Organisational buying behaviour

Criteria and influences in the buying process within high commercial value restaurants

Bachelor thesis within business administration

Author: Julia Hadmark
Charlotte Lindberg
Linda Remahl

Tutor: Olga Sasinovskaya
Maya Paskaleva

Jönköping January 2008
Abstract

In 2005 the wine importer and supplier Pernod Ricard Sweden acquired Allied Domecq, a company with a wide assortment of wines. However, due to Pernod Ricard Sweden’s strategic focus on spirits the last decade they now experience a lack of knowledge of how to best sell and endorse wine to restaurants. After thorough research of present academic literature we have found that there is a theoretical gap of knowledge regarding the relationship between wine suppliers and restaurants and the interactions between them. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to gain a deeper understanding of the influences on organizational buying behaviour when purchasing in a B2B environment. We have investigated what criteria and services are more important for restaurants when purchasing wine, in order for the supplier to understand the behaviour of the buyer and act accordingly.

A qualitative research has been conducted where 18 high commercial value restaurants in the region Mälardalen in Sweden were interviewed via telephone. The interview questions consisted of both open-ended questions and close-ended Likert scale questions, in order to receive both deeper answers including the respondents’ own opinions and comments, as well as preference data and attitude measures.

In the analysis of our data we have discovered the importance of offering a concept and not just a product to the restaurants. In this concept the price in relation to quality is vital, as well as value adding activities such as education, which is important since there is a lack of documented knowledge among the persons responsible for the purchasing of wine. Support and sales meetings have proven to be efficient ways for the supplier to communicate their message to the restaurants rather than the use of traditional communication channels e.g. TV and printed advertisement. Furthermore, we have observed that the relationship between the supplier and the restaurants is crucial. This is due to the fact that most high commercial value restaurants only have one supplier and their emphasised need for the business to run smoothly. Therefore, previous experience of the supplier and the established degree of trust are highly influencing factors.

We believe that if the results of our study are taken into consideration, the supplier has a great chance of becoming successful and creating profitable long-term relationships with high commercial value restaurants.
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1 Introduction

The following section will introduce the reader to the subject of organisational buying behaviour and will through a funnel approach narrow down and discuss the selling of wine to restaurants, concluding with the purpose of the thesis, research questions and perspective.

1.1 Background

Long before the concept of marketing was introduced entrepreneurs unconsciously recognised that the needs of customers were an important part of their own success, according to Cummins and Mullin (2002) and that caring for them was vital for the business’ survival. Further, at this time when the alternatives of products were more limited and there was relatively little choice, customers took what they were offered; it was simply the sales person’s job to convince customers that the product was needed. However, these days have been replaced by an era where the number of different products is boundless. Furthermore, customers generally select the product themselves, what is needed today is to convince the customers that they want to buy from you. Hence, we find that there is a need for a better understanding of buying behaviour.

Art Schick, vice president of purchasing, at Pepsi Worldwide Concentrate Operations support this in Pugh (2004, p.38): “years ago the business-to-business market (B2B) was much more of a bid-out business; the buyer would take the lowest-cost supplier. However, today many suppliers are looking at the customers as partners, and further include them in the creation of a product in order to get it just the way the customer wants it.” Hence, in B2B markets the smarter suppliers are really trying to understand what their customers’ businesses are all about and be proactive in working with them.

Sargeant and West (2001) provide a definition where consumer and organisational buying behaviour is defined as “the environment and decision process affecting individuals and groups when evaluating, acquiring, using or disposing of goods, services or ideas.” However, just as organisational buying behaviour has similarities to the buying behaviour of consumers, it also has many differences and taken as the total the differences make it imperative to view organisational buying from its own point on the buying spectrum. Sargeant and West (2001) define organisational buying as the decision-making process, by which organisations form their needs for products and services and then search, identify, evaluate and choose between the alternatives. As opposed to consumer buying behaviour which may be influenced by social background, culture, family values, etc. Further, in organisations, the buying decision is often taken by groups and the buyers tend to be more rational and competent compared to consumers.

Relationship marketing has strongly influenced the B2B market, according to Spekman and Carraway (2005), who also discussed a report published by Stanford University and Accenture showing that companies using collaborative relationships raised market capitalisation by eight percent. However, it is often argued that different businesses need different relationships. It is further argued that buyers are often reluctant to build close relationships in fear of becoming too dependent on the supplier, and they are also quick in reverting to old habits which results in lost benefits from collaborations. Furthermore, suppliers fear being taken advantage of, e.g. they often proceed in using traditional models of sales techniques and personal selling behaviour which generally present the buyer as someone who needs to be persuaded to buy.
Within the restaurant industry wine is a very important profit centre and therefore, well established, good supplier relationships are vital. Found in a study by Dodd, Gultek and Gudyosh (2005) is the impact that suppliers’ attitudes have on the relationship between the supplier and the restaurateur. Furthermore, suppliers of wine to restaurants need to consider how they come across when interacting with the restaurateur, and suppliers also need to be fully aware of how to best influence the restaurateur’s buying decision. Hence, suppliers need to have complete understanding of the restaurateur’s buying behaviour in order to generate successful sales.

Research by Yong Kim, Oh and Gregoire (2006) suggests that a crucial necessity for restaurants is to acknowledge the need to pay more attention to valuing supplier relationships. By following the recommendations of Yong Kim et al. (2006) entailing more information sharing with suppliers, restaurants can create greater value for themselves and their customers and build good faith and trust in their suppliers. A positive consequence of information sharing may also be higher product and service quality and long-term cost reductions, since the information sharing activity allows the supplier to enhance its capabilities, according to Monczka, Trent and Callahan (1993) in (Yong Kim et al., 2006).

Sharing of information, i.e. sharing of value has been a major difficulty in the B2B relationship context, according to Wilson (1995) in (Yong Kim et al., 2006). A reason for this is put forward by Wilson (1995) that restaurants because of their industry characteristics of independence and small size have tended to overlook the importance of nurturing supplier relationships. Hence, many restaurants have failed to create value by sharing information with their suppliers.

1.2 Problem discussion

Dodd et al. (2005) presented a study on supplier-customer relationships and emphasised the importance of the suppliers’ attitudes. We believe however, that there is a gap of knowledge that needs to be filled regarding the relationship between wine suppliers and restaurants and the interactions between them. There is a need for an understanding of what kind of relationships and practices are preferred by the responsible person at the restaurant and not only suppliers’ attitudes.

When it comes to buying contexts there is according to Loudon and Della Bitta (1993) in (Sargeant & West, 2001), a plethora of different environment and decision related variables that may impact on the decision of whether or not to make a purchase. We believe that these influences are imperative for the successful supplier to understand in organisational buying behaviour in restaurants.

The success of a sale is according to Webster (1965) dependent on the understanding the supplier has for how the customer makes the buying decision, and who is responsible for the decision. Further, the supplier needs to understand the process the customer goes through when identifying alternatives and establishing decision criteria, as well as when evaluating and selecting a supplier. This is supported by Jacobsen and Thorsvik (2002) who also emphasise that it is the process of making a decision that needs to be understood, since decisions are often defined as the outcome of a decision process. Further, it is the whole process of actions and considerations which lead to a decision being made. Hence, in order to understand the decision made one needs to understand the decision process.

The wine and spirits industry in Sweden is unique since it is highly influenced by the Swedish government’s monopoly on selling wines and spirits to consumers, and the strict regula-
tions affecting sales to businesses. In order to import and sell wine to businesses in Sweden, a particular license is needed, according to Statens folkhälsoinstitut (2003). Approximately 900 companies have at present time the right to import and bring in alcohol to Sweden, according to Maria Hellstrand at Skatteverket. These suppliers compete for the task of providing the approximately 11000 established restaurants in Sweden which have a liquor license (S. Bronell, personal communication 2007-09-14).

One of the biggest wine and spirits suppliers on the Swedish market is Pernod Ricard Sweden (Pernod Ricard Sweden, 2007). The company was established in 1991 as Perau Associates AB, an importer and supplier of wine. Since 1994 Pernod Ricard Sweden have been fully owned by the French Groupe Pernod Ricard. Sanna Bronell, marketing manager at Pernod Ricard Sweden states that during the last decade the strategic focus has been shifted to the spirits assortment, since spirits are highly brand oriented and Pernod Ricard Sweden is a brand oriented company. Further, in 2005 Pernod Ricard Sweden acquired the company Allied Domecq, which had a wide assortment of wine contributing immensely to Pernod Ricard Sweden’s wine portfolio. These activities have resulted in a need for Pernod Ricard Sweden to balance the focus between spirits and wine and its management. Furthermore, the strong focus on spirits has resulted in an outdated understanding about the wine market which now needs to be updated and emphasised. Today, the company is ready to commit to and find out how to endorse and sell their wines to restaurants. Hence, Pernod Ricard Sweden needs to better understand restaurants’ buying behaviour when purchasing wine.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a deeper understanding of the influences on organisational buying behaviour when purchasing in a B2B environment. We will investigate what criteria and services are more important for high commercial value restaurants when purchasing wine, in order to make managerial implications for how to best meet restaurants’ needs when endorsing and selling wine to them.

1.4 Research questions

The following research questions have been put forward in order to throughout the thesis assist in guiding and facilitating the process of the empirical investigation and analysis, as well as building a base for the conclusions.

- What criteria do restaurants find most important when purchasing wine, concerning the wine and the supplier, and why are these important?
- What kind of service and support are valued by restaurants, and why are these valued?
- What factors influence in the buying process and the decision made, and why and how do these influence?
- Who influence in the buying process and the decision made, and why and how do they influence?
1.5 Perspective

This thesis will consider organisational buying behaviour from the perspective of the supplier. This will be done in order for the supplier to gain a deeper understanding of the criteria and influences which affect the buyer during the buying process. Thus, in order for a supplier to establish successful co-operations with organisational buyers these issues should be considered.
2 Frame of reference

This section of the thesis will provide the reader with the relevant theories related to organisational buying behaviour, which will provide a basis for the analysis of the empirical data. First the buying process in which the decision is made will be introduced. Followed by the new marketing mix, buyer expectations, and finishing with organisational and environmental influences on buying needs.

2.1 The buying process

Central to the organisational buying process is the organisational buying decision process model, according to Webster and Wind (1972), which may be a long process and contains the involvement of several other members of the organisation, as well as members of other organisations. Further, there are a number of different views on the number, nature, and sequences of the various stages comprising the model, but there is no way to distinguish which view is the correct one, or if there is one. Hence, it is most likely that a correct one does not exist as organisations are different in their characteristics and therefore need different models.

Johnston and Lewin (1996) stress the importance for the sales person to fully understand the buying behaviour of their customers in order to succeed in B2B markets. However, pointed out are also the difficulties with achieving this understanding.

2.1.1 Webster’s buying process model

Webster (1965) introduced a model of four stages for the industrial buying process in order to better analyse and identify the important variables and causal relationships that exist in this complex environment. However, this model was just an introduction and was aimed at and has been further developed for greater specificity. The first stage of Webster’s (1965) model is problem recognition, where a buying situation is created by an identified need which may be solved through a purchase. A problem or need arises when there is a gap between the actual performance of the organisation and the organisation’s goals. Further, there are both external and internal factors that may influence the goal-setting and problem recognition, thus research is needed to recognise the major influences. The second stage is buying responsibility, which includes selecting the buyer in the organisation, which is influenced by the organisation, industry, product, as well as individual factors. The third stage is the search process, which entails the gathering of information in order to find alternative solutions and establishing criteria for evaluating buying alternatives. The search process may also change the goals. The fourth and last stage is the choice process, which involves the selection of one or more suppliers. Further, this stage may be influenced by the order in which the alternatives are evaluated, the relationship between price-quality-service, as well as the priorities assigned to price-quality-service. Webster’s (1965) general model is good to use for understanding the basic process of organisational buying, however Webster and Wind (1972) as well as Sargeant and West (2001) have further developed it to achieve a deeper understanding.

2.1.2 Sargeant and West’s buying process model

Webster and Wind (1972) further developed Webster’s (1965) model to include five stages in a continuous process; identification of a need, establishing objectives and specifications, identifying buying alternatives, evaluating alternative buying actions, and selecting the sup-
pler. Johnston and Lewin (1996) found that Webster and Wind (1972) were correct when they proposed that their model of organisational buying behaviour as a process with its five stages greatly affects organisational buying behaviour.

More applicable to our research is the B2B buying process model by Sargeant and West (2001), which describes the decision process in greater detail in seven stages and comes closer to the buying process of a restaurant (see figure 2-1). The B2B buying process has been chosen since it allows us to incorporate other contemporary relevant theories of criteria and influences. The buying process model will present us with an outline of the buying process, providing an understanding of where what factors and influences may affect the buyer and the decision made. The model is constructed in a clear way with appropriate components and it will further serve as a guide through the analysis in order to make it comprehensive.

![Figure 2-1 B2B buying process (Sargeant & West, 2001)]

The first stage of Sargeant and West’s (2001) model includes the same activities as Webster and Wind (1972) describe where someone in the organisation recognises a problem to be solved or a need to be fulfilled. However, Sargeant and West (2001) also include that the nature of the problem should be qualified and agreed upon in the organisation, and that the specification of the need or problem and characteristics of the product or service needed should be established. Next, Webster and Wind (1972) combine supplier search and proposals into one stage whereas Sargeant and West (2001) describe them in two stages. Firstly, the supplier search where the organisation will use the suppliers they remember and recognise as well as seek information beyond these companies. Secondly, the proposals where the organisation will request suppliers to make an offer for the product or service needed. We find that the latter version of the stages relates better to the situation of restaurants’ buying behaviour, since supplier search is extremely crucial as brand rights are exclusive, which makes the search and communication with suppliers particularly important. The next stage
in Sargeant and West’s (2001) model represents a crucial part; evaluation of alternatives, which can be conducted in two ways; to consider beliefs and intentions, as well as attitudes and intentions. Webster and Wind (1972) emphasise the need to prioritise the different characteristics of the product or service and to establish appropriate trade-offs. The next stage in Sargeant and West’s (2001) model is to select a supplier on the basis of the criteria that has been established previously. However, the decision may be highly influenced by the different people involved and their respective authorities. This is where the model ends, according to Webster and Wind (1972). Yet, Sargeant and West (2001) continue one more step which includes evaluating the buy after the purchase has been made in order to see how well the purchase worked out. Post-purchase evaluation is important for restaurants as they often require post-sale support and services such as education and information about the wine.

The supplier search stage and proposals stage of the model will not be discussed in the analysis since they do not serve the general purpose of this thesis, which is to understand influences and criteria when purchasing wine. The search for suppliers and gathering of proposals is a task of more concrete nature and does not affect the buying decision in the same way as the other stages do.

2.2 The new marketing mix

Perreault and McCarthy (1999) define a marketing mix as a collection of controllable variables that a firm puts together to satisfy a target group. Numerous varieties of marketing mixes have been put forward in academic research, the most famous one being the four Ps model first introduced by McCarthy (1960) in (Perreault & McCarthy, 1999) entailing product, price, place, and promotion as vital factors to incorporate in the marketing strategy. Kotler, Wong, Saunders and Armstrong (2005) declares the four Ps model as being the front runner within the marketing mix concept. According to Dev and Schultz (2005) the framework has been widely used since the middle of the 20th century, however it ignores the importance of the customers, prospects and markets since it focuses only on the proper implementation of the four Ps, and about manipulating price, product, promotion, and place in order to better use tools and techniques in supplying the product or service. Therefore, a new demand-driven marketing mix is needed, since the changing market place is making it obsolete, instead of the old supply-driven four Ps; a recreated marketing mix should be approached from the customer’s perspective.

Bennett (1997) also argues for a new marketing mix from the perspective of the customers, for the reason that most models start from the premise that buyers may be seen as a collective who demonstrate the same behaviour. Bennett’s (1997) new marketing mix consists of the five Vs; value, viability, volume, variety, and virtue. Fundamentally the five Vs state that customers consider: value and not just cost; distance including access, choice, freedom to select, and time; volumes that suit themselves; variety of products which otherwise may lead to switching suppliers; and virtue which may result in a meaningful relationship.

Dev and Schultz (2005) have introduced SIVA; solution, information, value, and access, to replace the four Ps, whereas Shultz, Tannenbaum and Lauterborn (1993) introduced the four Cs, and Cummins and Mullin (2002) introduced the six Cs.

The six Cs model by Cummins and Mullin (2002) has been developed from the four Ps to represent the model from the buyer’s perspective. According to Schultz et al. (1993) distribution is no longer the decision of the supplier’s marketer, but the decision of the customer; the customer decides how, when, and where they wish to buy.
The six Cs model is presented below and has been included in the theoretical framework since it is emphasising in a concrete way the different factors that a buyer may find important. Furthermore, it is a model widely used by marketers, portraying how to reach customers. Therefore, we want to use the model from a reverse perspective; from the customer’s perspective, in order to see how important the different aspects are, as well as how they influence buyers in high commercial value restaurants. This will be done in order for the supplier to understand the buyers. We find it particularly interesting to examine whether the buyers perceive these aspects as important as the marketers claim the buyers do.

### 2.2.1 The six Cs model

The six Cs is a new marketing mix by Cummins and Mullin (2002) which aims to replace the four Ps model, and includes characteristics that are offered with a product or service in order to meet the customers’ needs, see figure 2-2.

The concept a company offers its customers must match what the customers need, and must be perceived by the customers as not only the solution to their need, but it should also offer a greater benefit; an advantage, according to Cummins and Mullin (2002). Further, the new marketing mix, which includes: cost, convenience of buying, concept, communication, customer relationship, and consistency, aims at getting organisations to consider their customers’ needs from a customer perspective.

We decided to include the six Cs model because it emphasises the aspects that a buyer finds important in a clear manner. Marketing experts believe that these aspects are very important and therefore, we find it interesting to see whether the buyers emphasise the same importance. In order to be able to gain a deeper understanding of what factors that influence the restaurants when purchasing wine, we need to examine how they value these aspects. This may further guide the supplier’s behaviour and actions in order to be successful.

![Figure 2-2 The six Cs (Cummins & Mullin, 2002)](image)

According to Cummins and Mullin (2002) *customer cost* and cost of ownership is considered from a value perspective including time and travel to make the purchase, since customers’ valuation of products today entail not only price but other social and behavioural factors as
well which need to be taken into consideration. Therefore, cost is a more suitable term to use than price presented in the four Ps model (Shultz et al., 1993). Dev and Schultz (2005) argue for this change as well, but call it value; value received by the customer for the investment made. Further, this does not only include financial costs, but also customer sacrifice. In order for companies to affect the cost of products they use sales promotions, e.g. two for the price of one, 33 per cent free, etc, or in combination with other products, according to Cummins and Mullin (2002).

When it comes to convenience of buying, which replaces the P for place, the customer will consider a mix of place/location, opening hours, and cash/cheque/credit card acceptability, Cummins and Mullin (2002) argue. Moreover, a company should make it as easy as possible for the customers to buy since customers are lazy and exercising the brain requires effort and energy. Schultz et al. (1993) state that time is limited for customers and therefore convenience to buy is essential; focus should be aimed at understanding where a customer group wants to buy and how. Dev and Schultz (2005) argue for access, which is comparable to convenience, and that suppliers should bring the customers to the solution in order to demonstrate how they can provide the fastest, easiest, and least expensive access to the product or service.

According to Cummins and Mullin (2002) the concept is a mix of product and service, and today few products are sold without some aftercare service, since customers take for granted a warranty or return policy. Further, a brand makes it easier for the customer to remember the concept, as well as sales promotions which add fun to the purchase for the buyer. Instead of the P for product one should focus on the customers’ needs and wants, according to Schultz et al. (1993) since it is no longer profitable to sell whichever product is made, rather it needs to be shaped into the concept the customers want. Dev and Schultz (2005) argue that instead of offering a product one should offer a solution; customers are overwhelmed by products but starving for solutions. Therefore, the new imperative for marketers is to understand the solution needed by the customer instead of making a product and then fitting it to the customer.

Communication is how well the product or service is communicated to the customer, according to Cummins and Mullin (2002) and enables the company to make full use of sales promotions by matching communication with the feel of the brand and the right offer. Further, in order for customers to buy the concept it should not be too complex, dull, or in terms not commonly used. Schultz et al. (1993) argue that communication should step in instead of the P of promotion, since the buying process today is dependent on good relations between business partners, which can only be achieved through good communication. Dev and Schultz (2005) also argue that promotion should be replaced, but replaces it with the term information, since current marketing and communication planning is no longer relevant in the modern marketplace. Today, providing customers with the right information, on the right subject, and at the right time is becoming increasingly important (Dev & Schultz, 2005).

Cummins and Mullin (2002) also argue for customer relationship, since customers expect to be treated with respect at all times and that all reasonable questions will be answered and that problems are solved. This means that they want to be remembered and recognised as soon as they have made a purchase. Further, customers also appreciate a good relationship with the sales person, e.g. if a customer gets different answers from an organisation they tend to trust the person and not the organisation. According to Cummins and Mullin (2002) research has shown that making sure all departments give consistent answers is worth 30% of sales. Due to dynamic changes in customer markets; from being able to sell most products,
to a situation where products only sell if they are specifically requested by customers, Schultz et al. (1993) emphasise that focus should be put on customer relationships in the form of studying customer wants and needs.

Cummins and Mullin (2002) describe consistency as the reassurance of ongoing quality and reliability of the other five Cs, and includes integration and the application of internal marketing within an organisation. However, this aspect of the model will not be discussed in the analysis since its main objective is to serve as a tool for the marketer in order to make sure that there is a consistency in the implementation of the previously mentioned categories. Hence, it is not relevant for our purpose.

2.3 Influencing factors

There are many influences in the environment that need to be considered in order to understand the buying behaviour and purchasing decisions made at high commercial value restaurants. The following theories on influencing factors assist us in understanding the more broad influences behind the purchasing decision. In addition, it will help us to distinguish what factors influence in the buying process of restaurants, as well as why and how they influence. It will also create an understanding for which persons in the buying process that affect the decision made and how and why they influence.

The buyer expectations theory has been included in the theoretical framework since it presents expectations that the buyer can have, which may influence in the buying process as well as the outcome of the process, whereas the marketing mix discussed earlier managed criteria to consider which may influence the buying decision. The theory on organisational and environmental influences have been included since these influences influence on a more general level up until the need is recognised.

2.3.1 Buyer expectations

The choice of a wine or supplier is not only influenced by tangible criteria as mentioned above, but also by intangible criteria such as a buyer’s expectations, which have a large influence on the outcome of a buying task, according to Sörqvist (2000). Further, six factors are suggested that may influence: previous experience, marketing and advertisement, image and reputation, importance and interest, third party information, and product price. Previous experience with the supplier or the supplier’s product or service is said to have a large influence on the buyer's expectations. It has also been shown that negative experiences have a greater influence than positive experiences. Marketing and advertisement gives the buyer a picture of what to expect from the product’s or service’s respective characteristics and abilities. Image and reputation can greatly influence the buyer’s expectations, and includes the company and organisation as well as the brand and retailer. Importance and interest of the product also influences; the higher the importance is the more information the buyer gathers, and the less impressionable the buyer gets. Third party information may have a significant influence on expectations since it is often regarded as reliable and objective. It includes information from media, industry organisations, studies, etc. Product price is one of the basic influences, the higher the price the better quality the buyer expects. However, we assume that the purchasing of wine is important at the restaurants we have investigated since they are of high commercial value and yearly turnover from beverages is high. Therefore, importance and interest will not be discussed in our analysis.
Most of the factors suggested by Sörqvist (2000) create buyer expectations which the supplier cannot influence as they happen. Grönroos (2007) writes about the importance of balancing expectations and experiences in order to reach a state of satisfaction, and when an imbalance occurs, the image, perception, and ultimately the overall quality of a business encounter will be negatively affected. Hence, these influences need to be seriously considered in order to prevent and eliminate negative business encounters and outcomes.

2.3.2 Organisational and environmental influences on buying needs

The complexity of organisational buying behaviour reflects the many factors which influence the outcome of the organisational buying decision process, according to Webster and Wind (1972). Further, the buying process in a formal organisation usually involves several individuals whose decisions are influenced by other individuals, the organisational setting in which they operate, environmental constraints within which the organisation performs, and by their individual characteristics. These multiple influences on the buying decisions are explained by the following equation:

\[ B = f(I, G, O, E) \]

where B (buying behaviour) is a function of I (individual characteristics), G (group factors), O (organisational factors), and E (environmental factors).

Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991) state that to a large extent organisational buying is concerned with not only the outcome of a buying situation, but also with the different events and relationships leading up to the purchase outcome. Therefore, a model has been proposed (see table 2.1) and will be discussed further as it includes factors which influence buying needs. Further, the model is divided into two broad classes of influences; organisational and environmental influences. The organisational influences are further divided into three subgroups: structural, individual, and task. Environmental influences are further divided into four subgroups: buyers, suppliers, competitors, and regulatory forces.

Table 2-1 A model of organisational buying needs (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and procedures</td>
<td>Work load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Number and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Perceived importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory forces</td>
<td>Power base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences of not adapting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991), the structural factors determine the overall structure of the organisation and exists independently of the individuals and activities present. Further, technology is assumed to be influencing what is bought as well as the nature of the buying process, which is also supported by Webster and Wind (1972) and Sheth (1973) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). Technology is characterised by flexibility; when a large number of combinations of input and outputs are available the technology is seen as flexible, whereas a limited number of inputs and outputs characterise an inflexible technology (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). The buying need is also influenced by the rules and procedures the organisation possesses in order to handle various tasks, Grønhaug and Venkatesh
(1991) state. Further, these rules and procedures usually work as programmes, which tend to activate and structure certain activities in the buying process. Organizational structure is, according to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991) made up of centralisation, formalisation and complexity. Centralisation includes the extent to which decisions are shared in the organisation, and a high degree of centralisation usually offers a focused direction to organisational activities and structures it. Centralisation tends to affect repetitive buying needs in a positive way and the discovering of new buying needs in a negative way. Formalisation concerns the extent to which the organisation is bounded by rules and procedures. Hence, the more formalised the organisation, the more repetitive buying needs will appear, and less new and unstructured buying needs will be discovered. Complexity of the organisation refers to the level of differentiation and presence of varied professions in the organisation. A high complexity organisation tends to be more aware of new buying needs, but it also tends to inhibit implementation. Only organisational structure will be discussed in the analysis as this thesis no more than touches upon structure in the form of buyer responsibility, i.e. technology, and rules and procedures do not serve our purpose.

Individual level factors are seen as a fundamental part of the organisation influencing buying needs, according to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991). The three crucial factors of individual level factors are: competence, work load, and organisational position (Hall, 1982) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). Individual competence implies that the more relevant competence an individual has, the better he/she will understand the problem and buying needs. Effective use of competence which is seen as a scarce resource, often leads to letting the most competent individuals be involved in several buying situations (Wind & Thomas, 1981; Johnston & Bonoma, 1981) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). Work load may vary over both time and organisational members, and new buying needs tend to be overlooked when the work load is experienced as high by the relevant organisational members. According to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991) the buying decision will be influenced to the extent that the buying need is perceived as important. Further, the perception of the need will vary depending on the organisational position of the individual.

The organisational tasks can be divided into novelty and type, where the novelty of the need often is positively related to uncertainty (Howard & Sheth, 1969; Cyert & March 1963) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). Organisational tasks are often seen as directly related to output, according to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991), whereas non-tasks are often seen as indirectly related to the output. Therefore, it is also common that buying needs directly related to output receive higher priority and attention. However, since wine is directly related to output there is no need for further analysis of the task aspect.

The environment is assumed to be constructed by the organisation, which takes into account the environmental influences in accordance with the perceived importance they have for the organisation’s operations (Starbuck, 1976; Weick, 1979) in (Grønhaug and Venkatesh, 1991). Buyers’ satisfaction is closely linked to the survival of the organisation, and according to Emerson (1962) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991) the fewer buyers the organisation has the more important they become. Further, the more important the buyers become the greater the attention given to them. Hence, the buyer relationship is seen as imperative for the organisation. Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991) claim that interactions with buyers are important for both the buyer and the organisation. Moreover, the organisation will change their output and thereby also their input in order to satisfy the buyers. For this reason, organisations are also dependent on a continuous supply of products and services from their suppliers (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991). Further, through interaction with suppliers uncertainty may be reduced and adjustment made; the more important the input
is to the organisation, the more likely a permanent relationship is. Moreover, previous successful experience with the supplier will cause the organisation to include it in their network. When it comes to competitors, organisations usually keep watch over the most visible ones and overlook the less visible ones, according to Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991), in order to counteract moves made by them which are seen as threatening, and to initiate new buying needs. Furthermore, regulatory agents may also influence the organisation in various ways; laws and regulations may create new buying needs, which are influenced by the cost of change, power base behind the laws or regulations, and consequences of not adapting. However, competitors and regulatory agents will not be discussed in the analysis as it does not serve our purpose.
3 Method

This section will present and discuss the method used for conducting the empirical research on buying behaviour in high commercial value restaurants. It will describe how the data has been collected, discuss the trustworthiness of the data, the ethical implications that need to be considered, and finally describe how the data will be presented and analysed.

In order to plan and conduct a research in a clear way it is important to have a clear research topic according to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2003), which in our case is represented by our purpose; to gain a deeper understanding of the influences on organisational buying behaviour when purchasing in a B2B environment, and to investigate what criteria and services are more important to restaurants when purchasing wine.

3.1 Qualitative and quantitative approach

The method used in research should be chosen in the light of the research problem and purpose according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005). The research questions of our report which we will answer are: what criteria regarding the wine and supplier, as well as what service and support are most important to the restaurants, and why? Who and what factors influence the buying process and decision made, as well as why and how?

Hence, a qualitative research will be conducted since our aim firstly is to understand the behaviour of buyers i.e. the responsible persons at restaurants, and secondly to understand the perception and attitudes of the buyers. A qualitative approach describes the behaviour of people individually, in groups, or in organisations, according to Curwin and Slater (2002) whereas a quantitative approach emphasises the collection of numerical data, summarising it, and drawing conclusions from the numbers. Creswell (2002) argues that a qualitative approach is more suitable for research which plans to make knowledge claims on socially constructed findings by asking open-ended questions. It is furthermore stated that the intent is to discover themes from data to be able to draw behavioural patterns from a sample. Creswell’s (2002) argument corresponds to our research and will therefore act as a fundamental motive behind our chosen method.

3.2 Data collection

The collection of data is highly dependent on the ability to gain access to sources, according to Saunders et al. (2003). However, this can be difficult since organisations or individuals might not want to spend time on voluntary activities which require time and resources. This is also true in our research since restaurants are busy places and catching the people responsible at a convenient time might be difficult. However, since our qualitative research includes a larger number of interviewees and shorter interviews this will not create a significant problem. Further, Saunders et al. (2003) state that the data collection must also be appropriate for the research questions, objectives, and strategy.

3.2.1 Primary data

Primary data is collected by the researchers and is used, according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) when secondary data is not available or not able to answer the research questions posed. Furthermore, the main advantage with primary data is that it is collected specifically for the research problem at hand, making the data, if collected in a reliable way closely con-
nected to the research topic. Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005) further state that in contrast secondary data may not be totally applicable to the research topic, since it was collected with a different research purpose in mind. In addition, the disadvantages of primary data also needs to be considered and includes: being time consuming, costly, possibly hard to get access, respondent dependent, and low degree of control. We have used primary data collected through telephone interviews as there is no secondary data available within the area that we are researching. The disadvantages of collecting primary data have been overcome by starting the collection phase as early as possible, using communication channels that are less costly, making sure early on that we would have access to our population, creating interview questions in a reliable way, and accepting the low degree of control for us as researchers.

Primary data can be divided into three subcategories; experiments, observations and communication (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). We have used the third category of communication in our thesis in the form of telephone interviews. Interviews can be created in three different ways according to Bailey (2007); structured, unstructured or semi-structured. We have created questions for a structured interview, which Bailey (2007) claims are particularly useful for comparing answers from different respondents. In addition, Bailey (2007) explains that in structured interviews questions are asked in a specific order, precisely formulated to suit the researchers’ interest, and the interviewer may even make sure to ask each question in the same manner to each interviewee. Furthermore, it is stated that in a structured interview the interviewer determines which questions are asked, in which order and pace, trying to keep the interviewee on the right track. However, there are five ‘do nots’ which an interviewer needs to consider: do not deviate from the standard explanation of the study, do not deviate from the sequence of questions or question wording, do not give the interviewee your personal views, do not interpret the meaning of a question or give clarifications, and do not improvise by adding answer categories or making word changes. We have taken these issues into consideration when writing our interview questions and conducting the interviews, as well as written down the key points for introducing the research to the interviewee including e.g. stating the purpose of the study.

When collecting primary data by conducting interviews it is important to consider factors which may influence the respondents and their answers. According to Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005) those factors can be: sponsors, appeal, stimulus, and questionnaire format. We have overcome these factors in our research by being honest with the respondents and informing them about the fact that we are collaborating with a wine supplier, but strongly emphasizing that their answers will remain confidential. Concerning the appeal factor we have not emphasised more than the importance of us appreciating the respondents’ help in our thesis work as university students. No appeal has been made in order to get respondents to answer in a certain way, or leading them to believe that they will give us better answers or the answers we want when giving a certain answer. We have not offered stimulus of any kind to the respondents making this factor non-existing in our case. When it comes to the format of the interview questions, it is only the formulation of the questions and length of the interview that may affect the respondents, since the interview will be conducted over the telephone. However, we have formulated the questions to be easily understood and neutral.

3.2.2 Sample selection

The population we have decided to investigate is the restaurants with high commercial value in the region Mälardalen, which is a region located around the lake Mälaren in the
eastern part of Sweden. It includes in our definition the counties: Uppsala county, Västmanland county, Södermanland county, and Stockholm county. There are several reasons why Mälardalen was chosen. First, it includes a large part of the population of Sweden since it has 2,749,617 inhabitants, i.e. approximately 30% of Sweden’s population, who are located on 5.7% of the total area of Sweden (Nationalencyclopedin, 2007). Second, it includes a mixture of cities of different sizes, providing diversity in the restaurants’ characteristics and market niches. Finally, as the population in the northern part of Sweden only represents a small percentage of Sweden’s total population this part was excluded. Also, the west coast was not included since the restaurants there are highly dependent on the summer season when the population increases significantly. Furthermore, the buying behaviour in the Scania area is highly influenced by Denmark, due to their more beneficial alcohol taxes.

Many researchers employ a purposive sampling method in qualitative studies since they know where the processes that are studied are most likely to occur, according to Denzin and Lincoln (1994). However, since we did not possess the required knowledge of which restaurants in the studied geographical area that are of high commercial value, this was not an alternative in our research. In addition, when choosing restaurants ourselves the resulting sample would have been biased due to our implicit preferences and similar restaurants may have been selected.

The population for our investigation was collected by contacting each municipality in Mälardalen by telephone, requesting a list of all existing restaurants in each municipality which have been granted a license to serve alcohol. We received lists from 52 of the 53 municipalities in Stockholm, Uppsala, Södermanland, and Västmanland County. Unfortunately Heby municipality was excluded since their list arrived too late, i.e. after we had drawn our sample and started to collect the empirical data. However, the population is still diverse and there are other municipalities included of similar size and character as Heby which may represent similar behaviour. The total number of restaurants in the population was 3687.

The lists of restaurants received from the municipalities were sorted in alphabetical order and the restaurants were given a number reaching from 1 to 3687. A probability sampling was done with the use of a computer programme; Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the function Randomisation. According to Brewerton (2001) probability sampling, also known as random sampling is a sample collected in such a way that each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected, making the sample representative. Further, there are three different ways in which probability sampling can be used, and we have decided to perform a single random sampling (SRS). SRS entails complete random sampling from the total population, and is therefore best used when a good sampling frame exists, e.g. the availability of a list of the total population, as in our case.

A large sample of 235 numbers each representing a restaurant was drawn due to uncertainty concerning how many restaurants possessed high commercial value, and the response rate of the telephone interviews. Out of the 235 restaurants 18 interviews were conducted, giving a response rate of 7.65%. However, the low response rate was mainly due to the majority of restaurants not being relevant for our research, e.g. 8.5% were casual dining restaurants or had the restaurant as a secondary function, another 8.5% where not interested in participating, 14.5% had less than 25% turnover coming from beverage sales, 17.5% where unreachable, and 4% were not even allowed to sell alcohol to the public. Another 13% of the restaurants could not participate in the research due to the following rea-
3.2.3 Constructing the interview questions

In our interviews we have used both open-ended questions and close-ended Likert scale questions. Open-ended questions are, according to Creswell (2002) the most common way of formulating qualitative questions, and we have used these in our interviews with the intention to receive deeper answers including the respondents’ own opinions and comments. These questions will then be analysed to understand the buying behaviour of high commercial value restaurants and the influences that affect them more. However, in our interviews two questions are not open-ended, but in the form of a Likert scale. The use of a Likert scale of measurement is a quantitative measurement of data, but one that is, according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) used to investigate preference data and attitude measures, which is the second focus of our investigation. We want to gain a deeper understanding of the buying behaviour of restaurants with high commercial value, but at the same time also consider descriptive data in order to see what criteria are more important and what influences affect the buyers more. Given that we are interested in not only researching the behaviour, but also the perception and attitudes of respondents, the use of a Likert scale of measurement is applicable in combination with our qualitative questions. The Likert scale questions have been given an interval from one to five. We have chosen to use five values since it provides a comprehensible amount of alternatives, making it easy to respond when interviewed over the telephone and not being able to read and get an overview of the questions. Another reason for choosing five values is that the more values people may choose from the more diversely they might value the intervals.

The interview questions start with four screening questions in order to find the restaurants with high commercial value. After that some background questions about the restaurants have been constructed, mainly for the benefit of Pernod Ricard Sweden. Next, the questions which serve our purpose and research questions follow. These questions have been developed from the theories in the theoretical framework, making sure that all relevant aspects are covered in the interviews.

Before commencing the interviews a pilot test of the interview questions was conducted in order to make sure that the length of the interview was acceptable and that the questions would not be misinterpreted. The pilot test was conducted using a purposive sampling of restaurants in Jönköping and Borås, which we assessed would have high commercial value. The reason for choosing these two cities was that we are familiar with many restaurants in the areas. Two restaurants were interviewed via telephone and the result of the pilot test was overall positive. The length of the interview was acceptable and the questions were easy to understand except two of the questions which we improved based on the feedback from the interviewees. One question was deleted for the reason that it was perceived as too long and exhausting for the respondents to answer, and it contributed to the interview becoming very time consuming. Also, our question regarding the impact of influences during the buying process was given the same Likert scale measurement as the first Likert scale question in our interview questions. This was done since the respondents implicitly interpreted it to be answered in this manner, and in so doing being more consistent and not confusing the respondents.
3.2.4 Conducting the interviews

To conduct qualitative research using telephone interviews has advantages such as access, speed, and lower cost, according to Saunders et al. (2003) thus making it more convenient. However, this approach is likely to be appropriate only in particular circumstances, as when access and possibility to interviews are restricted by cost, time, and distance. We have chosen to conduct telephone interviews due to a number of reasons which we find make this a particular circumstance where telephone interviews are appropriate: the number of interviewees is higher than in a usual qualitative research, the distance to the interviewees is significant, and the short time needed to conduct one interview makes the travel to the many spread out interviewees costly. Saunders et al. (2003) further put forward some limitations with this approach. Firstly, it may be difficult to establish a personal contact with the interviewee over the telephone, which may have an effect on the trust, which might be needed between the interviewer, and the interviewee when asking sensitive questions. Secondly, it might be difficult to conduct the interview at a favourable pace and at the same time record the forthcoming data. In addition, you cannot witness the non-verbal behaviour of the interviewee, which might affect your interpretation of how sensitive questions to ask. Finally, conducting interviews over the telephone may raise some ethical issues. We find these limitations highly adequate; however we have overcome them by a number of facts. The nature of our questions are not sensitive in the sense that trust needs to be fully established before commencing the interview, and additionally total anonymity has been guaranteed all interviewees. Further, as our questions are not sensitive as previously mentioned, the lack of witnessing non-verbal behaviour will not create a problem. As for recording the data whilst conducting the interview, we have overcome this by printing the questions in advance with blank spaces after each question, in order to easily fill in the answers while interviewing the restaurants without slowing down the pace of the interview. Ethical issues will be considered further under ethical implications.

The 18 telephone interviews were conducted by calling each restaurant in the order of the sample list. First presenting ourselves and where we are calling from, as well as stating the purpose of our call. After that, going through the screening questions to see if the restaurant possessed high commercial value, which if confirmed led to continuing the interview with the restaurant according to our interview questions, or scheduling a new date for the interview. The interviews were concluded with a question regarding their anonymity and thanking them for their kind cooperation. The length of the interviews varied from 15-30 minutes.

High commercial value restaurants are defined as more mainstream restaurants with high quantities of wine sales (Sanna Bronell, personal communication, 2007-09-14). Further, the desired criteria to be fulfilled by the restaurants with high commercial value is: they should have more than 48 chairs, the purchasing price of wine should be between 40-60 SEK per bottle, and a minimum of 25% of restaurant turnover should be generated from beverage sales, where the majority comes from beer and wine. However, four restaurants only fulfilled two of three screening questions, but we still estimated them as having high commercial value. One restaurant only had 40 seats but had a turnover percentage of 60% coming from beverage sales, which we consider complements the few seats. Two restaurants could not report for certain a turnover percentage higher than 25% coming from beverage sales, but was still included due to their high purchasing quantities. At one restaurant the purchasing prices of their wines started from 65 SEK, however it was still included due to their high purchasing quantities and since the prices were still close to our price range.
3.3 Trustworthiness

When it comes to qualitative research and trustworthiness there is, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) one major issue to consider: how can a researcher persuade his or her audience that the findings of an investigation are worth paying attention to and worth taking account of? Lincoln and Guba (1985) describes four means to operationalise trustworthiness; through credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility entails authenticity, believability and plausibility of results, according to Miles and Huberman (1994) in (Bailey, 2007). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) credibility can be derived in a number of different ways. One of these ways is to engage in activities that ensure credibility of empirical findings and interpretations through; prolonged engagement, persistent observations and triangulation. Furthermore, an additional way to ensure credibility is peer debriefing, which is useful when checking the investigation process externally through the use of e.g.: a pilot test to check implicit assumptions and other factors that otherwise may have gone undetected by the researchers and influencing the results of the research, and hence also the credibility. We have achieved trustworthiness in our research by adopting the credibility means of using a pilot test in order to ensure credible data collection.

Transferability entails, according to Stake (1995) in (Bailey, 2007) the usefulness of findings beyond the situation, setting, and participants involved in the research. Further, this broader term is adopted by researchers when finding external validity and generalisation difficult. When it comes to transferability a qualitative researcher can only propose working hypotheses together with a description of the time and context in which they were found to hold (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, whether or not they hold in other contexts is an empirical issue and the qualitative researcher may only provide a thick description for the next coming researcher to be able to reproduce the data. Further it is argued that it is not the qualitative researcher’s task to provide transferability, but to provide the data base that makes judgements about transferability possible. Hoepfl (1997) in (Bailey, 2007) agrees with the above and states that the level of transferability apparent depends on the knowledge, awareness, and experiences of the reader. We have adopted the transferability means by systematically describing our chosen method in detail in order to make it possible for future researchers to replicate our empirical investigation.

Dependability concerns factors of instability, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), who also argue that without credibility there is no chance for dependability to emerge, the two are intertwined. Further, dependability requires internal consistency in terms of a clear correspondence between conclusions drawn and methodology adopted. We have achieved credibility in our data and therefore also dependability. Further we have put emphasis on our internal uniformity of all thesis parts being interrelated and coherent.

The technique of confirmability audit is used to establish confirmability in research and takes into account both the audit trail and the audit process when assessing confirmability of the research at hand, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985). In this thesis we have utilised means to achieve credibility, dependability and transferability in order to achieve confirmability by showing where all concerned parts have originated from and how we have used them in the writing process.
3.4 Ethical implications

When conducting a research it is important to consider some ethical aspects which may affect the outcome of the research. According to Brewerton (2001) the first important issue is to have the respondents’ consent to include them in the research, and inform them about the purpose of the research as well as what it will be used for. However, this includes a risk that the behaviour during the research may be distorted, but if not informed the researcher has limited the respondent’s own right to decide if they want to participate. Still, the dilemma is put on the researcher to maximise the welfare and interest of the respondents, as well as maximising the validity and accuracy of the empirical data. Secondly, it is imperative to take measures not to deceive the respondent, which may occur when trying to mask the true nature of the research, the function of the respondent’s actions, or concealing the experiences the respondent might have (Brewerton, 2001). Finally, according to Barrett (1995) in (Brewerton, 2001) the issue of confidentiality and anonymity needs to be considered and it is expressed that most professional bodies of research claim that all information should be held confidential unless otherwise agreed between the parties. Further, the information should not be attributable to the respondents if presented to a wider audience, if not otherwise agreed. Brewerton (2001) stresses that if confidentiality and anonymity can not be guaranteed the respondents should be informed before the research takes place.

We have considered the ethical issues and measures have been taken to abide by them. When conducting the telephone interviews the respondents have been informed about our purpose and intentions. In the end of each interview the respondent has had the choice of remaining anonymous. The purpose of the research has been explained before asking any questions and answers will be held confidential, except for the names of the participating restaurants who have given their permission to forward the names to Pernod Ricard Sweden.

3.5 Data presentation and analysis

The empirical data collected in our research will be presented in a clear and logical order following the outline of our interview questions, but not with each questions as a heading but compiled into relevant sections under the corresponding headings. However, the questions in our interviews which have been asked purely for screening purposes or for the benefit of Pernod Ricard Sweden will not be included in the empirical findings, since they do not assist in fulfilling the purpose of this thesis, and would only confuse the reader.

When analysing our empirical data we will follow the structure in our theoretical framework. We will analyse the data through the B2B buying process model starting with problem recognition, however skipping supplier search and proposals and instead continuing with evaluation of alternatives where the marketing mix has been integrated into the model. Next, the stage of evaluative criteria will be analysed where buyer expectations has been integrated. After that selection and post-purchase evaluation will be analysed. Following the B2B buying process model, some of the data will also be analysed using the model of organisational buying needs.

The analysis will also assist to make some managerial implications for how to best endorse and sell wines according to the customers’ wants and needs. The conclusions will follow in a section after the analysis, finishing with our managerial implications.
4 Empirical findings

In this section the relevant empirical data for the research questions and the purpose of this thesis will be presented. The data collected in the 18 interviews have been compiled into different sections under their corresponding headings, in order to make it presentable and more comprehensive to the reader.

4.1 Purchasing responsibility

One of the first questions we asked our interviewees was who is responsible for purchasing, and what position this person had at the restaurant. Further, we also asked what qualifications that had made these persons responsible.

When it comes to what position at the restaurant the persons who are responsible for the purchasing of wine have, the majority of the restaurants state that it is the restaurant manager that is responsible. Approximately one third of the restaurants had the owner as responsible for purchasing, and one restaurant expressed that they had a particular purchasing manager.

The restaurants were also asked if the responsibility was shared with an additional person or a person who assisted or contributed to the purchasing decision. The majority of the responsible persons made all the purchasing decisions themselves without any other person assisting. However, a few restaurants state that they have help from an additional person, whose title varies from owner and controller, to waiter or other staff.

It is stated by many restaurants that the owners who are responsible for the purchasing decisions at the restaurants are responsible simply because of their title as restaurant owners. One restaurant said: “I am the owner of the restaurant so it is natural that I decide what to purchase”. Furthermore, the majority of the restaurant managers have been expressed to be responsible due to their position at the restaurant. Only one third of the persons have been said to be responsible as a result of their experience or education, of which only two persons have some kind of sommelier education. At a few restaurants it is a combination of experience and position that have made them responsible.

4.2 Important criteria and characteristics

We continued our interviews with first asking the restaurants to spontaneously state criteria which they find important when purchasing wine. After that we asked them to rank the importance of eleven characteristics which we had suggested, and to comment on why the highly ranked characteristics are important.

When the restaurants spontaneously stated what criteria are more important when purchasing wine, the majority expressed that quality is a more valued criterion. The second most valued criterion mentioned by many of the restaurants was price. Furthermore, many of the restaurants explained that not only the two criteria quality and price separately are important but rather the relationship between them. One third of the restaurants emphasised the importance of the wine matching the food on the menu. In addition, the supplier was mentioned as an important criterion by some of the restaurants and it was also expressed by some restaurants that the fact that the wine should be well-known is a more important criterion. On the contrary, a few restaurants emphasised the importance of the wine to be unique, and some restaurants stated that it is crucial that it should not be possible to buy the wine at Systembolaget. A few restaurants also claimed that the criterion that the wine is
drinkable is important. In addition, it was mentioned by a few restaurants that a screw cork on the bottle is an important criterion, as well as the variety of the assortment that the supplier offers. Furthermore, reliability and trustworthiness of the supplier is expressed to be an important issue by a few restaurants.

The full data of the eleven ranked characteristics is presented in charts in appendix two. Starting with price and discounts most restaurants valued these highly; with an even distribution ranging from moderate to very high importance. However, campaigns are valued only moderately by a third of the restaurants, and even more restaurants value campaigns low or very low. Quality on the other hand, is valued as highly important by practically all restaurants. The majority value it as highly important and an additional number of restaurants value it as very highly important. When it comes to the assortment a supplier offers and the time it takes from placing an order to delivery there is an even distribution of opinions from nearly all restaurants saying that these characteristics are moderately to very highly important. Also for delivery options there is an even distribution of opinions, however ranging from very low importance to very high importance. When it comes to payment options nearly all restaurants have expressed it as important, opinions ranging from moderately to very highly important. The majority of the restaurants found having only one supplier as highly to very highly important and further all restaurants value the supplier-buyer relationship from moderately to very highly important. Finally, as for support the majority of the restaurants found it highly to very highly important and only a few restaurants valued it low or very low.

The following comments were made about each characteristic regarding why they are important.

**Price**

It is expressed by a few restaurants that price is important because it contributes to the restaurant getting high sales. This aspect is mentioned in another way by one restaurant which stated that it plays a vital part for the restaurant’s profit. However, it is also argued that “a low price versus good quality is very important to uphold the restaurant’s standard”.

**Discounts**

One restaurant emphasises that a good final product offered to the guest is important. “Price and discounts are important because we need to make money.” Again it is argued that price versus quality is very important to uphold the restaurant’s standard.

**Quality**

As with price it is expressed that it is important to balance price and quality in order to uphold the restaurant’s standard. One restaurant stated it simply by: “quality is self-evident”. Quality is crucial, according to another restaurant because a good final product offered to the guest is important. “Quality is vital in order to get satisfied customers.” It is said that since the guests are expecting a good wine, the wine represent the restaurant, and therefore they should match the food in quality. Further, it is important that the quality should be consistent, according to one restaurant.

**Delivery time**

One restaurant states that it is important that everything with the supplier works well since they only have one supplier. Another argues that: “it needs to work smoothly otherwise it
takes too much time and you have to make too much of an effort yourself and things go wrong”.

**Payment options**

The cooperation between the supplier and the restaurant is expressed to be important, since when a relation of trust is created the supplier knows that the restaurant will pay, and preferably on a monthly basis. “Payment options ease the running of the restaurant.”

**One supplier**

Having only one supplier is important, according to one restaurant because: “it makes day-to-day operations run smoothly, having one supplier with a strong relationship.” It is highlighted that things work more smoothly when having only one supplier because it makes them more reliable and problems are solved immediately. It is also stated to be important since having only one supplier makes the business run more smoothly since you know who to talk to; otherwise it takes too much time and effort. “A good cooperation makes it easier to do business with them.” Furthermore, a long-term relationship with one supplier is said to be important because then the restaurant can trust recommendations due to the long-term collaboration.

**Relationship**

It is stated that the relationship between the supplier and the restaurant is important because when a relationship is created they can trust the supplier. Furthermore, it is expressed that communication with the sales person should be excellent in a good relationship, and the relationship helps to maintain high quality. To have a good relationship makes day-to-day operations run smoothly, and when having a close relationship problems can be solved immediately. A long-term relationship is in addition claimed to be important in order to not get fooled and to be able to trust recommendations. The relationship is also emphasised because it makes it easier to do business. “It’s important with a good relationship with the ones you are working with, you get feedback, get reliable answers, you can trust them, get help, suggestions.” Trust is mentioned by many restaurants as a very important part of the relationship with the supplier.

**Support**

Support is seen as a very important factor where the restaurants get feedback, support, assistance, and reliable answers. “It is important that you can rely on the supplier.” It needs to work smoothly and the supplier should come with suggestions. The restaurants want to know who they should talk to, and get help to solve problems immediately. Furthermore, support is needed to a large extent because a good final product offered to the guest is important.

**4.3 Updating the wine menu**

When asked how often the wine menu is updated a few restaurants expressed that it is updated as often as once a month. Further, a few restaurants stated that they update their wine menu four to eight times every year. However, half of the restaurants stated that they updated their wine menus approximately two to three times a year. Many of these restaurants expressed that they have a summer menu and a winter menu. An additional few update their menu once a year.
4.4 Sales meetings

The restaurants were asked how often they would prefer to be contacted by the sales person after cooperation has been established, and for how long these sales meetings should last. Firstly, the results show that most restaurants are positive towards sales meetings. Only a few restaurants state that they would rather handle it via telephone or e-mail, or that sales meetings are not needed at all or depending on the relationship with the supplier. One of the restaurants even finds sales meetings strenuous and time consuming. Out of the positive restaurants some have expressed that they would like monthly sales meetings, but the time ranges from five minutes to one and a half hour per meeting. In addition, some restaurants prefer a sales meeting every other month, lasting from 15 minutes to two hours. Further, some restaurants prefer sales meetings on a quarterly basis, lasting from 30 minutes to one hour. Finally, a few restaurants expressed that they want sales meetings once or twice a year, not specifying how long a meeting should be.

4.5 Support

In the restaurant industry there are different kinds of support which the wine supplier may offer restaurants, and in this section we asked the restaurants if they prefer the different supports, and in that case how much support they would prefer. Further, we asked the restaurants to comment on why some support is wanted and why some support is not wanted. The results and comments are compiled under each kind of support.

Education

As with sales meeting the majority of the restaurants were positive towards education. Only a few restaurants did not prioritise it. The positive restaurants had varying preferences as to the amount of education. A few restaurants wished to have education on approximately a monthly basis for a couple of hours, whereas some found it necessary to have it only twice a year, lasting for a couple of hours to a day. A few restaurants preferred education only once a year for some hours and one restaurant specified education to wine tastings a few times a year.

Some of the reasons for the positive attitude towards education are: in order to motivate the personnel, make them more confident, and because of the need to keep one self and the personnel updated with the latest products. One restaurant expressed it by: “education is important because the day you see yourself as fully educated is the day you have failed.” Further, the restaurants found it important for the personnel to learn about the different grapes and the specifics of the wines for sale at the restaurant. “In order to sell more and better, we need to have knowledgeable personnel since one should always be able to answer the customer’s question.”

Educational trips

The majority of the restaurants were positive towards educational trips. However, one third of the restaurants did not prioritise them, were not interested at all, or did not have an opinion about it. Out of the positive restaurants the majority preferred trips once a year, for two persons on average. One restaurant preferred it only every other year for two to three persons.

Only a few of the restaurants expressed reasons behind their positive opinion towards educational trips. These included: “trips are nice”, “a motivator for the personnel”, and “it’s
good to be constantly updated”. However, one restaurant commented negatively on educational trips: “educational trips are mostly for commercial purposes where they force things on you”, and another restaurant simply did not have time for trips.

**Activities**

When it comes to activities as support, the majority of the restaurants are again positive. Activities entail e.g. wine tastings for the persons responsible, the personnel or guests, but may also include other activities. However, there are some restaurants which do not prioritise activities or do not know how much of this support they would want. Regarding the positive restaurants there is a varying but even distribution of the amount of activities they want. Some restaurants wish to have activities four times a year for a few hours, some prefer to have activities approximately two times a year for a few hours, and additionally some restaurants believe that activities once a year for a few hours is enough.

Only a small number of restaurants have commented on why activities are wanted, however the reasons mentioned for their importance are: to keep the personnel updated, and act as a motivator for the personnel. “Activities are good. It’s good to be able to explain better to customers, and it is good to keep one self updated.” Some restaurants state that they either do not have time for many activities or that the size of the restaurant makes activities unnecessary.

**POS-material**

The overall opinion of POS-material was positive, and the majority of the restaurants were open for it, only a few were negative. However, a few of the restaurants stressed the importance of the quality of the products and preferred to receive material upon own request rather than getting the products randomly.

Only a few have commented on why they are positive or negative towards it. One restaurant said: “POS-material is material that is always needed and used.” A few restaurants said that POS-materials are useless since the restaurants have material with their own logo, or that they prefer to sell by themselves without any rubbish.

**Advertising material**

Only a small number of the restaurants are positive towards advertising material, and one of them expressed that it was only relevant in the restaurant’s bar. The majority of the restaurants were not interested in advertising material at all, and one restaurant said that it is because they use their own material.

Many restaurants commented on advertising material; however all were of negative nature. Advertising material was claimed to be ugly, tacky, does not fit the restaurant, or not needed. Some restaurant said that they rather use their own material with their logo on.

### 4.6 Post-sale services

In our interviews we also asked the restaurants if they would prefer any additional post-sale services other than the support that we previously discussed. Some additional services were expected from half of the restaurants. The other half of the restaurants could not specify any additional services they wanted. The services that were expected from the supplier include: availability mainly via telephone, a convenient handling of complaints, straightforward communication, keep the restaurant updated, always have wine in stock when needed,
and stay in touch with the restaurant. “The supplier should continue to stay in touch and make sure that we are satisfied.” A few restaurants also expressed that they expect the supplier to be honest.

4.7 Influencing factors

Presented in the charts in appendix two is the data of the eleven influencing factors in the buying process suggested by us. The data shows that the majority of the restaurants feel that influence from TV advertisement is very low. Only a few express that they are moderately influenced. Nearly all restaurants also valued printed advertisement as having a very low to moderate influence; additionally some restaurants valued it as of very low influence. As for sponsoring at events there is an even distribution of opinions of influence among the restaurants; ranging from very low to very high influence. When it comes to reputation and image all except one restaurant find them moderately to very highly influencing. For both factors of influence the majority of the restaurants find them highly influencing. Previous experience has also proven to be influencing among the restaurants. Practically all restaurants find it highly to very highly influencing. Half of the restaurants find third party information to be moderately influencing. The rest of the restaurants’ opinions are evenly distributed among the rankings. Practically all restaurants have expressed that the sales person influences in the buying process. The opinions are evenly distributed from moderately to very highly influencing. As for personnel the majority of restaurants find them moderately to very highly influencing, however the opinions are unevenly distributed. Also, the influence of other persons has a very uneven distribution among the values. Many of the restaurants find other persons highly influencing. However, some restaurants have expressed them as either of very low influence or moderate influence. Finally, we can see that other factors have a low influence. Half of the restaurants have stated that they are of low or very low influence, and only a third has claimed them to be of moderate influence.

The restaurants were also asked to comment on why the factors that they have ranked as highly or very highly influencing affect them. The comments are compiled under each influencing factor.

Sponsoring

It has been expressed that sponsoring gives a good overall picture of a product. It shows that the supplier is willing to make an effort. Further, as one restaurant claimed: “if the wine is associated with a certain event it makes it interesting”

Reputation

Reputation is said to have a large impact on the overall picture of the wine and supplier. As one restaurant expressed it: “we can not justify a purchase if the reputation or image is bad”. One restaurant said that the environment gives away different signals which make you curious to try different wines. Furthermore, one restaurant claimed that: “if the wine or supplier has a good reputation you make a purchase since you believe that the guests will like it because they have heard the same reputation”.

Image

One restaurant claims that image is the source that is most trusted. However, just as with reputation a purchase can not be justified if the image is not good. It is claimed that image
has a large impact on the overall picture of wine and supplier. The restaurant takes it into consideration since both the restaurant and guests perceive the same image.

**Previous experience**

It is expressed by many restaurants that their own experience is a reliable source and that it has a large impact, being the most trusted source. When trusting your personal experience you know what you get, according to one restaurant.

**Third party information**

It is said by some restaurants that the people you work with and your colleagues are perceived as very reliable sources. Also, the environment gives away different signals which one might listen to, and that makes one try different wines. It is explained that since these sources often have nothing to gain on recommending you something these source are more reliable. “It is easy to trust the people in the near surroundings.”

**Sales person**

Many restaurants express that it is all about trust and that if the salesperson is good and competent he/she is the most important influence. One restaurant even claims that the decision-making can be delegated to the sales person. It is stated that the sales person should be reliable and personal. However, one restaurant said that salespeople can be funny people and not trustworthy due to their intentions.

**Personnel**

One restaurant stated that: “the chef has plenty of experience and makes the food so what he thinks is important”. It is also claimed that the employees and other people in the surroundings are trusted, hence their opinions are important. Another aspect put forward is that it is believed that the personnel have nothing to gain on recommending a wine or supplier, which makes them more reliable.

**Other persons**

Several restaurants state that they trust their colleagues and friends in the restaurant business as well as the people they work with. Furthermore, it is emphasised that other persons influence because you know what information can be trusted. The environment such as people around you gives away different signals, which makes you curious and try different wines.
5 Analysis

In the following section the empirical data will be analysed in relation to the theoretical framework. It will follow the structure of the B2B buying process model, where the marketing mix and buyer expectations have been integrated into the model, finishing with the analysis of the organisational and environmental influences on buying needs.

5.1 B2B buying process

From the data collected in our research we can observe an existing buying process occurring. However, since we have not focused on stage two and three in the B2B buying process model presented by Sargeant and West (2001) we can not say that the process we have found occurring corresponds entirely to their model, but we can see that there is a relevant process occurring. Problem recognition is the first stage presented in the buying process model. Taken into the context of high commercial value restaurants problem recognition is taking place when the restaurants update their wine menu on a regular basis, resulting in a continuous need for purchasing new wine. The answers received on the question what criteria are most important when purchasing wine and why, demonstrate that some evaluation of alternatives i.e. stage four in the buying process model, is occurring. The six Cs model has been integrated into this stage. In the fifth stage of the buying process model, evaluative criteria, we have integrated Sörqvist’s (2000) buyer expectation theory in order to consider influences. Our data has shown that it is imperative for the supplier-buyer relationship to work in order for the restaurant's business to work smoothly, which shows that influences affect the evaluative criteria of the buying process. Naturally a selection will then follow based on how important the different criteria and influences are and this selection is stage six in the buying process model. The final stage is the post purchase evaluation and this is an important part of the buying process since it includes e.g. different types of support, which we have seen are of great importance to the high commercial value restaurants.

5.1.1 Problem recognition

According to Sargeant and West’s (2001) model the first step is to recognise the buying need and to specify it. We have recognised that in the restaurant industry a need occurs every time the restaurants update their wine menu. According to our data, restaurants of high commercial value update their wine menu on average two times a year; hence need recognition occurs naturally at least two times a year. Further, this implies that the supplier needs to recognise when these two occasions occur in order to be able to timely initiate sales and promotional activities, for the restaurants to already be aware of the wine or supplier when their need is identified. The problem recognition stage also includes establishing the criteria for the products to be purchased. In our research we have found that high commercial value restaurants do have some criteria which they require the wine or supplier to fulfil. Quality and price have been the most emphasised factors of importance. However, what seems to be more important is the relation between price and quality. We have interpreted that even if the wine is cheap there is still a need for decent quality for the price paid. A third factor to add to this combination is that the wine should be matched with the food on the menu, which has been emphasised by several restaurants. This contributes to the complexity of the situation for the buyer when purchasing wine. Viewed from the supplier’s perspective this situation is even more complicated, since the supplier needs to recognise the factors of importance as well as their complex combination, in order to satisfy the buyer’s need. A fourth factor increasing the complexity even more is that the wine
should also be well-known among restaurant guests, which can be complicated since some of the restaurants do not want to buy wine that is easily accessible for consumers at Systembolaget.

5.1.2 Evaluation of alternatives

We have observed in our research that some form of ranking and trade-offs occur, making some characteristics more important than others. This is proven by the fact that the restaurants were able to rank according to our characteristics in the questionnaire. This corresponds well with Webster and Wind’s (1972) model of the buying process emphasising the need to prioritise the different characteristics and to establish appropriate trade-offs between them. We have distinguished that these rankings and trade-offs are occurring naturally, since all the mentioned characteristics are desired to a varying extent. If the restaurants did not recognise that trade-offs are necessary, all characteristics in our questionnaire would be ranked very high.

Six Cs model

The specifications of desired characteristics of the wine and supplier that have been ranked in the initial stage of the problem recognition become useful when evaluating the alternatives of wines and their accompanying supplier. The six Cs model presented in the theoretical framework is a suitable tool for analysing our empirical data. It entails six different areas of buyer criteria which correspond to our characteristics, and that the restaurants should reflect upon when in a buying situation.

Customer cost does not only include financial cost, but also customer sacrifice seen from a value perspective (Cummins & Mullin, 2002; Dev & Schultz, 2005). Further, Sörqvist (2000) argue for the influence that product price has on buyer expectations. We have found in our data that campaigns are valued low, whereas price and discounts are valued high. As expressed by a few restaurants: “price and discounts are important because we need to make money”. We have interpreted that in a purchasing situation the restaurants are more interested in price and discounts rather than campaigns, since these are valued of higher importance. However, we also believe it is since campaigns tend to last for only a specified period of time. Price and discounts are more stable in the long run, whereas campaigns are of a more temporary nature. Therefore, as the restaurants on average update their wine menu two times a year, we believe that they prefer price and discounts over campaigns, since they provide a reliable cost estimate in the long run. We interpret that the restaurants want the supply to be stable and delivered on a regular basis between the updates so they will know what they get and to what price. As one restaurant expressed it: “it needs to work smoothly, otherwise it takes too much time and you have to make too much of an effort yourself and things go wrong”.

In the restaurant industry support such as activities and sales meetings are seen as adding value, thus having a positive effect on cost. The majority of the restaurants found support highly important in order to receive feedback, assistance, reliable answers, and to get problems solved. Although one restaurant finds sales meetings time consuming and strenuous which would have a negative effect on cost, the majority of the restaurants still find sales meetings as adding value. It can be observed from the empirical data that in restaurants with high commercial value the concept of cost and price have become obsolete. This is supported by Dev and Schultz (2005) who argue that one should consider the value received by the customer for the investment made. Today the received value is seen as the most important aspect for high commercial value restaurants. We believe that the price and
discount is still of significant importance, but it is the value adding support that will make the relationship go further beyond the purchase.

Payment options and delivery time is valued high by the restaurants while delivery options is expressed to be of low importance. However, we find it interesting to consider why payment options are more valued than delivery options when there are industry standards for both procedures. Especially since the restaurants clearly have expressed a need of the restaurant to run smoothly. Even though payment options and delivery time as well as delivery options to a certain extent are important, the restaurants seem content with the current industry standard and no further development seems to be under progress or needed. Cummins and Mullins (2002) argue for more extensive involvement from the supplier to bring the customer to the solution; however we do not believe that this corresponds to the high commercial value restaurants in Mälardalen.

Evidently the concept is of significant value for restaurants with high commercial value; the importance of price in relation to the quality of the product can not be emphasised enough. As mentioned earlier the restaurants stress the importance of the quality in relation to the price, rather than simply a high quality product or a low price product. Dev and Schultz (2005) claim that instead of offering a product, a solution should be offered. As seen in our empirical data support is an important part of concepts offered to high commercial value restaurants. Support includes value adding activities such as education, but may also include services such as availability when problems occur. In addition, a good image or reputation may influence a purchase decision positively since the restaurants assume that the consumer has the same impression. “We can not justify a purchase if the reputation or image is bad.” What the restaurants demand when it comes to concept is a wide range of quality products to a reasonable price, and a good image or reputation does not have to be a part of the concept, but it might affect the way the restaurants view the concept. We believe that when it comes to the concept in the marketing mix there is a need for the supplier to offer a multitude of solutions to the restaurant. However, we think that the restaurants need to feel that there is still freedom for them to customise the solution so that it becomes their solution and not the supplier’s solution.

Our collected data indicates that the offered assortment is important and we believe that this is related to the fact that many of the restaurants prefer to have only one supplier. Having only one supplier eases the running of the restaurant and saves time and money if things go wrong since the restaurant knows where and who to turn to. As said before, assortment is also important in relation to having one supplier since the restaurants prefer a wide range of solutions to choose from.

In the restaurant industry TV advertisement, printed advertisement, and sponsoring at events are used just as in any other industry to reach the audience. However, the result shows that the restaurants are not very influenced by TV advertisement and printed advertisement while sponsoring has a higher influence. Considering how the restaurants are influenced, TV advertisement and printed advertisement can be seen as not very efficient communication tools, whereas sponsoring of events is more efficient. It has been expressed that when the wine is associated with an event the positive perception increases of the wine. As one restaurant expressed it: “if the wine is associated with a certain event it makes it interesting”. We find it natural that TV and printed advertisement has a low influence on the restaurants, since they want more than just the product, as mentioned in the section about the concept. The restaurants seek value adding services rather than simply the product. Sponsoring at events is seen as positive by one restaurant because it shows that the supplier is willing to make the extra effort. This can be related to the extra effort
the restaurants want from the supplier in the form of support integrated into the concept, as discussed in the previous section. We also assume that TV advertisements are usually aimed at consumers and therefore wines that are advertised on TV are usually available at Systembolaget, which the restaurants do not like. Hence, TV advertisement naturally has a low influence on the restaurants’ buying behaviour.

In the restaurant industry sales meetings is a very common way of communicating with restaurants. Most of the restaurants are positive towards sales meetings; however a more efficient way of communication is through the use of support offered by the wine supplier. Support such as education, educational trips or activities are appreciated by the restaurants, which enables the supplier to make full use of the concept they want to convey. E.g. educational trips can be “a motivator for the personnel” or assisting in keeping personnel updated. Further, wine tastings are an excellent opportunity for the supplier to promote their wines, which is supported by Dev and Schultz (2005) who argue that providing buyers with the right information on the right subject and at the right time is becoming increasingly important. We believe that education and activities are the most efficient ways of promoting the concepts to the restaurants.

The supplier may also use POS-material and advertising material in order to promote themselves. The majority of restaurants are positive towards POS-material since they are used every day, however concerning advertising material there is a clear negative attitude observed. The restaurants perceive the advertising material as ugly and tacky; hence trying to make restaurants accept advertising material is an inefficient way of communicating the concept to them, since it will only create negativity. Sörqvist (2000) emphasises the influence marketing and advertisement has on the buyers’ expectations, hence adapting it to the buyers’ needs and wants is extremely important. Further, just as Cummins and Mullin (2002) argue that communication should be further developed from the narrow concept of promotion, the restaurant industry also shows a need for this type of development. This is due to the fact that traditional communication tools such as TV advertisement do not seem to be influential enough.

It is self evident in our data that the relationship between the restaurant and the supplier is very important for the majority of the restaurants, implying that the supplier should consider this aspect more carefully. It is stated by one restaurant that a good relationship makes day-to-day operations run smoothly. This is especially vital for high commercial value restaurants since many of them prefer to have only one supplier. If the supplier-buyer relationship is not working well, this can become a motivator for switching suppliers. “It is important with a good relationship with the ones you are working with, you get feedback, reliable answers, you can trust them, get help, as well as suggestions”. Trust has proven to be a significant part of the relationship.

Our data is highly in accordance with what Cummins and Mullin (2002) say about customers wanting to be respected and remembered, as well as the trust needed. Further, it is supported by the argument from Schultz et al. (1993) that focus should be put on studying customer wants and needs. Further, we believe that a good supplier-buyer relationship can increase the sales person’s influence on the restaurant. This will also increase his freedom to take own initiatives and to provide the restaurant with new opportunities, which is positive for the supplier.
5.1.3 Evaluative criteria

Buyer expectations have been integrated into the stage of evaluative criteria in the B2B buying process models since its different aspects correspond to attitudes and beliefs. From our data we can observe that previous experience, third party information, sales person, personnel, and other persons are influencing the decision made to a varying degree.

Buyer expectations

In our investigation previous experience has proven to be very important and a highly influencing factor. Previous experience is a source that can be trusted and it means that the responsible person at the restaurant knows what to expect. We find it self evident that previous experience is important since when relying on ones own previous experiences instead of relying on someone else’s, one knows exactly what the wine will be like because one knows ones own way of evaluating it. It has been stated by the restaurants that it is crucial that the business runs smoothly, thus if they have a negative experience of a wine or its supplier this will effect their purchasing decision since they do not want to risk disturbances in the daily operations.

Third party information has a moderate influence and this can be related to the fact that trust is a major issue when it comes to influence. We believe that the relatively low influence is due to the fact that when receiving information from someone else, it might be biased and this influences the effect it has on the buyer, making the buyer more critical. Sörqvist (2000) considers third party information as coming from the media, industry organisations and studies etc. However, we have found that in the restaurant industry there are additional influences apparent; sales person, personnel and other persons. The sales person has proven to have a high influence on the buying decision, however we believe that the trust in the relationship is crucial for the degree of influence the sales person has. Personnel and other possible persons are also highly influencing factors. We have interpreted that personnel is highly influencing, since they have experience and also work for the benefit of the restaurant. Other persons that influence have a varying degree of influence depending on their relationship with the buyer. We believe that the influence a person has is highly related to the level of trust. It can be seen that within high commercial value restaurants previous experience can be distinguished as a more important influencing factor than third party information and should therefore be considered more profoundly. The discussed influencing factors correspond to the beliefs that Sargeant and West (2001) argue should be considered when evaluating criteria.

Sargeant and West (2001) also argue for discussing attitudes when evaluating criteria and in the restaurant industry we have found them to be reputation, image and other factors. When it comes to reputation and image these influence to a high extent, which have been discussed earlier. We find it important to consider reputation due to the information intense society today where word-of-mouth is a very strong communication channel. This is especially important since it is not only the restaurants that are aware of the information but also the guests. As one restaurant expressed it; “if the wine or supplier has a good reputation you make your purchase since you believe that the guests will like it because they have heard the same reputation”. It is particularly important when a wine or supplier have a negative reputation since a negative reputation travels faster. We believe that restaurants do not want to be associated with such a reputation, hence it is important to be aware and consider the reputation.
5.1.4 Selection

Naturally there is a selection process also in the restaurant industry, which is based on the criteria and influences previously discussed in the evaluation of alternatives and criteria. The interesting issue to examine is which person is responsible for the decision. We have seen in our data that it is mainly the owners and restaurant managers that are responsible for the purchasing of wine i.e. the selection. There have only been two persons responsible with some kind of sommelier education. The reason that the particular persons are responsible has mainly been because of their position at the restaurant. Only a few persons are responsible because of their experience, which is important considering that we are focusing on restaurants with high commercial value where sales of wine is a significant source of income. We believe that an educated waiter/waitress will represent the restaurant and the wine, as well as sell more than a waiter/waitress without education. We assume therefore that some kind of education is desirable from the supplier side, which has also been proven by our empirical data showing that restaurants are positive towards support of this kind. Further, it becomes important for the supplier to be in tune with the criteria and influences affecting the restaurant owner or manager since it is they by themselves who most often make the selection of which wine to purchase.

5.1.5 Post-purchase evaluation

It is evident that post-purchase evaluation plays a crucial part in applying Sargeant and West's (2001) B2B buying process model to the restaurant industry. We find it crucial for the supplier to be attentive to signals and needs from the restaurants when it comes to support, as their needs and wants vary widely due to several factors. We believe that post-purchase evaluation is important because it will show the buyer whether or not the supplier is reliable, and it is the support that creates a commitment of trust between the restaurant and the supplier. Additional services, which the restaurants have expressed that they want from the supplier, are: that they should be available also after the purchase, they should be reliable, and the restaurants expect to receive feedback as well as help. This service is self-evident for the supplier to offer, according to us. These factors will lay the foundation of the buyers’ post-purchase evaluations of the suppliers. We have found in our investigation that the restaurants emphasise a good supplier-buyer relationship and therefore the relationship also plays a large role in the post-purchase evaluation.

5.2 Organisational and environmental influences on buying needs

The model of organisational and environmental influence on buying needs will be analysed separately since it is a more general model of influences, which always take place in the organisation until a need is recognised, rather than within the buying process.

High commercial value restaurants are highly centralised as can be seen from our study and the theory by Gronhaug and Venkatesh (1991) says that centralisation tends to negatively affect the discovery of new buying needs. We believe that it is especially true for the high commercial value restaurants since it is most often the owner or restaurant manager who is responsible for the purchasing of wine, and he/she also has responsibility for a variety of other tasks such as; accounting, personnel issues, recruitment, marketing etc. Hence, the buying need is easily overlooked. If the restaurants would have a sommelier there would be more focus on the buying needs of wine, since this is where their main responsibility lays.
However, the fact that high commercial value restaurants are centralised does not need to be very negative since wine purchasing is most often a repetitive task, except for the two times a year when the wine menu is updated. It is when the wine menu is updated that the centralisation may affect the buying need and creativity negatively. As we have said before, it is at this point in time that we believe that the supplier should come in with their products, knowledge, and support to influence the buyer in the buying decision.

We believe that formalisation is highly related to the degree of centralisation in high commercial value restaurants. As the owner or restaurant manager most often is the person responsible we believe that there are not many rules or procedures applied. Hence, the previously mentioned risk of repetitive buying is confirmed, which is also supported by Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991).

We find that high commercial value restaurants are low complexity organisations. We interpret this from the fact that, as said before it is most often the owner or restaurant manager who is responsible for the purchase, with little help from other personnel. The fact that there is a low degree of delegation in the restaurants supports our assumption. As Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991) argue, the low complexity may also negatively affect the discovery of new buying needs in the restaurants. Together with the high centralisation and formalisation this creates a great risk for new buying needs being overlooked, which needs to be seriously considered.

From our empirical data we can observe that there is a low degree of relevant education among the persons responsible for the purchase of wine at high commercial value restaurants. We have only observed in a few cases that the relevant competence exists for fully understanding the purchasing of wine. The supplier can affect the level of individual competence by offering support such as education. This is also a good opportunity for the supplier to influence the restaurants, considering that the restaurants trust the sales person due to their own lack of relevant education when it comes to wine. We believe that since the owner or restaurant manager often are the most competent person at the restaurant and the one that is involved in all decisions, it is foremost them who the sales person should put their primary focus on. Wind and Thomas (1981); Johnston and Bonoma (1981) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991) argue that since competence is a scarce resource, competent individuals are usually involved in several buying situations. This is also the case for high commercial value restaurants considering that the owner or manager is responsible for several aspects in the organisation as mentioned earlier. Further, we believe that the amount of workload and organisational position is related to the previous mentioned aspect that it is often the manager or owner who is the only person responsible and the individual with relevant competence. This may result in the buying need being overlooked when the workload is high. We interpret that this may be the case since some restaurants update their wine menu as often as twelve times a year while others only update the wine menu two times every year. We do not say that the restaurants must to update the wine menu twelve times a year. However, it does indicate that the need to update may be overlooked due to workload and the degree of centralisation present at the restaurants.

Emerson (1962) in (Grønhaug & Venkatesh, 1991) argues that the fewer buyers the organisation has the more important they become. However, restaurants have many guests making no single one more important than another. Still, we find it interesting that in our investigation none of the restaurants have expressed in any way that the guests influence their buying decision of wine. The restaurants assume that if price and quality are good, and the wine matches the food, then the guests will like it. Hence, as the restaurants do not actively research the opinions of the guests this implies that the supplier does not need to make ex-
tra effort to understand the guests’ behaviour. Nonetheless, we believe that some kind of interaction with the guests would improve the results of the purchasing decision, which is supported by Grønhaug and Venkatesh (1991), and would further lead to the supplier also needing an understanding of the guests’ behaviour.

The satisfaction of guests is dependent on a continuous supply of products from the supplier and it is also important for the smooth running of high commercial value restaurants. “Delivery needs to work smoothly otherwise it takes too much time and you have to make too much of an effort yourself and things go wrong”. As emphasised in our data the relationship between the supplier and the restaurant, as well as previous experience are important environmental influencing factors, which is further supported by Gronhaug and Venkatesh (1991).
6 Conclusion

In the following section the conclusions drawn from our analysis will be presented, which further will answer our research questions and purpose.

The problem that this thesis has been addressing is the lack of knowledge about buying behaviour, which today’s wine suppliers may experience when endorsing and selling wine to restaurants, in our case Pernod Ricard Sweden.

We have found in our research that when answering spontaneously the restaurants value price in relation to quality as well as the wine matching the food as the most important criteria. The fundamental reason for the importance of price in relation to quality is the restaurants’ basic need to make a profit and therefore the quality should be maximised in accordance with the price paid. Through our analysis we have reached the conclusion that the value received replaces cost and that concept replaces the product in high commercial value restaurants. The value and the concept both include support such as education which is important since our result indicate that there is a lack of knowledge among the persons responsible for purchasing.

The support that we have found to be most wanted by the restaurants is: sales meetings, education, and activities. These are wanted because they motivate the personnel and is seen by the restaurants as a good way to get updated. Furthermore, a knowledgeable personnel leads to better service to the guest. Services that we have seen are important include the supplier always being available to help, to solve problems, and to give feedback. We conclude that the restaurants want to feel assured that operations will run smoothly and that service will be provided.

Our results shows that previous experience is the factor that influences the most; this is self-evident as it is the source one can trust the most since all other information may be biased to some extent. We can conclude that if the restaurant has a negative previous experience this will affect the purchasing decision negatively, since a restaurant does not want to risk disturbances in their daily operations. We can also conclude that reputation and image are also highly influencing factors. A purchase cannot be justified if the reputation or image is poor. However, if the reputation or image is perceived positively this might initiate a purchase. We find this especially important considering today’s information intense society and the great impact of word of mouth. An interesting fact that has appeared in our study is that TV advertisement and printed advertisement has a low influence on the restaurants. Therefore, we conclude that the use of support is a more efficient way for the supplier to communicate the concept to the restaurants than traditional TV and printed advertisement.

We have seen in our research that it is usually the owner or restaurant manager solely who is responsible for the purchasing of wine in high commercial value restaurants. People in the internal and external environment only have the possibility to influence in the buying process. The people, who mainly influence through their opinions and recommendations, are the sales person, personnel, and other persons such as colleagues and friends. However, significant for this is the relationship and the degree of trust between the restaurant and the respective person. The sales person influence due to his/her knowledge, the personnel because they have experience and work for the benefit of the restaurant, and other persons because they have nothing to gain on recommending a certain wine or supplier.
We propose that suppliers should focus on developing and offering concepts instead of just products, where price in relation to quality is emphasised. The concepts should not be based on cost or price; rather on the value received by the buyer. The restaurants appreciate value adding activities such as education and activities, especially since there is a lack of knowledge among the persons responsible. However, it is important that the support is customised to the restaurants since they have very varying needs. Furthermore, support is a very efficient way of building a good relationship and trust with the restaurant.

When it comes to high commercial value restaurants communication should be done through direct contact such as sales meetings, education and activities, since TV advertisement and printed advertisement has proven to have a low influence. Hence, too much effort should not be spent on these traditional communication tools. Also, the supplier should not promote the use of advertising material in the restaurants since the restaurants have a negative perception of them, and rather use their own material. The information that is communicated to the restaurants should be well thought through since the restaurants are sceptical towards outside information, as it might be biased.

Services such as availability, offering help, problem solving, etc. should be self-evident for the supplier to offer. There is a basic overall need for the restaurants to feel that everything with the supplier works smoothly.

The supplier should work proactively to prevent bad reputation and try to enhance a good reputation and image, since word of mouth has a large impact in B2B-markets. Therefore, they should make extra effort to satisfy a restaurant that is unsatisfied. This has proven to be especially important among high commercial value restaurants where previous experience has a high influence on the purchasing decision made. The supplier should not only engage in building a relationship with the responsible person at the restaurant but also the other personnel, due to the fact that the personnel have a high influence in the buying process.

The most important aspect to focus on for the supplier is the relationship with the restaurant. This is important because many restaurants prefer to have only one supplier, which means that it is crucial for everything to work smoothly with them. There should be one person responsible for a restaurant in order for the restaurant to know who to contact. Further, it also makes it easier to build a commitment of trust between the two parties. A good relationship and trust will lead to greater influence of the sales person, and gives the sales person more freedom to be creative.

As the restaurants on average update their wine menu only two times a year, the suppliers should be attentive to when these occasions takes place and work proactively in order to be the first in mind when the restaurants discover the buying need. There may also be a need for the restaurants to update their wine menu more frequently, as it might be overlooked. Therefore, the supplier should prepare and make an update as easy as possible for the restaurants in order for the persons responsible to feel motivated to update the wine menu more often, to the advantage of the supplier. This is especially true as these are high commercial value restaurants where wine sales constitute a significant part of the profit. How-
ever, in order for this to work properly there is also a need for the supplier to have a wide assortment available for the restaurants. The restaurants want well-known wines which are unique, but not available for consumers at Systembolaget.

The restaurants which we have interviewed do not actively research the opinions of the guests, which means that the supplier does not necessarily need to focus on understanding the guests. They should instead focus on the person responsible for the purchasing decision.

We believe that if these guidelines are taken into consideration by the supplier when approaching high commercial value restaurants and doing business with them, the supplier has a great chance in becoming successful and creating a profitable long-term relationship.
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Appendix 1 Interview questions

Intervju-frågor

Restaurang: ______________________________

Kontakt: _________________________________

Datum & tid: ______________________________

Screeningfrågor:

1. Har ni tillstånd att servera alkohol till allmänheten? (JA)
2. Hur stor del av er årsomsättning procentuellt kommer från försäljning av dryck, majoriteten från öl och vin? (>25 %)
3. Hur många sittplatser har ni? (>48)
4. I vilken prisklass ligger majoriteten av era viner på vinlistan, i inköpspris? (40-60 kr)

Bakgrundsfrågor:

5. Hur ser er kundgrupp ut, demografiskt?
6. Hur många gäster har ni per vecka?
7. Hur många lådor vin (antal flaskor) i prisklassen 40-60 kr köper ni in per vecka?

Teorifrågor:

8. Vem/vilka förutom du är ansvarig(a) för vininköp?
9. Vilka kvalifikationer är det som har gjort dem ansvariga?
10. Vilka kriterier är viktigast när ni köper in vin och varför?
11. Hur viktiga är följande egenskaper vid vininköp, värdera från 1-5 där 1 motsvarar mycket svagt, 3 måttligt och 5 mycket starkt:

   Pris........................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Rabatter................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Kampanjer.............................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Kvalitet.................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Utbud...................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Ledtid ...................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Leveranssätt ........................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Betalningsvillkor .................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Att ha en och samma leverantör......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Relationen mellan er och leverantören............................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Support (utbildning, utb.resor, aktiviteter, produktinfo.) ................. 1 2 3 4 5

12. Varför är de ni rankat högt viktiga?
13. Hur föredrar ni att bli kontaktad av vinleverantörens säljare vid första kontakt?
(post, e-post, telefon, inbokat möte, spontant besök, ta egen kontakt, annat)

14. Hur snart efter etablerat samarbete kan vinet erbjudas på restaurangen?

15. Hur ofta uppdaterar ni er vinlista?

16. Använder ni listningsbidrag? Eventuellt, hur mycket?

17. Vid etablerat samarbete, hur ofta vill ni att säljare kommer på besök för produktinformation och försäljning, hur lång tid per möte?

18. Hur mycket vill ni ha av följande support?
   Utbildning (timmar)........................................................................................................
   Utbildningsresor (antal resor & personer)......................................................................
   Aktiviteter (för personal, kunder, etc.)(typ & timmar)...................................................
   POS-material (korkskruvar, pennor, etc.)........................................................................
   Skyltmaterial..................................................................................................................

19. Varför är denna support önskad/inte önskad?

20. Vad förväntar ni er för service och support av er vinleverantör efter köp (bortsett från nyss nämnda supportalternativ)? Hur skall denna service/support gå till väga? (e-post, personliga besök, post…)

21. Fr.o.m. att behovet uppstår till att vinet är inköpt, påverkas ni av följande faktorer (angående vinet samt leverantören)? värdera från 1-5 där 1 motsvarar mycket svagt, 3 måttligt och 5 mycket starkt:
   TV-annonsering................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Reklam (tryck)................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Sponsring vid events........................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   Rykte ............................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Image............................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Tidigare erfarenhet av vinet och leverantören............................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Tredjehandsinformation ............................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Säljaren.......................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Krögaren/Sommelier/Kocken/Servitör-Servitris ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   Övriga............................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5

22. Hur och varför influerar de faktorer ni värderade som 4 och 5 er mycket?

23. Vad är er åsikt om varumärkena Jacob’s Creek och Castillero del Diablo, samt deras respektive viner?

24. Ger ni ert medgivande till att ert deltagande i denna undersökning blir officiellt, dock att svaren förblir anonyma?
Interview questions

Restaurant: _______________________________

Contact: _________________________________

Date & time: ______________________________

Screening questions:

1. Do you have license to serve alcohol to the public? (Yes)
2. How large share (in percentage) of your yearly turnover comes from beverages, mostly beer and wine? (>25 %)
3. How many seats do you have? (>48)
4. In what price range are the purchasing prices of your wines on the wine menu? (40-60 SEK)

Background questions

5. Demographically, what does your customer base look like?
6. How many guests do you have per week?
7. How many boxes (bottles) of wine in the price range 40-60SEK do you purchase per week?

Theory questions:

8. Who, except you are responsible for the purchase of wine?
9. What qualifications made this/these person(s) responsible?
10. What criteria are most important when purchasing wine, and why?
11. How important are the following characteristics when purchasing wine, Value from 1-5, very 1 is very little, 3 is moderately, and 5 very much:

   Price......................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Discounts............................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Campaigns............................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   Quality.................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   Assortment............................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   Time from placing order to delivery ................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Delivery options .................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Payment options .................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Having one supplier.............................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Supplier-buyer relationship................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   Support (education, edu.trips, activities, product info.)...................... 1 2 3 4 5
12. Why are the highly ranked factors important?

13. How do you prefer to be contacted by the wine suppliers’ salesman at the initial contact? (post, e-mail, telephone, booked meeting, spontaneous visit, make contact yourself, or other)

14. How soon after established cooperation can you offer the wine at the restaurant?

15. How often do you update/revise your wine list?

16. Do you apply ‘menu listing subsidies’? If so, how much?

17. When cooperation has been established, how often would you like a salesman to come with product information and further sales, and how many hours each meeting?

18. How much do you want of the following support?
   - Education (hours) ..............................................................................................................
   - Educational trips (number of trips & persons)..............................................................
   - Activities (for personnel, guests, etc.) (Type & hours) .............................................
   - POS-material (corkscrews, pens, etc.) .............................................................................
   - Advertising material ........................................................................................................

19. Why is this support wanted/not wanted?

20. What kind of post-sale services and support do you expect from your supplier (except the previously mentioned)? How do you want this service/support to be conducted? (E-mail, personal visits, post…)

21. From the point when the need is recognised until the wine is purchased, are you influenced by the following factors (regarding the wine and supplier)? Value from 1-5, very 1 is very little, 3 is moderately, and 5 very much:
   - TV advertisement ................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   - Advertisement (printed) ...................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   - Sponsoring at events ............................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   - Reputation ............................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   - Image ..................................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   - Previous experience of the wine and supplier .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
   - Third party information ....................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   - Sales person .......................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   - Restaurateur/Sommelier/Chef/Waiter-waitress ............................................... 1 2 3 4 5
   - Other persons ........................................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
   - Other factors .......................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

22. How and why do the factors ranked as 4 and 5 affect you?

23. What is your opinion about the brands Jacob’s Creek and Castillero del Diablo, and their respective wines?
24. Do you give your consent to make your participation official, however maintaining your answers anonymous?
Appendix 2 Empirical data

Price, Discounts, and campaigns

Quality, assortment, and time from placing order to delivery

Delivery options, payment options, and having one supplier
Supplier-buyer relationship and support

TV advertisement, advertisement printed, and sponsoring at events

Reputation, image, and previous experience
Third party information, sales person, and personnel

Other persons and other factors