	.353	.467	.708
	Within Groups	21.160	28	.756		
	Total	22.219	31			
Experience*F6	Between Groups	1.267	3	.422	.574	.637
	Within Groups	20.608	28	.736		
	Total	21.875	31			
Experience*Overall	Between Groups	.337	3	.112	.532	.664
	Within Groups	5.914	28	.211		
	Total	6.252	31			

Type of Product-wise Respondents

The respondents have also been classified into four categories based on the type of products they deal in such as milk (6%), oil (9%), steel (16%) and others (69%, Table 1). ANOVA portrays insignificant mean differences

among the manufacturers dealing in different kinds of products ($F = .203$ $Sig. = .893$, Table 6). Further, when it was applied on individual factor wise, it disclosed insignificant mean differences in five out of six factors, viz. F1 (Fairness: $Sig. = .771$), F2 (Billing = .498), F3 (Out dated Products = .464), F4 (Gifts = .105) and F6 (Mutual Interest = .180, Table 6).

Table 6: Type of Product-wise ANOVA Results

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Type of Product*F1	Between Groups	.684	3	.228	.376	.771
	Within Groups	16.954	28	.605		
	Total	17.638	31			
Type of Product*F2	Between Groups	3.711	3	1.237	.812	.498
	Within Groups	42.675	28	1.524		
	Total	46.385	31			

Factors	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Type of Product*F3	Between Groups	.420	3	.140	.879	.464
	Within Groups	4.455	28	.159		
	Total	4.875	31			
Type of Product*F4	Between Groups	5.433	3	1.811	2.242	.105
	Within Groups	22.621	28	.808		
	Total	28.055	31			
Type of Product*F5	Between Groups	5.513	3	1.838	3.080	.044
	Within Groups	16.705	28	.597		
	Total	22.219	31			
Type of Product*F5	Between Groups	3.454	3	1.151	1.750	.180
	Within Groups	18.421	28	.658		
	Total	21.875	31			
Type of Product*Overall	Between Groups	.133	3	.044	.203	.893
	Within Groups	6.119	28	.219		
	Total	6.252	31			

Table 7: Testing of Hypotheses (ANOVA)

S. No.	Hypotheses	F Value	Sig.	Result
H1	There is no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different age groups regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.	.643	.533	Accepted
H2	There no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different educational backgrounds regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.	.223	.801	Accepted
H3	There is no significant difference among manufacturers belonging to different experience groups regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.	.532	.664	Accepted
H4	There is no significant difference among manufacturers dealing in different products regarding retailers' ethical behaviour.	.203	.893	Accepted

For testing various hypotheses, ANOVA has been applied and all the hypotheses were accepted (Table 7).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

To conclude, the present study indicates that manufacturers considered retailers as moderately ethical as the delay the payments on the merchandise purchased by them for resale to customers. Retailers having such dealings with the manufacturers ultimately influence their transactions with the ultimate market. It was found that suppliers are satisfied (3.76) with retailers to some extent as they experienced them respectful (3.72), honest (3.74), providing the needed space to their products in their retail outlets (3.75). Moreover, the manufacturers perceived retailers as responsible (3.63), humble (3.69) and try to develop long-term relations with them (3.59). However, about 60% of the total respondents found retailers delaying the payments in the stipulated time period by making payments quite late (2.81) and even paying less amounts

as agreed upon (2.81). It is suggested that the retailers should make payments on time and of the exact amount to the manufacturers so that they can meet their needs and ensure the regular supply of goods in the market. In addition, all the above demographic variables, viz. age, qualification, experience and types of products have no significant difference in the perceptions of manufacturers regarding the ethical behaviour of retailers. The present study contributes empirically to the literature on retailing ethics by emphasising on buyer-supplier ethical relations. The study shall be valuable for the retailers, manufacturers, regulatory bodies, researchers and policymakers for new guidelines and insights.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Like every research study, the present study also suffers from certain shortcomings which may serve as direction for the prospective research. Firstly, the

present study examines the demographic differences in buyer-supplier ethical relationship and the forthcoming researchers can concentrate on comparative analysis of various stakeholders regarding ethical behaviour of retailers. Secondly, the current study emphasised on the demographic differences in the explored factors of buyer-supplier relationship and the prospective research can construct a theoretical model and subsequently, validate and fit the model through the appropriate sample by using multivariate statistical techniques.

REFERENCES

- Arbuthnot, J. J. (1997). Identifying ethical problems confronting small retail buyers during the merchandise buying process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(7), 745–755.
- Deshpande, S. P. (1997). Managers perception of proper ethical conduct: The effect of sex, age and level of education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(1), 79–85.
- Dubinsky, A. J., Rajan, N., & Huang, W. Y. (2004). The influence of moral philosophies on retail salespeople's ethical perceptions. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 38(2), 297–317.
- Dwyer, R. H., Schurr, H. L., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 11–27.
- Ergeneli, A., & Ankan, S. (2000). Gender difference in ethical perceptions of salespeople: An empirical examination in Turkey. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40(3), 247–260.
- Fynes, B., & Voss, C. (2002). The moderating effect of buyer-supplier relationships on quality practices and performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(6), 589–613.
- Ganesan, S. (1993). Negotiation strategies and the nature of channel relationships. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(2), 183–203.
- Hair, J. F., William C. B., Barry, J. B., Ralph, E. A., & Ronald, L. T. (2009). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Pearson Prentice Publishers, New Delhi.
- Honeycutt, J., Earl, D., Myron G., Zugelder, M. T., & Karande, K. (2001). Determinants of ethical behaviour: A study of auto salespeople. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32, 69–79.
- Humphreys, P. K., Shiu, W. K., & Chan, F. T. S. (2001). Collaborative buyer-supplier relationship in Hong Kong manufacturing firms. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 6(4), 152–162.
- Kujala, J. (2001). Analysing moral issues in stakeholder relations. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 10, 233–247.
- Lavorata, L., & Pontier, S. (2005). The success of a retailers' ethical policy: Focusing on local actions. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 5(11), 1–9.
- Malhotra, N. (2008). *Marketing research: An applied orientation* (5th ed.). Prentice hall of India, New Delhi.
- Mallen, B. (1996). Selecting channels of distribution: A multi-stage process. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, 26(5), 5–21.
- Murry, J. P. J., & Jan, B. H. (1998). Managing promotion program participation within manufacturer-retailer relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 58–68.
- Sarma, N. N. (2007). Ethics in retailing-perception of management and sales personnel. Retrieved from <http://dspace.iimk.ac.in/bitstream/2259/388/1/61-68.pdf>
- Sharma, R. D., & Sharma, B. R. (2009). Ethics in retailing: Perceptions of consumers. *Saaransh: Journal of Management*, 1(1), 43–55.
- Sharma, R. D., & Sharma, B. R. (2011). Legal provisions and ethical values in retail sector: Study of convenience goods. *Arash: A Journal of ISMDR*, 1(1), 1–9.
- Sharma R. D., & Sharma, B. R. (2012). Legal and ethical orientation of Indian retailers. *International Journal of Business Ethics in Developing Economies*, 1(2), 24–31.
- Sharma R. D., & Sharma, B. R. (2013). Exploring retailer-manufacturer ethical relationships. *Journal of Supply Chain Systems*, 2(2), 19–23.
- Sharma, B. R. (2014). Differences in perception of wholesalers about retailers' ethical behaviour. *Drishtikon: A Management Journal*, 5(1), 21–36.
- Weitz, B. A., & Sandy, J. (1995). Relationship marketing and distribution channels. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), 305–320.
- Whysall, P. (1998). Ethical relationship in retailing: Some cautionary tales. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 7(2), 103–110.
- Whysall, P. (2000). Addressing ethical issues in retailing: A stakeholder perspective. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 10(3), 305–318.
- Whysall, P. (2000). Stakeholder mismanagement in retailing: A British perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23(1), 19–28.

ANNEXURE 1**Measures of Buyer-Supplier Ethical Relationship**

1	Needed information is provided by the retailers.
2	Retailers follow your instructions.
3	They are truthful in dealing with you.
4	They co-operate with you.
5	They give the needed space to your products.
6	The pay the bills on proper time.
7	They pay the exact amount as agreed.
8	They agree with your terms and conditions.
9	They demand excessive commission for selling your products.
10	They demand more gifts for selling your products.
11	They build long-term relations with you.
12	They deal with you politely and patiently.
13	They are honest in dealing with you.
14	They undertake their responsibility as retailers.
15	They give due respect and recognition to you.
16	They criticise other retailers with you.
17	They are loyal to you.
18	In case of less commission and gifts, they shift to other firms.
19	You trust your retailers.
20	They are committed to you.
21	You are satisfied from your retailers.
22	They help you as and when required.
23	Sometimes they become irritable.
24	They do fair business practices with you.
25	They focus on their interest only.
26	They threaten you to keep the products of your competitors.
27	They give excuses for keeping inventory in the retail store.
28	They are humble to you.
29	They are sincere.
30	They introduce your products to consumers.
31	They force you to set higher price of the product.
32	They charge the printed price.
33	Your retailers are straight forward.
34	They return expired dated products.
35	They don't deceive you.
36	They keep their promises.
37	Your retailers are ethical in dealing with you.