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ABSTRACT

ESSAYS ON SALESPERSON’S MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION—PERFORMANCE

SEPTEMBER 2023

CLAIRE HUIYOUNG CHA, B.A., INHA UNIVERSITY
M.A, THUNDERBIRD SCHOOL OF GLOBAL MANAGEMENT
PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Salesforces are important to firms as they drive a significant part of the firm’s brand, financial, and relational performance. Salesforce performance, job satisfaction, and motivation have remained key topics of interest to practitioners as well as researchers (Hansen & Levin, 2016; Pullins, 2001; Williams & Plouffe, 2007). This dissertation includes three essays. Essay 1 aims to address a lingering question theoretically and managerially. What is the relationship between satisfaction and performance? That question is assessed with a unique longitudinal simultaneous design to test four leading hypotheses of the causal relationship between salespeople’s job satisfaction and performance. The study’s design addresses various theoretical and methodological limitations of previous research, including the longitudinal relationships between the variables, a large cohort of insurance salespeople tracked over multiple periods, and objective performance measurement.

Essay 2 fills additional gaps in the sales management and management literature by exploring motivation changes among salespeople. The study is grounded in the Expectancy Theory of Motivation combined with the socialization theory to understand motivation changes in the early employment of salespeople. The study longitudinally assesses detailed
elements of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This study contributes to sales and motivation literature by providing a theoretical understanding of motivation dynamics in one work role, over time and beginning at a critical time, the onboarding stage.

Essay 3 proposes a bibliometrics analysis of salespeople's motivation literature. The goals of this bibliometric study are to map 50 years of salesforce motivation research with regard to performance analysis of the major papers and authors. Second, the analysis will map keywords and development themes that have been the most salient trends. The literature will undergo a science mapping to go beyond the key papers and authors to show the intellectual structure of motivation literature and the migration of trends in the literature. The final contribution of this bibliometric study is to analyze the research fronts and future research directions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Salesforces are important to firms as the salesforce’s performance can be clearly seen to lead directly to a significant part of the firm’s performance. Salesforce performance not only includes financial performance, but also non-financial performance in areas such as establishing the face of a firm, customer relationships, boundary spanning, and brand management. Accordingly, salesforce performance has remained a key topic for practitioners as well as researchers. Job satisfaction and motivation have also been major areas in the sales domain as those are the attitudes that are closely related to salesforce and, therefore, firm performance. This dissertation proposes three essays to investigate these key phenomena in the salesforce.

The relationship between salesforce performance and job satisfaction has been the topic of a long-lasting inconclusive debate. There has been a common sense and agreement that they are positively related, but the direction of their relationship has still left inconclusive. Over the past eighty years since the famous Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) were published, the relationship between performance and job satisfaction has remained a topic of interest. Nonetheless, only a limited number of studies have been both grounded in theory and focused on the nature of the relationship. A considerable number of these studies have examined only the unidirectional relationship between performance and job satisfaction (e.g., Brashear et al., 2003; Brown & Peterson, 1993, 1994; Dubinsky & Hartley, 1986; Itani et al., 2019; Keaveney & Nelson, 1993; Kwak et al., 2019; Rouziou et al., 2018; Shore & Martin, 1989). Meanwhile, only six studies have examined all competing relationships to find the direction of the causal relationship between performance and job satisfaction, and their results are inconsistent (e.g., Alessandri et al., 2017; Bagozzi, 1980;...
A summary of the research is seen in Table 1.

Most of the literature whose purpose has been to find the direction of the causal relationship between performance and job satisfaction by testing all of the possible relationships have been in the psychology or management literature. Those studies have been based on non-salesforce samples such as college students, post office staff, and manufacturing workers. Roe (2014) reports that it is ill-advised to generalize research across unique job roles and conditions, especially over time. The sales job has unique characteristics from most other jobs (Dubinsky & Hartley, 1986), and the results in psychology and management literature may not be applicable to the salesforce. An additional gap in the literature exists because no theoretical foundation has been presented in the studies testing the causal relationship between performance and job satisfaction to explain a reciprocal relationship, which is one of the prominent possible relationships. Methodologically, the studies to date may have also applied less rigorous methods (e.g., cross-lagged correlation and single-item measures) to examine a causal relationship with longitudinal data or used only cross-sectional data with insufficient sample sizes. This dissertation essay fills these gaps in the existing literature by investigating the direction of the causal relationship between salesforces’ job satisfaction and performance using a longitudinal dataset, enough sample size (1,425 salesforces), and a more appropriate method (3-stage least squared simultaneous equations model). Theoretically, we introduce a unique theoretical foundation for the reciprocal relationship and a present condition for this investigation.

Motivation is a psychological process that leads to certain behaviors (Mitchell, 1982) such that the motivation is not static but dynamic over time. Salesforce motivation changes over time. However, the nature of the change in motivation over time has not been established and is limited not only in the sales management literature but also in the broader
management literature. For over a century, work motivation has been considered one of the enduring and fascinating topics of management (Kanfer et al., 2017). More specifically, motivating salespeople has been one of the essential tasks of sales managers (Jaramillo et al., 2005). In the mid-20th century, interest in work motivation drastically increased, and it became a major research topic with the introduction of theories (Kanfer et al., 2017). One of the major theories is the Expectancy Theory of Motivation by Vroom (1964). In the sales domain, since the first motivation research was published by Oliver (1974), a substantial body of research has followed with many contributions. Motivation has been positively linked to performance (e.g., Miao & Evans, 2012; Tyagi, 1985; Walker et al., 1977) and job satisfaction (e.g., Miao & Evans, 2014; Tanner et al., 2015) as an outcome of work motivation. Over time, research has also been carried out on the relationship of a variety of work-related factors to motivation. Those work-related factors include personal characteristics (e.g., Cron et al., 1988; Ingram & Bellenger, 1983; Segalla et al., 2006) at an individual level: leaderships (e.g., Kohli, 1985; Lagace et al., 1993) and control systems (e.g., Miao & Evans, 2012, 2014) at manager level: organizational climate (e.g., Tanner et al., 2015; Tyagi, 1982) and organizational rewards (e.g., Cron et al., 1988; Segalla et al., 2006) at organization level: task significance (e.g., Teas, 1981; Tyagi, 1982) and task stress (e.g., Kohli, 1985; Tyagi, 1985b) as task factors. To date, no research on motivation changes over time has been conducted. There has been a strong call for a longitudinal study for a consistent understanding of related phenomena (Bolander et al., 2017) and to track how motivation develops over time (Kanfer et al., 2017). This dissertation investigates the motivation changes among newly hired salesforces during early employment based on a longitudinal dataset.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
This study aims to examine the job attitudes of salesforce personnel during the period of the early employment. The job attitudes and outcomes of interest are work motivation, job satisfaction, and job performance. The hypotheses are developed based on the following four research questions pertaining to the job attitudes held by salespeople:

1) What is the nature of a causal direction between salespeople’s job satisfaction and performance during the period?
2) What is the trajectory of salespeople’s motivation and motivation variables over time during early employment?
3) What factors affect the change in salespeople’s motivation and motivation variables during the period?
4) How has salespeople’s motivation research evolved?

1.3 USEFULNESS OF THE STUDY

This research contributes to the sales literature in the field of marketing by empirically and theoretically investigating previously unproven or inconclusive phenomena on salesforces job attitudes with more appropriate methods, enough sample size, and a longitudinal dataset. In cutting across all disciplines, it is the first empirical study of work motivation change. It is also the first research to introduce a theoretical foundation to a reciprocal relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Again, it is also the first study to examine salespeople’s motivation change during their early employment, which is an especially critical period for a firm's success and for the careers of salesforce personnel.

The empirical findings in this study will also contribute to practitioners by providing insights to develop and manage successful salesforces. Each research question will lead to managerial implications related to salesforces’ job attitudes during their early employment.

The results of the first research question will provide managers with organization-level information to help determine how and where to efficiently deploy their limited
resources to increase salesforces performance in such a way as to optimize firm performance. A firm will benefit by allocating more resources to the systems or programs that can enhance the cause in the relationship between salesforces’ job satisfaction and performance.

The answers to the second research question will inform managers of the critical points in time points when salesforces’ motivation changes during their first two years of their current employment and of the motivation variables that most affect motivation change during the period. For example, suppose there is a specific time point when the salesforce’s motivation drastically decreases, and the decrease is mainly from expectancy change. In this case, managers should encourage the salespeople by providing information about the natural motivation drop in this period and by establishing additional onboarding programs intended to increase the salesforce’s expectancy.

The third research question's findings will help managers hire and manage salesforces more effectively. If a particular individual difference moderates the salesforce’s motivation changes, a firm can choose to hire new salespeople in the group with specific individual characteristics. Also, a firm can offer distinct onboarding programs per group with different personal characteristics.

The answer to the final research question will provide managers with insights into how and what constitutes salespeople’s motivation by synthesizing all findings of motivation literature. In addition, managers can acquire ideas about future motivators for new millennium salespeople.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This dissertation proposal consists of the following chapters:

Chapter 1 ------ Introduction

Chapter 2 ------ Essay 1: Comprehensive Examination of the Causal Relationship Between Salesperson Job Satisfaction and Performance
The first chapter of the proposal provides the background of the study and the importance of the early employment period, followed by the purpose of the study. The usefulness of the study is also presented in this chapter.

The second chapter consists of four sections. The first section provides an introduction of the first essay. The second section reviews existing literature and develops hypotheses. The third section presents the methodology used in the essay. The final section discusses theoretical contribution, managerial implication, and limitations.

The third chapter begins with an introduction of the second essay; the next section reviews expectancy theory and literature review. Conceptual framework and hypotheses are then developed. Next, the methodology applied in the study is followed. The chapter ends with general discussions, including theoretical and managerial implications and limitations.

The fourth chapter first presents the introduction of the third essay. The background of the study is provided in the next section. Then, the final section describes the methodology used in this essay.
CHAPTER 2
A COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SALESPERSON JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Performance is one of the main concepts in marketing, management, and psychology. Salesforce performance, individually and collectively, is critical to firms, given that it contributes to a significant part of the firm’s revenue and organizational success (Cravens et al., 1993; Jaramillo et al., 2007; Levy and Weitz, 2012). In this light, sales scholars have spent considerable effort researching to identify and test variables that are related to Performance (Chawla et al., 2020; Churchill Jr et al., 1985; Jaramillo et al., 2005; Johnston and Marshall, 2016; Verbeke et al., 2011). One extensively researched variables due to its critical association with job enrichment organizations pursue (Loher et al., 1985) as well as happiness employees as human-beings pursue, is Job Satisfaction (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985; Dormann and Zapf, 2001; Brown and Peterson 1993; Judge, Heller, and Mount, 2002; Allan, Batz-Barbarich, Sterling, and Tay, 2019).

Despite scholars’ efforts, consensus about the Performance- Satisfaction relationship remains inconsistent (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985; Brown and Peterson, 1993a; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton, 2001). The debate about the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance has a long history. The moderate positive correlation between them has been well documented, but the causal relationship remains unclear (Alessandri et al., 2017; Christen et al., 2006; Riketta, 2008; Brown and Peterson 1993). This argument goes back to the Hawthorne studies conducted by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) in the management domain. Later, Bogozzi (1980a) focused on this relationship in the sales domain.

Judge et al (2001) reviewed and various existing relationship configurations between Satisfaction and Performance. Four of the causal relationships are: (1) Performance leads to
Satisfaction (e.g., Bagozzi, 1980b; Kwak et al., 2019), (2) Satisfaction leads to Performance (e.g., Mallin and Ragland, 2017; Rouziou et al., 2018), (3) Satisfaction and Performance are reciprocally related (e.g., Alessandri et al., 2017; Wanous, 1974), and (4) Performance and Satisfaction are not related.

Bagozzi (1980) examined all four possible relationships between salespeople’s Performance and Satisfaction. While he made a meaningful contribution to sales literature as he introduced the debate on the relationship between Performance and Satisfaction into the sales domain and articulated the importance of knowing the true relationship between two constructs, his model ignored an endogeneity issue between Performance and Satisfaction. Because the study used a simultaneous system of equations (Performance equation and Satisfaction equation) in their structural equation model to test the relationships, it needed at least one exogenous variable unique to each equation. The exogenous variable should only affect an equation but not the other equation.

In Bagozzi (1980), achievement motivation was used as such a variable to the Satisfaction equation, but achievement motivation per se has a significant influence on job performance. Achievement motivation theory starts from “a desire to success” (Miner, 2015), and “Achievement motivation refers more specifically to motivation relevant to Performance on tasks in which there are criteria to judge success or failure” (Wigfield and Cambria, 2010, p.1). That is, Performance is an outcome of achievement motivation. Simply adding achievement motivation only to the Satisfaction equation for the identification of their model, although achievement motivation also affects performance, does not fix endogeneity bias. Because the study incorrectly excluded achievement motivation from the Performance equation, the coefficients for the Performance equation and, thus, their results were biased.

Recently, Alessandri, Borgogni, and Latham (2017) argued that they found a true relationship between Performance and Satisfaction using a unique method and concluded that
Performance and Satisfaction reciprocally affect each other. Although they made some progress in Performance – Satisfaction literature as the first study that found the existence of the reciprocal relationship of two constructs, there are some caveats to applying non-sales context results to a sales context or validating their results. First, they used samples of individuals with different organization tenure. A sales job has unique characteristics. For example, sales performance is measured more frequently (e.g., weekly, monthly) than non-sales jobs, is operationalized in dollar amount, and has an immediate, visible impact on the firm’s performance. Salespeople often work outside the organization independently, have the autonomy to deal with customers, face hostile atmospheres (e.g., cold call rejection), and perform as a boundary spanner. Such unique activities would likely make their Satisfaction more unstable than non-sales employees. Hence, the relationship between salespeople’s Performance and Satisfaction may differ from those of non-sales employees. The empirical literature shows different results from the same relationship between sales and non-sales samples. For example, Brown and Peterson (1994) reported effort-satisfaction correlation is significantly stronger for non-sales employees than for salespeople. Jaramillo, Mulki, and Marshall (2005) found a stronger relationship between Performance and organizational commitment for salesforces than for non-sales employees.

Second, they did not provide any theory to support a reciprocal relationship. The study did not develop a hypothesis for a reciprocal relationship but simply introduced the relationship. They only described a reciprocal model “is based on theoretical arguments similar to those of Models 1 and 2” (Alessandri et al., 2017, p.211). Similar to other literature that tested all of the four causal relationships, this study did not provide a theoretical foundation for a reciprocal model.

Finally, although their results were supported statistically, they could be questioned theoretically. First of all, Satisfaction is a single item construct in their research. They
measured Satisfaction using a single item and, thus, had to fix a measurement error. There should be a reliability issue. Next, the variables Satisfaction and Performance impact the level of the other in a continuous feedback loop but do not necessarily impact the change of the other variable. Finally, but most importantly, we disagree with their premise that last year’s satisfaction affects the change in this year’s Performance and vice versa. The causal time lag is much more approximate than the actual time lag. For example, if an employee was satisfied with their job last year but is dissatisfied with their job now, which Satisfaction influences her present Performance more? We believe their current Satisfaction influences their current Performance more than last year’s Satisfaction if the causality from Satisfaction to Performance exists. Therefore, using a simultaneous model to examine a genuine relationship is more appropriate.

Due to the limited literature examining the various causal relationships between Performance and Satisfaction in the sales domain, the present study fills that gap by testing for a true causal relationship between salesperson’s Satisfaction and Performance by simultaneously testing all four causal, directional possibilities with simultaneous equations based on panel data representing the responses of 1,685 salespeople. The panel data decreases a bias from unobserved heterogeneity such that more efficient estimation results can be obtained (Cai, 2010) than cross-sectional data. By doing so, we aim to overcome the shortcomings of the existing literature mentioned above for validation. We also believe that literature should provide a theory about a reciprocal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction and not just assume it to be the combination of inverse relationships. Table 1 shows the differences between the current study and existing literature.

The current study contributes to sales literature in several ways. First, we advance inconclusive sales literature on salesperson’s Satisfaction and Performance by finding the nature of the relationship between salesperson’s Satisfaction and Performance with more
appropriate methods, enough sample size, and a longitudinal data set. Second, drawing on the extended expectancy theory of motivation by Porter and Lawler model (1968), the present study extends Satisfaction-Performance relationship explanations by introducing a unique theoretical foundation for a reciprocal relationship based on the simple combination of both unidirectional relationships. Finally, we improve a reciprocal relationship argument in the literature by showing that the effect of Satisfaction-Performance and Performance-Satisfaction depends on the present condition, using 3-stage least squared simultaneous equations model with panel data, a unique method.

The remainder of this chapter begins with a literature review and hypotheses section where we introduce various models on the relationship between Performance and Job Satisfaction and develop our own hypotheses. We then present our research method, our model specification, and data analysis procedure, and report our hypotheses test results in the methodology section. It is followed by discussion of research findings, theoretical, and managerial implications. Finally, we conclude this paper with limitations and future research directions.

2.2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The literature review will focus on the various pathways found in the literature regarding the Performance and Satisfaction relationship. The structure of this review will go through four different direct relationships hypothesized in the literature. We begin with Model 1, Performance and Satisfaction: a unidirectional link from Performance to Satisfaction. Next, Model 2 is the unidirectional link from Satisfaction leading to Performance. The third model, Model 3, is the reciprocal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. Finally, we discuss the most widely found relationship, Model 4, where there has been no hypothesized direct link between Performance and Satisfaction. Each subsection will begin discussing the underlying theories used to propose each model,
followed by the findings in the sales management literature. Each section will conclude with a rationale for each model based on the literature. The literature review focuses on examining direct relationships between Performance and Satisfaction and not the indirect links between the constructs (e.g., mediation or moderation between Performance and Satisfaction).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Statistical Model</th>
<th>Sample (N)</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Reciprocal Model Theory</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Relationship Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwak, Anderson, Leigh, and Bonifield (2019)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Salespeople (100)</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallin, Gammoh, Pullins, and Johnson (2017)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Salespeople (225)</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel and Bowen (1971)</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>cross lagged correlation</td>
<td>Undergraduate students (86)</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanos (1974)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>cross lagged correlation</td>
<td>Telephone operators (80)</td>
<td>Telephone company</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan and Slocum (1975)</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Empirical and Experimental</td>
<td>cross lagged correlation</td>
<td>Managers (35), operators (59)</td>
<td>Steel mfg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandri, Borgogni and Latham (2017)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>Post office employees (1,004)</td>
<td>Post office</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Study</strong></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>3SLS Simultaneous Equations</td>
<td>Salespeople (1,685)</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Cross-sectional data, L: Longitudinal data
2.2.1 Model 1: Performance $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction

The first relationship between Performance and Satisfaction researchers hypothesized in the literature is Model 1, where Performance is an antecedent of Satisfaction. Model 1 is the most common relationship in the sales literature that directly links Performance and Satisfaction. The foundations for their hypotheses are grounded in motivation theories. First, researchers supporting Model 1 noted motivation theories, such as Expectancy Theory (Miner, 2015; Vroom, 1964) and Self-Determination Theory (Deci et al., 2017; Deci and Ryan, 1985), where people behave to achieve their happiness, or Satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001). Expectancy Theory proposes that good Performance leads to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that, in turn, lead to Satisfaction (Lawler and Porter, 1967). Locke (1970) propounds that Satisfaction depends on the value of the attained rewards from the Performance, and Locke (1976) extends his arguments with a Balance Theory which posits that Satisfaction is driven by an individual’s assessment of the discrepancy between the expected and obtained rewards after obtaining rewards through Performance. Brown and Peterson (1994) and MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne (1998), and Bagozzi (1980) invoked Expectancy Theory and Balance Theory, respectively, to explain Model 1. Self-Determination Theory proposes that intrinsic rewards motivate individuals to behave (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Salespeople act to achieve intrinsic rewards for innate psychological needs or Satisfaction. Salespeople are motivated to achieve better Performance for intrinsic rewards that, in turn, increase Satisfaction (e.g., Cho and Chang, 2008). Significant causal relationships were found in all of the studies above that used the theories for their hypotheses to support Model 1.

However, many studies testing Model 1 were drawing not on theories or own rationales but on previous literature (e.g., Chakrabarty et al., 2011; Johnson and Sohi, 2014). A significant
number of studies tested Model 1, without theoretical argument, as one relationship among many paths in larger theoretical models that examine impacts of other important variables as predictors or outcomes to other variables, including Performance and Satisfaction. Examining the nature of the relationship was not the primary purpose of the studies. Accordingly, they ignored other possibilities and tested only a unidirectional effect from Performance to Satisfaction. For example, Jones et al. (2007) examined overload’s effects on several outcome variables. They included Performance and Satisfaction separately in their outcome variables from role overload and then simply linked Performance to Satisfaction as a replication hypothesis without theories. The unidirectional relationship from Performance to Satisfaction was found to be significant. Kwak et al. (2019) investigated adaptive selling strategy’s influence on several outcome variables. Performance and Satisfaction were treated as either direct or indirect outcomes. Based on the previous study by Brown and Peterson (1994), the path from Performance to Satisfaction was also included as a part of their conceptual framework. The relationship was found to be significant in their test results. Pomirleanu and John Mariados (2015) examined the influence of organizational/functional support on Satisfaction. In their conceptual model, Performance was added as one of the control variables on the basis of previous literature, but its impact on Satisfaction was insignificant.

Inconsistent test results have been found, although Model 1 is a common model in sales and marketing literature: significant results (e.g., Mulki et al., 2007; Schmitz and Ganesan, 2014) and insignificant results (e.g., Sohi, 1996). Even some literature had different results when conducting two studies with the same model. For example, Brown and Peterson (1994) had different results from the two studies. Drawing on Self Determination Theory, Brown and Peterson (1994) ran two studies in their article: an empirical study using cross-sectional data and
a meta-analysis of 5 different sales studies. They reported that their empirical study showed an insignificant direct effect of Performance on Satisfaction, whereas their meta-analysis proved the significant unidirectional relationship from Performance to Satisfaction. The results under the non-sales context have also been inconsistent (Birnbaum and Somers, 1993; Stumpf and Hartman, 1984). Several reasons can be warranted to explain this inconsistency. First, the Performance measures used in the literature are different. Some measured Performance based on its broad meaning, including efforts made and financial outcomes (Jones et al., 2007; Kwak et al., 2019), whereas others used Performance measures based on narrow meaning, actual sales produced (e.g., Bagozzi, 1978, 1980). Effort’s effect on both Performance and Satisfaction is already known (Brown and Peterson, 1994; Christen et al., 2006). Therefore, including effort only in the Performance measure can create a bias. Second, most research was conducted with cross-sectional data and did not control for unobserved heterogeneity. Furthermore, except for Bagozzi (1980), studies ignored an interdependency between Satisfaction and Performance by testing only a unidirectional effect of Performance on Satisfaction and, thus, generated endogeneity bias.

Despite inconsistent results, Model 1 is one of the most widely used relationships in sales and marketing literature and the most popular model among the four essential Performance – Satisfaction models. Therefore, it is worthwhile examining its existence. We believe that the Balance Theory, which originated in motivation theory, can champion this model. Consistent with the Balance Theory, a salesperson’s Satisfaction is likely affected by an assessment of the discrepancy between expected rewards and received rewards and between his obtained rewards and the rewards obtained by others working under similar conditions in the same organization. Dissimilar to non-sales jobs, salesforce Performance is frequently measured and open to
salesforces themselves and managers via various channels such as sales tracking intranet, monthly manager meetings, and monthly/quarterly sales meetings. Salesforces know their sales performance as well as other salesforces’ performances. They can estimate compensation calculated from sales performance. The discrepancy between their own and others’ compensation will affect their Satisfaction.

Moreover, coworkers and managers also know the discrepancy because salesforce’s performances are open to them. The fact that others also know “my discrepancy” would strengthen or worsen Satisfaction. Separately from the motivation theories, Self-Perception theory (Bem, 1972) also supports Model 1. According to self-perception theory, individuals determine their attitudes by observing their own behavior, and they interpret others’ behaviors in the same way (Bem, 1972; Critcher and Gilovich, 2010). Salespeople’s Satisfaction would develop after they evaluate their performance. When they observe that they are doing well in their sales, they will be happy. Therefore, we hypothesize as follows,

\[ H_1: \text{Performance as an antecedent is positively related to Job Satisfaction.} \]

**2.2.2 Model 2: Job Satisfaction \(\rightarrow\) Performance**

The second relationship proposed in the literature regarding Performance and Satisfaction is Model 2, which proposes that Satisfaction is an antecedent to Performance. The theories used to support this are grounded in attitude and behavior literature in social psychology, where psychologists believe that attitudes lead to behaviors. The premise that attitudes cause behavior is a prevailing theme in the psychology literature, and most attitude researchers presume that behaviors are inferred by attitudes (Judge et al., 2001). Attitudes are viewed “as guidelines and facilitators of behavior” (Riketta, 2008, p. 473). This belief is consistent with the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; Wickström and Bendix, 2000) that argued that
productivity is improved when workers are happy. Satisfaction is also viewed as an attitude that affects behavioral outcomes such as Performance. Drawing on the Theory of Planned Behavior, Mulki et al. (2009) argued that higher Satisfaction induces higher Performance, and it was true especially in the sales domain because salespeople produce sales Performance by significantly influencing customer Satisfaction. Jaramillo et al. (2011) also invoked the Theory of Planned Behavior to explain Model 2, arguing that salespeople with high job Satisfaction reciprocate to the job by exerting more effort, resulting in high performance. Both studies achieved strong support for Model 2 from their empirical examinations.

However, similar to the literature that only tested Performance’s effect on job Satisfaction, not vice versa, the purpose of the majority of literature that included Model 2 was not to discover the nature of the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance either. Accordingly, they did not draw any theory for Model 2 but included it in their large theoretical frameworks for other constructs and ignored a possible reversed unidirectional relationship. For example, Fournier et al. (2010) included Model 2 in their frameworks for the moderating role of ethical climate on salesperson propensity to leave without a hypothesis, theory, or any empirical references and reported an insignificant relationship from Satisfaction to Performance. Based on only empirical evidence from previous literature, Mallin et al. (2017) contained Model 2 as one of the paths to test the mediating role of salesperson-brand identification between motivations and salesforce outcomes and reported an insignificant result but did not develop the hypothesis for Model 2, mentioning that the relationship between Performance and Satisfaction was beyond the scope of their focal research. Ramaswami and Singh (2003) reported that they included a relationship from Satisfaction to Performance but did not hypothesize the relationship because
they found inconsistent results in the previous literature. As we discussed above, the empirical results of Model 2 are inconsistent.

In other marketing and management articles in a non-sales context, the empirical results for Model 2 are also inconsistent. For example, Shore and Martin (1989) ran a regression analysis with cross-sectional data of hospital employees and bank tellers and found a significant effect of Satisfaction on Performance in a non-sales context. In their coping model with organizational stresses, Keaveney and Nelson (1993) argued that Satisfaction with job rewards was affected by job performance, whereas Satisfaction with the job itself affected job performance. They tested their hypotheses with cross-sectional data of buyers, but the researchers failed to find support for their argument.

There are some limitations to concluding this model from previous evidence. First, there is a limited number of studies that tested this model. Even in management or organizational study, a few studies were found to posit this model. The other limitations are similar to those for Model 1 in that studies that support Model 2 all used cross-sectional data and ignored the interdependency of job Satisfaction and job performance. Although Model 2 has not achieved strong support empirically, especially in sales literature, Model 2 is a generally believed relationship in social psychology. Theory of Reasoned Action and Theory of Planned Behavior links attitude-motivation-performance. When an employee has high Satisfaction with his job/firm, they would like to remain in their current job and contribute to the firm for job security. To do so, they are inclined to work hard and, thus, result in high performance. Moreover, salespeople’s attitudes are closely linked to customers in a sales context. Salespeople with high Satisfaction are likely to have good attitudes toward customers, one of the facets of salespeople’s Satisfaction. Customers are also likely to have good emotions toward salespeople who have good
attitudes toward customers. Thus, salespeople with high Satisfaction would positively influence their customers. Such positive influence would increase customers’ purchasing intention, positively resulting in sales performance. Therefore, we hypothesize as follows,

$$H_2: \text{Job Satisfaction as an antecedent is positively related to Performance.}$$

2.2.3 Model 3: Job Satisfaction $\leftrightarrow$ Performance

A reciprocal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction has not been grounded in any theoretical foundation (Alessandri et al., 2017; Judge et al., 2001). The literature explains Model 3 just by a combination of Model 1 and Model 2. This reciprocal relationship could work all together at the present time. Otherwise, the relationship could happen in order under a time gap. Most of all research that examined the reciprocal causality between Performance and Satisfaction was conducted under the premise that past Satisfaction affects present Performance and past Performance causes present Performance (e.g., Alessandri et al., 2017; Riketta, 2008; Siegel and Bowen, 1971, 1971; Wanous, 1974). Bagozzi (1980) is the only literature that examines a simultaneous reciprocal relationship between Satisfaction and Performance.

Despite the long history of the argument, no sales literature hypothesized a reciprocal relationship between a salesperson’s Performance and Satisfaction. Thus, the present study extends a literature category for Model 3 from the studies that posit model 3 to the studies that tested the reciprocal relationship between Satisfaction and Performance. We found six articles from all academic disciplines: Bagozzi (1980) in sales, Sheridan and Slocum Jr (1975) and Siegel and Bowen (1971) in management, Alessandri et al. (2017), Riketta (2008), and Wanous (1974) in psychology. The research objective of all those studies was to find the nature of the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance. However, no study provided a theoretical foundation for the reciprocal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. Instead, the
studies simply combined model 1 and Model 2 (Alessandri et al., 2017; Judge et al., 2001; Riketta, 2008). Five of them used dynamic models such as cross-lagged correlation (Sheridan and Slocum Jr, 1975; Siegel and Bowen, 1971; Wanous, 1974), cross-lagged autoregression (Riketta, 2008), and latent difference score model (Alessandri et al., 2017). One used a structural equation model with cross-sectional data (Bagozzi, 1980).

Bogozzi (1980) and Siegel and Bowen (1971) reported that Performance only affected Satisfaction significantly, but no reversed causality existed. On the other hand, Riketta (2008) found that Satisfaction significantly affected Performance, whereas Performance did not significantly impact Satisfaction. Some literature found partial or full support for the reciprocal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. For example, Wanous (1974) and Sheridan and Slocum Jr (1975) found partial support with significant results. However, the support for this model is limited because Wanous (1974) used a different Satisfaction (e.g., intrinsic Satisfaction vs. extrinsic Satisfaction) in each direction, and Sheridan and Slocum Jr (1975) did not use the same variable either (e.g., managers’ Performance vs. operators’ Performance) when they tested each direction. Moreover, cross-lagged correlation does not prove the causality between two constructs because correlation includes not only direct but also indirect correlation. It only provides information about the correlation between lagged Satisfaction (lagged Performance) and current Performance (Satisfaction). Alessandri, Borgogni, and Latham (2017) is the only study that found a significant reciprocal relationship between Satisfaction and performance.

Although no study hypothesized Model 3 and only one study, Alessandri et al. (2017), found empirical support, Model 3 remains one of the possible relationships between Performance and Satisfaction. We believe that Model 3 can be explained by Porter and Lawler’s extended expectancy theory of motivation (1968). Porter and Lawler included a feedback loop that makes
the theory more dynamic than the original expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), which explains motivation from effort, Performance, and rewards, to valence. According to Porter and Lawler (1968), Performance leads to Satisfaction through intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and the affected Satisfaction, in turn, causes Performance through increased valance and effort. Between these two different approaches of the reciprocal model (time-lagged vs. simultaneity), we believe a simultaneous model is more appropriate to examine the causality because individuals decide to act based on the present information rather than past information. Also, in general, one is happy when they are doing well now, although we did not do well in the past. Liska, Felson, Chamlin, and Baccaglini (1984) also argue that “in describing oneself at the present time, one is likely to use current information; thus, more recent behavior is likely to influence present attitudes more than behaviors performed in the past” (p.16). Moreover, if the behavioral measure covers a long period and the attitude measure has a long period gap, the present measure has more appropriate because the causal time lag is much closer than the actual time lag (Liska et al., 1984). We propose that a salesperson’s present Satisfaction and present Performance affect each other simultaneously or at least approximate in time. Therefore, we hypothesize as follows,

H3. Job Satisfaction and Performance have positive and simultaneous effects.

2.2.4 Model 4: No Causal Relationship between Performance and Job Satisfaction

No study has been conducted to prove Model 4 that there is no relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. Consequently, no theory has been introduced to explain Model 4. The majority of the studies that include Performance and Satisfaction use them as unique variables that do not have a direct relationship. For example, Amyx, Bhuian, Sharma, and Loveland (2008) treated Performance and Satisfaction as two separate dependent variables and investigated the causal relationship between salesperson corporate ethical value and Performance
and between salesperson corporate ethical value and Satisfaction. Miao and Evans (2014) also included Performance and Satisfaction as two unique outcomes in their analysis that examined the effects of sales controls and salesperson motivation on Performance and the effects of sales controls and salesperson motivation on Satisfaction. Neither Amyx et al. (2008) nor Miao & Evans (2014) examined the causal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. Another subset of studies that do not contain a causal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction presents a spurious relationship by a common antecedent. Sohi (1996) found that Performance and Satisfaction had a significant correlation, but the relationship became nonsignificant when role perceptions such as role ambiguity and role conflict were predicting both Performance and Satisfaction. Brown & Peterson (1994) argued that effort created a spurious association between Performance and Satisfaction by showing that a significant correlation between two constructs was rendered nonsignificant when effort was a predictor of both. There have been several reasons why researchers do not include a causal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction, although both constructs are included in the studies. First, some posit no relationship between Performance and Satisfaction. Others do not include a causal relationship between Performance and Satisfaction as it is out of focus of their research interest (Judge et al., 2001). The studies that belong to Model 4 were not conducted to prove no relationship between Performance and Satisfaction or to examine the spurious association between Performance and Satisfaction. In the present study, Model 4 is used as a null hypothesis ($H_0$). Supposing that we fail to support any model among competing Models 1, 2, and 3, our empirical test result falls into Model 4.

$H_4$: There is no significant relationship between Performance and Satisfaction.
2.3 METHODOLOGY

2.3.1 Data collection and Procedure

Over 5,000 insurance salespeople participated in the research. The sampling frame for this study consisted of full-time, multiple-line insurance sales representatives from 60 different insurance companies in the United States and Canada. The unique sample focuses on a static panel of newly hired salespeople and follows them through two years of their careers. The multi-wave panel began with the first survey beginning with new employees and participants who answered the previous survey six months, one year, two years after their first initial hiring.

At the initial survey, 5,090 salespeople responded at a 27% response rate. The second survey was sent back to the original respondents (5,090 salespeople) and achieved 2,488 responding sales representatives for a 49% response rate. From the third survey, we obtained the responses from 1,685 salespeople among the original respondents for a 33% response rate. The last survey was sent back to the 5,090 sales representatives who initially responded and responded by 947 for a 19% response rate.

The present study uses data from year one and year two that include yearly Performance and all seven items of job satisfaction and analyzes data from 1,685 sales representatives in the year one survey, from 947 to examine a relationship yearly Performance and Satisfaction. 83% of the sample is male, and the average age of the sample is 37.45 years. 52% of the respondents have a bachelor’s or higher degree. In addition, 20% of the sample have insurance sales experience and 19% have non-insurance sales experience.

2.3.2 Data

Examining the nature of relationships based on our competing hypotheses requires more applicable data for causality testing. Our data is appropriate for several reasons. First, the data
has a longitudinal structure that regularly measures focal constructs at different time points, resulting in better control for unobserved heterogeneity that can be an alternative explanation for the causality. Second, salespeople in the dataset have the same organization tenure. The data were collected from when they were hired to their 3rd year, and we use data from year one and two surveys conducted after turnover turmoil is over. 27% of newly hired salespeople (Richardson, 1999) and especially 50% of insurance salespeople leave their organization in their first year (J. S. Boles et al., 2012; Landau and Werbel, 1995). The turmoil could alter the nature of causality between Performance and Satisfaction. Third, salespeople in our sample sell all the same products, all kinds of insurances, in the same industry. Same products and same industry setting can avoid impacts of different seasonality and situational factors on performance. Fourth, our data include a consistent set of control variables across all surveys from the static panel. We can consistently control for other potential factors to Performance and Satisfaction over time. Finally, the data is not susceptible to common methods bias. The longitudinal nature of our data collection process reduces the chance of common methods bias among responses (Bolander et al., 2017; Jap and Anderson, 2004). The measures also use various measurement and scale formats, such as the Likert scale, single-choice scale, multiple-choice, and open-ended, and the order and wording of questions are different among surveys. In addition, the study’s goals and purposes were fully delineated when each survey was circulated to salespeople. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the data collection and the study’s goals. Altogether, we believe that potential common method bias is not a significant concern in our data (Hulland, Baumgartner, and Smith, 2018).
2.3.3 Measures

The current study consists of two primary constructs, job Satisfaction and Performance, as dependent variables and other exogeneous variables such as excluded variables and control variables. For the identification of equations, age, mentoring, sales experience, and effort are used as the excluded variables. Control variables are gender, education, training, marital status, number of children. Demographic variables were measured in the initial survey, and dynamic variables were measured in every survey.

Endogenous variables

*Job satisfaction* was measured with seven items that were borrowed and adjusted from Bagozzi (1980) and Churchill and Walker (1974): “Overall, how satisfied are you with your success?” “I have adequate support to help me accomplish my goal,” “My company encourages my professional growth,” “I’m satisfied with my present income,” “I’m satisfied with my probable future earnings in the life insurance business,” “The company gives serious consideration to complaints from agents in the filed” and “The company does a good job selecting its filed management.” The first item was measured by a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1= very dissatisfied to 5= very satisfied. For the rest of the items, the respondents were asked to answer the questions of “Rate following statement below according to how much you agree or disagree.” The five-point scale ranging from 1= totally disagree to 5=totally agree was used for these items. The score of job satisfaction was calculated by averaging seven-item scores. Cronbach’s alphas are .73, and .71 for year one and year two, respectively. (Appendix 1).

*Performance* was measured by a salesperson’s total annualized commissions in dollar amount from all lines of business for the year. The annualized commission is commonly used performance measure in the insurance industry as well as academic research with a sample of
insurance agents (e.g., (Landau and Werbel, 1995; Turner, 2008). Respondents were asked, “what was your level of production based on the number of annualized commissions in the past 6 months and the past 12 months?” The yearly mean and standard deviation, in thousands are 24.02 and 36.47 in year one and 30.16 and 23.94 in year two.

*Exogenous variables*

*Age* was measured at the first survey, and one is added to the age in the following yearly survey. The mean and standard deviation of age in the first survey are 37.11 and .23. For *mentorship*, the participants were asked, “Is there someone you consider a mentor for your career as an insurance agent?” The participants answered by choosing one from five choices such as 0 = none, 1= yes--an experienced agent in the agency, 2= yes- a manager or supervisor in the agency, 3= yes- someone outside the agency, and 4= yes- other. We recorded to (0 =0), (1, 2,3, or 4 =1). Then, we converted this question to two dummy variables: inside mentor and outside mentor. 33.1% of the participants do not have a mentor, and 66.9% have a mentor. The standard deviation of *mentor* is .47.

For *General sales experience and industry-specific sales experience (non-insurance)*, the respondents were asked, “Which of the following best describes your occupation prior to your current position?” The respondents answered by checking one from 17 different occupations, including “insurance sales” and “other sales (non-insurance).” For the industry-specific sales experience variable, “insurance sales experience” was coded as 1, and the others were 0. For general sales experiences, “other sales (non-insurance)” was coded as 1 and the others were 0. The mean and standard deviation are .20 and .01 for insurance sales experience and .19 and .01 for other sales experiences.
Effort was rationalized by the number of applications generated for the last 12 months. Some literature includes effort in performance measures, but they are different. Effort is an input for performance, and performance is an output from the effort (Christen et al., 2006). In the procedure of insurance sales, the application is close to sales performance. However, the application is not equal to sales performance. For example, a salesperson with a small number of applications can produce more sales than another with a large number of applications. Therefore, it is certain that the number of applications is input, thus effort, not sales performance.

Participants were asked, “What was your level of production in the past month, past six months, and past 12 months?” The yearly mean and standard deviation are 70.6 and 3.33 in year one and 79.97 and 3.78 in year two.

Training was rationalized by a perception of the training they received and measured by twelve items (Appendix 1). Participants were asked to rate 12 different areas of training and calculated the average. The question used was “using the scale below, how you rate the training you have received in each of the following areas? Scales were 0 = Received none, 1 = Very poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral/Unsure, 4 = Good, and 5 = Very Good. The mean and standard deviation are 3.16 and .87 in one year survey and 3.28 and .88 in two year survey.

Other demographic information. A question to measure education level was, “What is the highest education level that you have?” The response choices were: 1= Graduate degree, 2= B.A. or B.S. (four-year) degree, 3= Associate (two-years) degree, 4= High school diploma, and 5= Some high school. We reversely coded the answers and then converted them to a dummy variable. Associate degree or higher education was 1, and a high school diploma or lower education was 0. 51.0% of the participants had a four-year college or higher degree, and 47.2% of them had a high school or lower degree. The standard deviation is .49. Gender was measured
by asking “what is your sex?” and coded into a dummy variable. “Female” was coded to 0, and “male” was coded to 1. The mean and standard deviation are .83 and .38. Marital status was asked by the question “what is your marital status?” and also coded into a dummy variable. “married” was coded as 1, and all the other answers, such as “divorced” and “separated” were coded as 0. The mean is .74, and the standard deviation is .43. Respondents provided the number of their children. The mean was 1.64, and the standard deviation was 1.47.

2.3.4 Model Specification

Before we test the four competing hypotheses, we need to discuss the major methods that previous literature has employed to examine the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance. The most prevalent method used was a path analysis using cross-sectional data. “Causal inferences based on cross-sectional data represent a contentious issue in nearly all areas” (James et al., 1982; Judge and Thoresen, 2001,p.377). One of the contentious issues in cross-sectional data is the unobserved heterogeneity (Cai, 2010) which affects both the Satisfaction and Performance of salespeople. This, in turn, results in an endogeneity bias. Using panel data can better control for unobserved heterogeneity. This approach has a more efficient estimation capability than the use of cross-sectional data. Not just studies that used cross-sectional data, but also most of the studies undermined the endogeneity issue between Satisfaction and Performance. This suggests that Satisfaction may not be exogenous to Performance. Like other attitudes in an organization, such as motivation and organizational commitment, Satisfaction is influenced by organizational factors. For example, to improve the Satisfaction of salespeople, management may allocate resources to several programs associated with better company benefits and improved organizational climate. The ultimate goal of such programs is to improve Performance (Darden et al., 1989) through increased Satisfaction. In this
case, Satisfaction is endogenous to Performance. Conversely, Performance can be a direct cause of Satisfaction. Salespeople who have low Performance may have low Satisfaction. Therefore, since they have a cross effect on each other, the use of Satisfaction as an exogenous variable creates a simultaneous bias on the effect of Performance, and the use of Performance as an exogenous variable produces a simultaneous bias on the effect of Satisfaction. Each construct is endogenous with respect to each other. In addition to the simultaneity between Performance and Satisfaction, it is likely that the error terms from each equation are correlated. Therefore, the two simultaneous equations are identified when each equation has at least one unique exogenous variable, which is excluded from the other equation. This is known as the exclusion restriction (Bollen, 2014; Hsiao, 2014; Zellner and Theil, 1992).

Studies that examined either unidirectional model (Satisfaction → Performance or Satisfaction ← Performance) ignored the possibility of the reversed effect, which may have existed because the consideration of the other causal direction was not in their interest. However, results from testing only one causal direction can be biased because of the ignorance of simultaneous joint effects by Satisfaction and Performance. Testing two separate opposite directions could have a different result from testing two models together after considering the simultaneous effect on each other. Thus, it is necessary to test a reciprocal model that can test all four directional possibilities such as Performance to Satisfaction (model 1), Satisfaction to Performance (model 2), a reciprocal effect (model 3), and no effect on each other (model 0).

We examine the simultaneous impact between salespeople’s Performance and their Satisfaction. To capture this effect, we first develop the system of two equations. In the first equation, salespeople’s Satisfaction is the dependent variable, and their Performance is treated as a predictor of Satisfaction. The second equation consists of Performance as the dependent
variable when Satisfaction is a predictor of Performance. Therefore, the first equation highlights the effect of Performance on Satisfaction, while the second question focuses on the impact of Satisfaction on Performance. Second, due to the simultaneous impacts of these two variables, we treat both Satisfaction and Performance as endogenous variables. Third, we assume that error terms in Equations (1) and (2) may be correlated (Rinallo and Basuroy, 2009). This implies that we need to impose exclusion restrictions by including unique exogenous variables into our simultaneous model to avoid the model under specification issues (Duan et al., 2008). The inclusion of the unique exogenous variables into each equation in our model makes the system of equations identified (Pindyck and Rubinfeld, 1981). The following equations elaborate on the simultaneous relationships between Satisfaction and Performance in our specification:

\[
(1) \quad \text{Job Satisfaction}_{(i,t)} = \beta_{0js} + \beta_1 \text{Job Performance}_{(i,t)} \\
+ \beta_2 \text{Age}_{(i,t)} + \beta_3 \text{Mentorship}_{(i,t)} \\
+ \beta_4 \text{Gender} + \beta_5 \text{Education} + \beta_6 \text{Training}_{(i,t)} \\
+ \beta_7 \text{Marriage status} + \beta_8 \text{No.of Children} + \mu_{js(i,t)}
\]

\[
(2) \quad \text{Performance}_{(i,t)} = \gamma_{0jp} + \gamma_1 \text{Job Satisfaction}_{(i,t)} \\
+ \gamma_2 \text{General Sales Experience} + \gamma_3 \text{Industry specific Sales Experience} \\
+ \gamma_4 \text{Effort}_{(i,t)} + \gamma_5 \text{Gender} + \gamma_6 \text{Education} + \gamma_7 \text{Training}_{(i,t)} \\
+ \gamma_8 \text{Marriage status} + \gamma_9 \text{No.of Children} + \mu_{jp(i,t)}
\]

where \( \text{Job Satisfaction}_{it} \) and \( \text{Performance}_{it} \) represent the Satisfaction and Performance of \( i \) th sales rep at time \( t \), respectively. \( \mu_{js(i,t)} \) is an error term for salesperson \( i \)’s Satisfaction at time \( t \). \( \mu_{jp(i,t)} \) is an error term for salesperson \( i \)’s Performance at time \( t \).
In the first equation, Satisfaction is the dependent variable, and salespeople's Performance is treated as a predictor. Age and mentorship are added as unique exogenous variables to the first equation. As salespeople get older, their financial needs increase due to financial obligations (e.g., mortgage, auto loan, college tuition for children). As needs increase, the deficiency increases and, thus, Satisfaction is likely to decrease. Previous research supports age’s negative impact on individuals' Satisfaction (Livingstone, Roberts, and Chonko 1995). On the other hand, age is not relevant to Performance in non-physical labor such as service, including sales (Avolio et al., 1990; Sturman, 2003; Verbeke et al., 2011). Therefore, we include age in this equation. A mentee may benefit from a mentor’s supports to manage job stress and anxiety, which in turn reduces a salesperson’s dissatisfaction (Brashear et al., 2006; Hartmann et al. 2016; Pullins and Fine 2002). Furthermore, mentoring can increase self-determination (Spreitzer, 1995). Motivation literature based on self-determination theory explains the link between feeling of self-determination – Satisfaction – motivational state (Gagné and Deci, 2005) and motivation’s effect on Performance is proved by motivation theories such as Expectancy theory of motivation by Vroom (1964), Attribution theory by Sujan (1986), Self-determination theory by Deci and Ryan (1985). This is, mentoring affects Satisfaction, whereas it only affects Performance via motivation resulting from Satisfaction. Thus, we include Mentor \(_i\) in Equation (1) and exclude it in Equation (2) that denotes if an \(i^{th}\) salesperson has a mentor at time \(t\).

The second equation comprises Performance as the dependent variable when Satisfaction is a predictor on the right-hand side. In addition, industry-specific sales experience, general sales experience, and effort are added as unique exogenous variables to the second equation. The experience of a sales job enables salespeople to enhance their selling orientation and, thus, improve their Performance (O'Hara, Boles, and Johnston 1991; Ko and Dennis 2004).
Specifically, salespeople with prior sales experience of working in the same industry may adjust more quickly in a new work environment and may utilize their existing relevant knowledge to improve their Performance (Gibbons and Waldman, 2004; Neal, 1995). However, there is no certainty that prior sales experience or industry-specific sales experience in a prior occupation is related to Satisfaction. Moreover, to our knowledge, there is no literature that supports the causal relationship between a prior occupation, especially a sales job, and Satisfaction. Thus, we include both industry-specific sales experience and general sales experience in the second equation and exclude them in the first equation. Schmitz and Ganesan (2014) note that salespeople with a higher level of effort report better sales performance. This relationship has been supported by other studies in the literature such as Krishnan, Netemeyer, and Boles (2002) and Mulki, Jaramillo, and Locander (2009). Kwak et al. (2019) established that effort significant affects sales performance but does not affect job satisfaction. Thus, we include $Effort_{it}$ that represents effort of $i^{th}$ salesperson at time $t$.

Salespeople’s gender, education, marital status, the number of children, and training are included as additional exogenous variables in both equations to remove alternative explanations as common antecedents that make spurious causal effects between Satisfaction and performance. Marital status and number of children are added in both equations based on the belief that salespeople’s family responsibility and financial needs increase when they are married and have more children, resulting in an experience of additional need deficiency. Such additional need deficiency can decrease Satisfaction. However, the increased responsibility and financial needs can alternately be motivators to work harder and more time. As a result, Performance can increase. Gender, education, and training are added as the common antecedents based on the empirical results in the previous literature: gender (Boles et al., 2007; Ladik et al., 2002),
education (Román and Munuera, 2005), and training (Babakus et al., 1996; Hanaysha and Tahir, 2016).

**2.3.5 Model Estimation**

We apply two-stage (2SLS) and three-stage least squares (3SLS) to estimate coefficients in the system of Equations (1) and (2). Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is unable to estimate coefficients in our system of equations as the endogenous variable Satisfaction$_{it}$ correlates to $\varepsilon_{it}$. The same correlation can be seen for Performance$_{it}$ and $\varepsilon_{it}$. This violates one of the key underlying assumptions of the OLS method, making OLS a biased and inconsistent estimator. Both 2SLS and 3SLS approaches jointly estimate all parameters in our system of the equations to avoid biases in estimates. In two stages, the 2SLS approach first estimates predicted values of Performance and Satisfaction by regressing on all exogenous variables in both equations. Then, predicted values are used as instrumental variables to estimate coefficients in the second stage.

3SLS approach utilizes 2SLS estimates and calculates residuals to compute the cross-equation correlation. Then, the method applies the General Method of Moments to estimate coefficients (Duan et al., 2008). Compared to 2SLS, the 3SLS method is likely to be more efficient as it includes a cross-equation correlation of error terms (Rinallo and Basuroy, 2009). Therefore, 3SLS can obtain consistent and more efficient estimates of simultaneous equations over 2SLS (Zellner and Theil, 1992). Moreover, our data is panel data, so we need to allow error terms within salespeople to be correlated. Standard errors are adjusted for the clustering of observations within people for the panel structure of the data.

**2.4 RESULTS**

Correlation and descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2. Job Satisfaction and Performance are significantly correlated, and this result is consistent with our basic assumption. Age is correlated
with both Job Satisfaction and Performance. Mentorship is only correlated with Job Satisfaction, not Performance. On the other hand, insurance sales experience is only correlated with Performance, not Job Satisfaction. Effort is correlated with Performance as well as Job Satisfaction. Age as exclusion restriction in job satisfaction equation should directly affect Job Satisfaction, not Performance while effort as exclusion restriction in Job performance equation should directly affect Performance, not Job Satisfaction. However, it is important to keep in mind that these bivariate correlations represent both indirect and direct relationships between variables. Therefore, it is possible that variables excluded from the Job Satisfaction or Performance equation may still have significant bivariate correlations with the outcome they are excluded from.

The test results of the model specified in equation (1) and (2) are shown in Table 3. The upper side of Table 3 reports results from testing Equation (1) when Job Satisfaction is dependent variable and salespeople’s Performance is a predictor. The lower side of Table 3 denotes estimated coefficients for Equation (2) when Performance is dependent variable and salespeople’s Job Satisfaction is a predictor. As shown, current performance significantly affect to current Job Satisfaction after controlling for age, mentorship, gender, education, training, marital status, and no. of children ($\beta = .02, p < .01$). Simultaneously, current Job Satisfaction does not significantly affect current Performance after controlling for industry specific / other sales experience, effort, gender, education, training, marital status, and no. of children ($\beta = -.28, p > .05$). That is, when salespeople are currently now doing well on Performance, they feel satisfied with their job. However, even though salespeople are currently satisfied with their current job, salespeople are not necessarily selling much. This result supports
hypothesis 1 among all competing four hypotheses. The strong correlation between job Satisfaction and Performance is attributable to Performance’s effect on Job Satisfaction.

Age has significantly negative effect on Job Satisfaction ($\beta = -0.01, \ p < .05$). As age goes up, salespeople’s Job satisfaction decreases. Having a mentor significantly, positively influences Job Satisfaction of salespeople ($\beta = 0.26, \ p < .01$). That is, salespeople who have a mentor have higher Job Satisfaction than those who do not have a mentor. In addition, industry specific sales experience significantly influence Performance of salespeople ($\beta = 0.05, \ p = .05$), but general sales experience does not ($\beta = 0.68, \ p > .10$). In other words, salespeople who have insurance sales experience before joining the current agency generate better sales Performance than other salespeople who don’t have any sales experience. However, there is no evidence that salespeople who have other sales experience (non-insurance) have better current Performance than those without any sales experience. Effort significantly influences salespeople’s Performance ($\beta = 0.11, \ p < .01$).

Among control variables, gender does not have any significant impact on either job Satisfaction ($\beta = -0.03, \ p > .10$) or Performance ($\beta = -2.04, \ p > .10$). Education has a marginally significant negative effect on Job Satisfaction ($\beta = -0.07, \ p < .10$) while it has a marginally significant positive impact on Performance ($\beta = 4.07, \ p < .10$). Training significantly influences Job Satisfaction ($\beta = 0.27, \ p < .01$) but it significantly influences Performance only at one tail test ($\beta = 11.50, \ p < .10$). Marital status also has a significant impact on salespeople’s Job Satisfaction ($\beta = 0.13, \ p < .05$) and marginal impact on Performance ($\beta = 4.15, \ p < .10$). However, the number of children does not influence either salespeople’s Job Satisfaction ($\beta = 0.01, \ p > .10$) or performance ($\beta = -0.28, \ p > .10$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>37.77</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>-.07+</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentorship</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23+</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industry specific sales exp.</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07+</td>
<td>.11+</td>
<td>-.12+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other sales exp.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.24+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Effort</td>
<td>78.91</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>.15+</td>
<td>.10+</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04+</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Education.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>-.06+</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Training</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.46+</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06+</td>
<td>.23+</td>
<td>.09+</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Marital Status</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27+</td>
<td>-.08+</td>
<td>.08+</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td>.16+</td>
<td>-.08+</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. No. of Children</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.54+</td>
<td>-.08+</td>
<td>.10+</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14+</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.37+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unit of performance is $1,000. Correlations are based on pairwise deletion. *p < .05, +p < .0
Table 3: Results of Causal Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction Equation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Job Performance Equation** |     |       |       |
| Job Satisfaction           | -28.12| 17.83 | .11   |
| Industry specific sales experience | 4.96 | 2.57 | .05   |
| Other sales experience     | -1.05| 2.59 | .68   |
| Effort                     | .11 | .03   | <.01  |
| Gender                     | -2.04| 5.31  | .70   |
| Education                  | 4.07 | 2.32  | .08   |
| Training                   | 11.50| 6.47  | .08   |
| Marital Status             | 4.15 | 2.33  | .07   |
| No. of children            | -.28 | .71   | .69   |
| Constant                   | 73.30| 44.09 | .09   |

Note: R² is not applicable for 3SLS model. Unit of Job performance is $1,000. Standard errors are adjusted for the clustering of observations within people for the panel structure of the data.

2.5 DISCUSSION

The present study examines four competing theoretical models to discover the nature of the relationship between a salesperson’s Job Satisfaction and Performance under the premise of simultaneity between them.

2.5.1 Theoretical Contributions

The results provide strong support for a unidirectional relationship from present job performance to present job satisfaction. The results suggest that salespeople are more satisfied with their job when they have higher Performance, but salespeople are not necessarily working better when they are satisfied with their job. Therefore, reciprocal relationships do not exist. Additionally, we found that other important factors that are critical to either sales’ person’s Job satisfaction or Performance. As salespeople age, they are less satisfied with their job. Mentoring is also an important factor influencing salespeople’s Job...
Satisfaction. Salespeople are more satisfied with their job when salespeople have a mentor. On the other hand, salespeople’s previous sales experience is beneficial to salespeople’s Performance. Salespeople who already have sales experience of similar products in the same industry produce better Performance than those who don’t have any sales experience, but other sales experiences are not helpful for salespeople’s Performance.

The current study contributes to the literature on Job Satisfaction and Performance in several ways. First, we advance to inconclusive sales literature on salesperson’s Job Satisfaction and Performance by finding the nature of the relationship between salesperson’s Job satisfaction and Performance with more appropriate methods, enough sample size, and a longitudinal data set. There have been several studies with student or office staff samples that examined the nature of the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance in other domains (e.g., Alessandri et al., 2017; Riketta, 2008; Siegel and Bowen, 1971), but Bogozzi (1980) has been an only study in sales domain. Due to the unique characteristics of sales jobs (Dubinsky and Hartley, 1986), salespeople’s Job satisfaction and Performance are distinct from those of non-sales occupations. We found that salespeople’s Performance is a critical factor for the salespeople’s Job satisfaction, but salespeople’s job satisfaction is not an important antecedent to salespeople’s Performance.

Second, drawing on the extended expectancy theory of motivation by Porter and Lawler model (1968), the present study extends Satisfaction- Performance relationship theories by introducing a unique theoretical foundation for a reciprocal relationship which has been based on the simple combination of both opposite unidirectional relationships. Although our results do not support the reciprocal relationship between salespeople’s Job satisfaction and Performance, our arguments for the reciprocal relationship based on the extended expectancy theory of motivation by Porter and Lawler model (1968) would be a good start to re-examine the relationship in the future research.
Finally, we improve a reciprocal relationship argument in the literature by showing that the effect of Satisfaction on Performance and Performance on Satisfaction depends on the present condition, using 3 stage least squared simultaneous equations. Appropriate methods are salient to examine the relationship that includes potential endogeneity issues. Most of the research that includes any directional relationship between salespeople’s Job satisfaction and Performance ignored the endogeneity issues because it is difficult to deal with them, resulting in a biased conclusion. We take into account the endogeneity issue in our model. Our study is the first to employ 3 stage least squared simultaneous equations, the most sophisticated method to test the nature of the relationship between salespeople’s Job satisfaction and Performance.

2.5.2 Managerial Implication

The present research also contributes to practitioners by providing insights on how and where to allocate more resources to increase the salespeople’s Performance, which is critical to firm performance. Suppose that Performance is an antecedent of Satisfaction. In this case, firms should place more effort and allocate more resources to systems that enhance job performance, such as sales support (DeConinck and Johnson, 2009; Rutherford et al., 2011), feedback systems (Johnson, 2013; Singh, 1998), and Performance rewards (Khusainova et al., 2018; Miao and Evans, 2014). The improved Performance will lead to Job satisfaction, which is critical to turnover (Birnbaum and Somers, 1993; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Stumpf and Hartman, 1984; Wang and Ma, 2013) and, thus, decrease turnover. By allocating more resources to systems for better performance, management can achieve two primary goals of the companies: High Performance and low turnover rate.

2.5.3 Limitation and Future Research Direction

In the present research, we conceptualized the effects of Satisfaction to Performance and Performance to Satisfaction more depend on the present condition, not the past condition.
With our yearly data set, the present year’s condition is more compelling. To strengthen our argument on the present condition, we wanted to compare the effects of the present year’s Performance and last year’s Performance to the present Satisfaction and the reverse effects but could not run both models with the limited time points. However, if we measure Satisfaction and Performance in a very close time lag, such as monthly or bi-weekly, it is reasonable in part to assume the previous Performance (previous job Satisfaction) in monthly or biweekly data may influence the current Satisfaction (the current job performance). Therefore, it will be more meaningful in future research if we examine and compare both simultaneous equations and cross-lagged autoregression with a monthly or bi-weekly data set.

We only examine the mentoring’s effect on Satisfaction with the involvement in mentoring. Having a mentor itself does not prove why mentoring leads to Satisfaction. Therefore, future research should include various aspects of mentoring in their study.
# Appendix 1

## A1: Measurement and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Endogenous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with your success?</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have adequate support to help me accomplish my goal</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My company encourages my professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m satisfied with my present income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m satisfied with my probable future earnings in the life insurance business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The company gives serious consideration to complaints from agents in the filed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The company does a good job selecting its filed management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Dollar volume of annualized commissions for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Variables appearing in the job satisfaction equation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age at the time of survey and 1 added to every year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>1 if has mentor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Variables appearing in the job performance equation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Sales Experience</td>
<td>1 if has insurance sales experience before joining the agency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sales Experiences</td>
<td>1 if has other sales experiences than insurance before joining the agency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Activity plans and review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case preparation and review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced underwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency meetings/ classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New agent class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answering your questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint calls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-study training sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selling skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home office training sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product/ technical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Variables appearing in both equation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1 if is male</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1 if has a bachelor or higher degree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Tenure</td>
<td>Number of years the agent worked for their previous job</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1 at year one and 1 added to every year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Children</td>
<td>Number of children the agent has in her family</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Number of hours the agent worked a week</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 3
SALESPERSON MOTIVATION CHANGES DURING THE EARLY EMPLOYMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Motivating salespeople has been one of the most important roles of sales managers as well as a popular topic in academic research. The first reason is that motivation is a crucial predictor of salesperson performance which is a major factor in firm performance (Miao and Evans, 2007; Jaramillo and Mulki, 2008; Tanner, Tanner, and Wakefield, 2015; Good, Hughes, Kirca, and McGrath, 2022). The other is that motivation is significantly related to turnover via salesperson performance which is a critical determinant in salesperson turnover. Sales managers face difficulty in managing the motivation of salespeople because the natural trajectories of salespeople motivation changes have not been known, and thus, they are not able to predict the motivation change.

Social scientists define motivation as “the psychological processes that cause the arousal, direction, and persistence of behavior” (Mitchell, 1982, p.81). In sales literature, motivation has been defined as “the amount of effort the salesman desire to expand on each of the activity or tasks associated with his job” (Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1977, p.162). The Expectancy Theory of Motivation has been one of the major theories of motivation since its introduction by Vroom in 1964. Valence – Instrumentality – Expectancy Model (VIE) has been explored by sales researchers (St. Clair et al., 2018; Tyagi, 1985a). Some argue that the empirical results of expectancy theory are not consistent (Miao, Lund, and Evans, 2009; Kanfer, Frese, and Johnson, 2017; Khusainova et al., 2018), and some suggest that expectancy theory should be combined with other theories (Kernan and Lord, 1990; Van Eerde and Thierry, 1996). However, there is still an empty area in the expectancy theory that should be filled with strong support before researchers admit the arguments. For example,
expectancy theory in the sales domain has never been explained with time change by a longitudinal study. How a salesperson’s motivation changes over time and how differently intrinsic motivation (IM) and extrinsic motivation (EM) change over time have remained unknown (Khusainova et al., 2018).

This study aims to fill these research gaps and extend extant salespeople research literature in three ways. First, we use a longitudinal study design and hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to find the trajectories of salespeople motivation changes. There have been no longitudinal studies investigating the change in salespeople’s motivation over time, even though there is a strong call for the longitudinal study (Bolander et al., 2017; Khusainova et al., 2018). None used the hierarchical linear modeling method to find the trajectories of motivation change. Therefore, the present study employs a longitudinal study to investigate (1) trajectories of motivation changes over time and (2) trajectory differences between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation change. Second, we examine a complete set of motivation forms and components.

Next, early motivation literature frequently examined motivation only using one or more of the three separate motivation components such as valence, instrumentality, and expectancy (Ingram and Bellenger, 1983; Kohli, 1985; Oliver, 1974; Teas, 1981; Walker et al., 1977). On the other hand, recent literature tends to examine intrinsic and extrinsic motivation separately (Good et al., 2021; Hansen and Levin, 2016; Miao and Evans, 2014; Tanner et al., 2015) or only focuses on intrinsic motivation (Dubinsky and Skinner, 2002; Miao and Evans, 2012; Román and Iacobucci, 2010). In reality, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation does not exist incompatibly. Rather, people in most work situations are motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically (Amabile, 1993). Therefore, by examining a combined motivation (a combination of IM and EM), IM, and EM, the current study contribute to providing more realistic, practical results. Third, we investigate how pre-employment
experience and onboarding experience moderate motivation changes in salespeople. Especially, we examine task and industry-specific experience as pre-employment experience and a realistic job preview (RJP as onboarding experience that has not been explored as predictors of motivation in sales literature.

Finally, this research focuses on salespeople during the early employment period from newly hired to their third year in the same organization. Critical organizational problems such as salespeople’s early turnover happen during this period (Cheng, 2014). By focusing on newly hired salespeople, the static panel enables us to control variations in career stage, tenure, and experience. An additional contribution of using the early employment is the inclusion of a supporting theoretical perspective, Socialization Theory, which is consistent with existing literature while also providing a clearer rationale for predicting changes in the motivation of salespeople in the early stages of their career.

This begins with a review of the key theories and existing salespeople motivation literature based on expectancy theory. We then develop hypotheses, describe methodology and report test results. Finally, we concludes with discussion where we present theoretical and managerial implications, limitation, and future research directions.

3.2 THEORIES AND LITERATURE REVIEW

3.2.1 Expectancy Theory of Work Motivation

Expectancy Theory originated evaluating the relationship between motivation and productivity (Georgopoulos, Mahoney, and Jones 1957). Their research, however, did not provide a formal theory of motivation. Subsequently, Vroom (1964) formulated an initial framework for a process theory which focused on the idea that that the overarching driver of motivation is their expectations about future outcomes focusing on three key components The key components in Vroom’s expectancy theory focus on the value of the outcomes (valence), ones’ ability to achieve those outcomes (instrumentality) and the probability that those
outcomes will happen (expectancy). More formally, Expectancy is defined by Vroom (1964) as a belief about the perceived probability that a certain behavior can be followed by the outcome of interest. Expectancy is the individual’s belief that the individual’s effort will result in desired performance (an effort–performance relationship). In contrast to expectancy, which involves an action to outcome (effort-performance) relationship, instrumentality is an outcome-outcome association. Instrumentality refers to the individual’s belief that the desired performance will result in the attainment of organizational rewards (a performance-reward relationship). Performance as an outcome of efforts leads to another outcome, a reward (Miner 2005). Valence refers to an individual’s value on the potential reward received after performance. Valence is associated with the degree of an individual’s satisfaction or attractiveness of the rewards to the individual (Robbins & Judge, 2009)

To explain the relationship between three components of expectancy theory, Vroom (1964) provided two propositions,

Proposition 1: “The valence of outcome to a person is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the all valence of all other outcomes and his conception of its instrumentality for the attainment of these other outcomes” (p.17).

Proposition 2: “The force on a person to perform an act is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of all the valence of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes” (p18).

In other words, as the valence of the outcome from the performance increases, the person is more likely to exert effort to produce the outcome. Due to the nature of the multiplicative relationship of components, the total motivation towards a certain performance can be zero or very low if the valence for the reward achieved by the performance is zero, or if the values of either or both expectancy or, instrumentality, are very low.
Porter and Lawler (1968) extended Vroom (1964) by including the employee’s ability and the perception of the role between effort and performance. Porter and Lawler (1968) also extended the theory by explaining the relationship between performance and satisfaction. The value of the rewards to the employee from their performance mediates the relationship between performance and satisfaction. Moreover, Porter and Lawler (1968) suggested a feedback loop to Vroom’s theory to include the effect of the employee’s learning from experience. That is, as performance leads to more rewards, the perceived effort-reward probability increases. Also, as the employee experiences satisfaction from the rewards, the future value of the rewards increases.

Lawler’s (1971, 1973) research further extended Vroom’s expectancy theory by taking self-esteem into account of the relationship between performance and expectancy and by making a clear distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, that evolve into intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic outcomes are personal rewards from the individual himself, such as increased feelings of self-esteem, accomplishment, and personal growth. Extrinsic outcomes are rewards given by external elements such as organizations. These rewards are externally mediated. Lawler (1981) concluded that the magnitude of an individual’s motivation to perform effectively is determined by expectancy and the attractiveness of the rewards from good performance.

In addition to Porter and Lawler, others also provided empirical supports for expectancy theory intended for the motivation of non-selling employees (Campbell et al., 1970; Mitchell & Nebeker, 1973; Nebeker & Mitchell, 1974; Peters, 1977; Pritchard & Sanders, 1973; Schuster et al., 1971; Schwab et al., 1979; Stahl & Harrell, 1981).

3.2.2 Expectancy Theory in the Sales Management Literature

The first literature to apply expectancy theory to the sales domain was produced by Oliver (1974), who argue that motivation had been extensively discussed in the sales
management literature, but little knowledge had emerged. He also argued that authors 
publishing in the sales domain had merely suggested specific variables to motivate behaviors 
but had not paid attention to the process by which the variables influence behaviors. This 
resulted in an incomplete theory of motivation. For this reason, Oliver turned his attention to 
the field of industrial psychology, where significant progress had been made in the 
advancement of knowledge about the relationship between employee performance and 
motivation at both the theoretical and empirical levels. He suggested Vroom’s expectancy 
theory, an industrial motivation theory, was also directly applicable to empirically prove the 
motivation of salespeople. As a result of the first literature on the application of expectancy 
theory in a sales domain, Oliver (1974) found that incentive is a superior predictor of the 
motivation of salespeople, while the intrinsic reward is not significant.

Predictors and Outcomes of Motivation

Motivation research base on Expectancy Theory- has focused on the drivers and 
outcomes of salesperson motivation (Pullins, 2001; Khusainova, et al., 2018). In the 
conceptual research of Walker, Churchill, and Ford (1977), they classified the variables into 
individual, interpersonal, organizational, and environmental variables that may influence 
salesperson motivation and the specific relationships among these variables. An overview of 
the literature is found in Table 4. Evans, Margheim, and Schlacter, (1982) also emphasized 
the need for categorization of factors, arguing that “…differences in organizations and 
salespeople make it impossible to specify exactly how a factor would affect motivation in a 
specific circumstance” (p.340). Teas (1981) modified the categories of Walker et al. (1977) to 
include individual characteristics, organizational factors, environmental constraints, and task 
characteristics to test the relationship between those four different sets of variables and 
salespeople’s perception of job-related expectancies and instrumentalities.
The existing studies with predictors of motivation are sorted based on the four categories: individual factors, organizational factors, environmental factors, and task factors (Teas 1981; Evans et al. 1982). In this classification of variables, manager level factors and firm level factors have been intertwined in organizational factors. The current study disentangles manager level factors from organizational factors. Environmental factors and all external factors are out of the control of management, and the Expectancy Theory-based literature has not explored the factors. Therefore, the current study includes four categories: individual level variables, manager level variables, organizational level variables, and task-related variables in Figure 1.

(1) Individual Level Variables

*Demographic characteristics* were of interest early in the 1980’s literature (Churchill, Ford, Ford, Walker 1979; Ingram and Bellenger 1983; Ford, Walker, and Churchill 1985; Cron, Dubinsky, and Michaels 1988). The authors were mainly concerned with determining the relationship between demographic variables and valence for rewards such as pay, promotion, Worthwhile accomplishment, personal growth, recognition, liking and respect, and job security. Churchill, Ford, and Walker (1979, 1985) found age and family size is reversely related to intrinsic valence and unmarried and/or highly educated salespeople have a preference for intrinsic rewards. Ingram and Bellenger (1983) reported a negative relationship between education and income and extrinsic rewards. Motivation variables were also found to act differently across nations/regions (Dubinsky, Kotabe, Lim and Michaels 1994; Segalla, Rouzies, Besson, and Weitz 2006, Khusainova et al. 2018). Finally, Dubinsky, Michaels, Kotabe, and Lim (1994) found a minimal difference between male and female salespeople’s perception of motivation components.

*Self-esteem and Self-perceived ability (Self-efficacy)* are also among the predictors of salespeople' motivation. Walker, Churchill and Ford, (1977) provided propositions that both self-esteem and self-perceived ability are positively related to the expectancy of salespeople.
Empirically, Teas, (1981) and Kohli, (1985) found a positive relationship between self-esteem and expectancy. Ingram and Bellenger, (1983) suggest that intrinsic rewards (intrinsic valence) are more attractive to those with higher self-esteem. Salespeople high in self-perceived ability (self-efficacy) were found to have higher expectancy (Teas, 1981; Chowdhury, 1993).
Figure 1. Expectancy Theory-Based Sales Literature

Predictors including mediators

Personal Level Factors
- Demographic factors (age, marriage, family size, education, income)
- Tenure job experience and Past performance
- Self-esteem
- Self-perceived ability / Self-efficacy
- locus of control
- Feeling of leadership
- Effort
- Skills and knowledge
- personal feeling, and emotion, emotional exhaustion
- Education
- Family size / marriage status / income

Manager Level Factors
- Closeness of supervision
- Supervisory style
- Supervisory behaviors (Arbitrary and punitive behavior / Upward influence behavior / Achievement oriented behavior)
- Leadership characteristics (Leader trust and support / leader goal emphasis, interaction and facilitation / psychological influence / hierarchical influence
- Managerial actions: Higher / lower sales potential = salesperson expectations
- Solicited input, provision of transitional compensation, provided thanness = sales perceptions of fairness
- Feedback about performance
- Sales control combination: outcome X capability control, outcome X activity control, capability X activity control

Organizational Level Factors
- Organization culture / Climate
- Participation
- Monetary rewards
- Premation
- Recognition
- Organization support
- Firm’s customer orientation

Role/Task factors
- Job variety / Task skill variety
- Task significance / importance
- Job autonomy
- Task complexity
- Organizational stress / Role overload / Role ambiguity / Role conflict / Subunit conflict

Moderator
- Gender
- Cadre Vs Hired band
- Region
- Career stage
- Job experience

Motivation
- Expectancy
- Instrumentality (I and EI)
- Valence (V and EV)
- IM, IM
- Motivation

Notes: M = Motivation, IM = Intrinsic Motivation, EM = Extrinsic Motivation, AM = Apathetic Motivation, E = Expectancy, I = Instrumentality, V = Valence, II = Intrinsic Instrumentality, EI = Extrinsic Instrumentality, IV = Intrinsic Valence, EV = Extrinsic Valence
## Table 4: Key findings and variables on salesperson motivation based on Expectancy Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Expectancy Theory measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Incentive (EM) is a superior predictor for performance while intrinsic outcome is not motivationally functional.</td>
<td>Compensation/ Incentive/ Intrinsic/ Most desirable/ all job outcome</td>
<td>V/E/I Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volume / criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsui et al.</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>High force score ($F=E \times \Sigma IV$) leads better performance</td>
<td>E/I/V</td>
<td>units sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker et al.</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>The article provides the conceptual model with individual, interpersonal, organizational, and environmental variables that influence motivation and job performance of a salesperson.</td>
<td>Personal/organizational/ environmental variables</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards (internally mediated/ externally mediated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill, Ford, Walker</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>The authors suggest there is a relationship between salesforce's valence for various rewards and personal characteristics such as age, marriage status, tenure, education, family size and self-esteem.</td>
<td>Age, marriage status, tenure, education, family size and self-esteem.</td>
<td>E/I/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teas</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>The important predictors of industrial salesperson motivation are the salesperson's personal characteristics, his perceptions of supervisory style, organizational communication, job significance and autonomy, job variety and completeness, job complexity, and selling constraints</td>
<td>Salesperson's personal characteristics, his perceptions of supervisory style, organizational communication, job significance and autonomy, job variety and completeness, job complexity, and selling constraints</td>
<td>E/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans et al.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Literature review of expectancy theory research in sales</td>
<td>Environmental factors: economic conditions/ strength of competition/ sales territory potential / restrictions of product availability - Organizational factors: imitation of structure/ consideration/ feedback/ participation/ monetary compensation - Individual factors: self esteem and self perceived ability/ Locus of control/ Tenure - Task factors: Skill or task variety/ Task identity or complexity/ task significance and autonomy</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyagi</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>- Organizational climate variables more strongly influence IM than EM. - Challenge and variety, role overload and leadership consideration does not have significant impact on EM.</td>
<td>Organizational climate variables job Challenge and variety, role overload and leadership consideration</td>
<td>E/I/I/E/I/IV/EV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key findings</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram and Bellenger</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>The authors find the relationship between age, job tenure, income level, specific self-esteem, compensation plan base, promotion opportunity rate, and recognition rate and valences on rewards such as Pay, Promotion, Worthwhile accomplishment, Personal growth, Recognition, liking and respect, and Job security</td>
<td>Pay, Promotion, Worthwhile accomplishment, Personal growth, Recognition liking and respect, and Job security</td>
<td>V on rewards such as Pay, Promotion, Worthwhile accomplishment, Personal growth, Recognition, Liking, Respect, and Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohli</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>- Arbitrary and punishment behavior is not related to instrumentalities.</td>
<td>- Arbitrary and punishment behavior / Contingent approach behavior / Upward influence behavior / Achievement oriented behavior</td>
<td>E/I/IV/EV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contingent approving behavior is related to extrinsic instrumentalities but not related to intrinsic instrumentalities</td>
<td>Mediators: Role clarity / Specific self-esteem / Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Upward influencing behavior is positively related to intrinsic instrumentalities but not related to extrinsic and overall instrumentalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achievement oriented behavior is not related to expectancies and instrumentalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role clarity is positively related to extrinsic instrumentalities but not related to intrinsic and overall instrumentalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction do not have the hypothesized effects on intrinsic or extrinsic valences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, Walker, and Churchill</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Results are consistent with previous research in showing that salespeople are motivated by money, that money does not lose its attractiveness as salespeople reach the later stages of their careers, and that high-order rewards tend to be most attractive to salespeople who are in the early stages of their career</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyagi</td>
<td>1985a</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>- Job dimensions are more influential on IM while Leadership characteristics are more influential on EM. - Both IM and EM have strong influence on sales performance but IM is more important factor for sales performance</td>
<td>- Job dimensions / Job skill variety / task skill variety / task significance / Job autonomy / Job feedback / agent feedback - Leadership characteristics / Leader trust and support / Leader goal emphasis, interaction and facilitations / Psychological influence / Hierarchical influence</td>
<td>IM/EM sales performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key findings</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyagi</td>
<td>1985b</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Organizational stress variables have negative impact on both IM and EM of salespeople but one variable role ambiguity does not have significant influence on either IM or EM.</td>
<td>Organizational stress variables: role conflict, role overload, subunit conflict, role ambiguity</td>
<td>IM/EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teas and McElroy</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Commitments are influential on reward motivation systems</td>
<td>Personal characteristics, sales task characteristics, sales organization characteristics, job search behavior, anticipatory behavior, work relationships, supervisor relationships, environmental factors.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teas and McElroy</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>This article provides a theoretical framework of salespeople motivation by integrating expectancy theory and attribution theory to guide future research</td>
<td>performance -&gt; Attributions concerning causality of performance -&gt; Moderator: Past performance information / individual difference</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cron et al.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>None of the hypotheses were empirically supported. However, generally salespeople motivation is consistent with the career stage framework.</td>
<td>Career stages</td>
<td>IV/EV/EI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram et al.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>- Motivation and commitments affect sales efforts that in turn have significant impact on performance. - there are weak realtionship between Organizational commitment and efforts.</td>
<td>Effort -&gt; Performance</td>
<td>IM/EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowdhary</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Laboratory experiments</td>
<td>- As quota level increases, effort increases up to a certain point and then decreases. - Increased quota impacts more strongly on the subject who are high in self-efficacy. - Information about the task difficulty is influential on the motivation to expend effort.</td>
<td>Independent variables: the level of quota/ the level of self-efficacy/ external information</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubinsky et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>There is minimal difference between male and female salespeople’s perceptions of expectancies, instrumentalities, and valence for rewards</td>
<td>Male / Female</td>
<td>E/I/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key findings</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lagace et al.                 | 1993  | Cross-sectional survey       | - Cadres (high quality relationship between sales managers and sales people) are higher on extrinsic and intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence and evaluation of their managers.  
- Cadres are lower on role overload, role insufficienty, role ambiguity, and role conflict | Cadre vs hired hand  
E/I/V | x   |
| Dubinsky et al.               | 1994  | Cross-sectional survey       | - There is significant difference in motivational perceptions between U.S salespeople and Japanese & Korean salespeople  
- There is no distinct difference in motivational perceptions between Japanese and Korean salespeople | Japan, US, Korea  
E/I/IV/EV | x   |
| DeCarlo, Teas, and McElroy    | 1997  | Cross-sectional survey       | - Performance and skills/knowledge attributions have direct impact on salespeople motivation  
- Organizational support attribution moderate the linkage between performance and motivation of salespeople | Performance  
- Moderators: Internal-stable attribution (skills and knowledge), internal unstable attribution (Effort), external-unstable attribution (Luck), External stable (sales support) | E   |
| Smith et al.                  | 2000  | Cross-sectional survey (study1) and Scenario-based experiment (study2) | - Managerial actions produce influence on both salespeople's motivation and performance under territory realignment situation  
- Expectations have stronger impact on motivation for salespeople gaining sales potential in a realignment than did fairness | Managerial actions: higher/ lower sales potential -> salesperson expectations  
Solicited input, provided transitional compensation provided fairness -> sales perception of fairness | M   | performance |
| Dubinsky and Skinner         | 2002  | Conceptual paper             | - The author provides a model of antecedents of salespeople's discretionary effort with 25 propositions  
- Intrinsic motivation in personal factors positively influence to salesperson discretionary efforts (Proposition 8). | IM | salesperson discretionary effort |
| Segalla et al.                | 2006  | Scenario based cross-sectional survey | - National culture has significant influence on compensation type and allocation rules managers choose.  
- Managers choose incentive pay for motivation of salespeople while don’t use equity allocations to achieve control and parity | M | Level of incentive, Incentive allocation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Expectancy Theory measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miao et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Cognitive dimensions influence on both IM and EM differently across career stages whereas affective dimensions do indifferently.</td>
<td>IM : Challenge seeking(Cognitive) / Task enjoyment (affective) EM: Compensation seeking (cognitive) / Recognition seeking (affective)</td>
<td>Career stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman and Iacobucci</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey (salespeople) and telephone interview(customers)</td>
<td>Salesperson's IM positively mediates the relationship between firm's orientation and salesperson's adaptive selling behavior</td>
<td>Firms customer orientation - mediators : Salesperson's customer qualification skills / salesperson's role ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao and Evans</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>The combination of capability and outcome control styles have positive impact on salesperson knowledge and IM. The combination of activity control and capability control decrease IM. IM decreases negative impact of role ambiguity on performance</td>
<td>Sales control combination : outcome X capability control, outcome X activity control, capability X activity control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao and Evans</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Interactive effects of OC and CC have positive impact on task enjoyment and recognition seeking. Interactive effects of OC and AC have a positive influence on compensation seeking but negative on task enjoyment. Interactive effects of AC and CC have negative impact on recognition seeking. Compensation seeking has stronger impact on performance of sales when with more new customers but challenge seeking is opposite</td>
<td>Sales control combination : outcome X capability control, outcome X activity control, capability X activity control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner et al.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Motivation for compensation (EM) positively influence performance but this relationship is not significant. Ethical climate influence the relationship between motivation for recognition and job satisfaction.</td>
<td>Pay, recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen and Levin</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Apathetic motivation, IM and EM are different variables and can coexist at times</td>
<td>AM/ IM / EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key findings</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusainova et al.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Literature review of salesperson motivation with several theories including expectancy theory</td>
<td>Motivation less extensively studied than drivers -Internal motivation and external motivation -&gt; performance -Negative outcomes such as role conflict, ambiguity and burnout -Salesperson motivation and Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenure/Job experience is an important factor in the motivation of salespeople. As they have longer experience on their job, salespeople may have better understanding of what they are expected to do, resulting in a positive relationship between tenure and expectancy (Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1977; Evans, Margheim, and Schlacter, 1982; Teas and McElroy, 1986). Teas (1981) failed to find a significant relationship. Ingram and Bellenger (1983) found salespeople with long tenure prefer intrinsic rewards to extrinsic rewards, which is opposite the findings of Churchill, Ford, and Walker, (1979 and Churchill et al., (1985). The latter found that salespeople with short tenure prefer intrinsic rewards. Teas and McElory, (1986) provided a different argument regarding tenure. With regard to causal attribution and expectancy estimate, they suggest that “the essential issue is not tenure on the job, but, rather, what happens during that tenure and how an individual causally interprets what happens” (p.83) and thus, salespeople with successful on task experience will attain a high expectancy estimate for future performance.

Career stage is also the main moderating factor of salespeople's intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. Salespeople's motivation may significantly vary per career stage (Cron, Dubinsky, and Michaels, 1988; Khusainova et al. 2018). Ford et al. (1985) found that the attractiveness of monetary rewards does not vary depending on career stage, while intrinsic rewards tend to be more attractive to early career stage salespeople. Miao, Lund, and Evans (2009) explained how IM and EM change differently per career stage when IM and EM are broken down into cognitive and affective orientations. They suggested that cognitive dimensions influence both IM and EM differently across career stages, whereas affective demotions do indifferently.

(2) Managerial Level Variables

Supervisory style and supervisor relationship: Teas (1981) reported that salespeople’s perception of supervisory style is a potentially salient predictor of salesforce motivation. Chonko
(1986) suggested that a supervisor relationship influences the salesforce’s instrumentality. Lagace, Castleberry, and Ridnour (1993) found that cadres (salespeople who have high-quality relationships between sales managers and salespeople) are higher on extrinsic and intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and evaluation of their managers. Cadres are lower on role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, and role conflict. Kohli (1985) invested the impacts of four different types of supervisory behaviors on salespeople’s motivation. He found that arbitrary and punishment behavior is not related to instrumentalities, Contingent approving behavior is related to extrinsic instrumentalities but not related to intrinsic instrumentalities, upward influencing behavior is positively related to intrinsic instrumentalities but not related to extrinsic and overall instrumentalities, and achievement-oriented behavior is not related to expectancies and instrumentalities.

**Leadership:** Tyagi (1982) found leadership consideration significantly influences both intrinsic and extrinsic instrumentalities. Tyagi (1985a) also found that leadership characteristics such as leader trust and support, interaction and facilitation, and hierarchical influence significantly impacts extrinsic motivation only, but psychological influence impacts both.

**Managerial actions:** Smith, Jones, and Blair (2000) investigated salesperson motivation in a territory realignment. They demonstrated that salesperson motivation is positively influenced by managerial actions taken for territory realignment. Expectancy-based actions are more effective in motivating salespeople whose territory realignment improved sales potential, whereas justice-based actions are more effective for salespeople whose territory realignment decreased sales potential.

**Feedback:** Teas (1981) found that the feedback about a salesperson’s performance is positively related to job status instrumentality. Evans et al. (1982) suggested that the feedback
increases both a salesperson’s expectancy and instrumentality estimates. Tyagi (1985) found that job feedback influences both IM and EM, whereas fellow feedback does not affect IM or EM.

**Salesforce control system:** Miao and Evans (2012) found that the combination of capability and outcome-based control styles positively impacts salesperson knowledge and IM, while the combination of activity control and capability control decreases IM. Miao and Evans (2014) further investigated the control system impact on IM and EM, which were disaggregated to cognitive and affective orientations. They found that the interactive effects of outcome-based control and capability control have a positive impact on task enjoyment (affective orientation of IM) and recognition seeking (cognitive orientation of EM), the interactive effects of outcome control and activity control have a positive influence on task enjoyment, and the interactive effects of activity control and capability control have a negative impact on recognition seeking.

(3) Organization Level Variables

**Organizational culture / Climate:** Tyagi (1982) reported that Organizational climate variables more strongly influence IM than EM. Challenge and variety, role overload, and leadership consideration do not have a significant impact on EM. Tanner et al. (2015) also found that Ethical climate influences the relationship between motivation for recognition and job satisfaction.

**Participation:** “The degree to which a salesperson is able to send information to the organization and have that information influence decision making is termed participation” (Evans et al. 1982, pp. 37). Teas (1981) found that participation is positively related to salespeople’s expectancy and also positively related to salespeople’s goals, self-fulfillment, company relationships, direct performance recognition, and job status instrumentalities. Evans et
al. (1982) suggested that increased participation leads salespeople to consider the organization’s goals as their own goals and thus enhance their motivation to attain them.

Monetary rewards: Lawler (1971) suggested that monetary rewards have a significant, positive impact on both expectancy and instrumentality estimate of salespeople. Oliver (1974) found that incentive is a superior predictor. Ingram and Bellenger (1983) reported that salespeople are more motivated by increased salaries when they are younger, with short job tenure, with larger family size, with lower education levels, or/ and with lower income levels. Miao et al. (2009) reported salespeople who are in the exploration and establishment stage of their career are more motivated by compensation. Segalla et al. (2006) found that sales managers prefer incentive pay among different types of compensation, and this preference is not different across national cultures. Tanner et al. (2015) reported that motivation for compensation positively influences performance, but this relationship is not significant.

Promotion: Ingram and Bellenger, (1983) found that promotion is a more attractive motivational factor to salespeople who are younger, married, with short work experience, with higher income, or/ and with higher self-esteem. Cron et al. (1988) reported that salespeople in the establishment stage of their career are more motivated by promotion. Dubinsky et al. (1994) found that salespeople in the US are more motivated by promotion than in Asia nations such as Japan and Korea.

Recognition: Ingram and Bellenger, (1983) reported that recognition motivates salespeople who are older, unmarried, with long work experience, with small family size, with higher income level, or/ and with higher self-esteem. Cron et al. (1988) reported that formal recognition is an important factor for salespeople's motivation across all career stages. Dubinsky et al. (1994) found that promotion motivates salespeople in the US more than in Asia nations.
such as Japan and Korea, and salespeople in Korea is more motivated by formal recognition than salespeople in Japan. Tanner et al. (2015) reported that ethical climate moderates the relationship between motivation for recognition and job satisfaction.

*Organization support:* Tyagi (1985a) found that leader support has a significant impact on the extrinsic motivation of salespeople. DeCarlo, Teas, and McElroy (1997) suggested that organizational support attribution moderates the linkage between performance and motivation of salespeople.

*Firm’s customer orientation:* Román and Iacobucci (2010) reported that firms’ customer orientation influences salespeople’s IM, and IM mediates the relationship between a firm’s customer orientation and salespeople’s adaptive selling behavior.

(4) Task-related Variables

*Job/Task variety:* Teas (1981) argued that task variety is an important predictor of industrial salespeople's motivation. Evans et al. (1982) suggested that increased variety increases both expectancy and instrumentality. Tyagi (1982) reported that job variety does not have a significant impact on IM and EM, but it significantly influences intrinsic valence and extrinsic valence. However, Tyagi (1985a) reported somewhat differently. He suggested that job variety has a significant impact on IM, not EM.

*Task significance/importance:* Teas (1981) reported that task significance significantly positively influences a salesperson’s global self-fulfillment, customer relationships, and direct performance recognition instrumentalities. Tyagi (1982) suggested that job importance is a significant predictor of both IM and EM, but argued in 1985 that job significance does not significantly impact EM but IM.
Job Autonomy: Teas (1981) reported that job autonomy is an important predictor of industrial salesperson motivation. Tyagi (1985a) found that job autonomy is an influential factor of IM.


Organizational stress: Some literature reported a negative relationship between motivation and organizational stress, such as role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, and subunit conflict (Khusainova, et al., 2018). Tyagi (1982; 1985b) reported that role overload does have a significant impact on IM, not EM. Tyagi (1985b) found that role ambiguity does not significantly influence either IM or EM, but role clarity is positively related to extrinsic instrumentalities but not related to intrinsic and overall instrumentalities (Kohli 1985). Tyagi (1982, 1985b) reported that role conflict is a significant, negative factor for IM and EM. Tyagi (1985b) found that subunit conflict also negatively influences IM and EM.

The trend in Expectancy Theory literature in the Sales Domain

By the mid-1990s, a majority of researchers in the sales domain solely applied expectancy theory and performed various empiric tests (Oliver 1974; Matsui et al. 1977; Teas 1981; Tyagi 1981, 1985a, 1985b; Kolhi 1985; Cron et al.1988; Ingram, Lee and Skinner 1989; Dubinsky et al. 1993, 1994; Lagace et al. 1993). Since the mid-1980s, there has been an argument on expectancy theory that the empirical evidence using multiplication of valence, expectancy, and instrumentality components is inconsistent, and thus the theory may be questioned theoretically (Tyagi 1985b Miao, Lund, and Evans 2009; Kanfer, Frese, and Johnson...
2017; Khusainova et al. 2018). For such reason, some researchers suggested that expectancy, instrumentality, and valence be used individually (Khusainova et al., 2018; Van Eerde and Thierry, 1996). In the reflection of the arguments, recent research does not solely apply expectancy theory but combined theories such as expectancy theory with attribution theory (DeCarlo, Teas, and McElroy 1997), with career stage theory (Miao et al., 2009), and with social cognitive theory (Tanner et al. 2015).

Throughout the literature, there have been various limitations. First, there has been no longitudinal study on salespeople motivation, and thus a strong need for it to understand commonly studied phenomena clearly and consistently in the sales field (Fried et al., 2007; Kanfer et al., 2017; Khusainova et al., 2018; Steel and König, 2006). Another limitation in the literature is that no study has investigated motivation change across all domains. Thus, it remains unknown how motivation variables change and develop over time (Kanfer, Frese, and Johnson 2017). The process by which the motivation variables interact over time has also been uncovered. Third, the current literature lacks the consistency of the sample’s organization tenure, which considerably affects motivation. When individuals start a new career, they have high morale in general. We know the motivation of newly hired salespeople and that of salespeople who have worked for five years are likely to be different. The existing studies all used salespeople as samples regardless of their organizational tenure. Finally, no theory has looked at an initial motivation measure and changes in motivation over time among all of the combined theories. Therefore, an additional theoretical perspective to supplement Expectancy Theory is required to investigate and explain changes from the initial level of motivation over time.

3.2.3 Organizational Socialization Theory
Organizational socialization theory argues that a new hire goes through a socialization process, which consists of three stages to become an insider: pre-entry, encounter to and acquisition of reality, and eventual accommodation to the new organization (Dunford et al., 2012; Feldman, 1981a, 1981b; Nelson, 1987; Wanous, 1992). Organizational socialization theory has evolved with many related topics such as performance (Wiseman et al., 2022), job satisfaction (Bauer et al., 2007), mentoring (Yang et al., 2013), personality characteristics (Harrison et al., 2011), culture (Menguc et al., 2007), but has not been applied to investigate motivation or motivation change.

In this paper, we use the ‘adjustment stage’ for ‘encounter to and acquisition of reality stage’. New employees tend to have positive expectations about their new job and organization through the pre-entry stage, where hiring firms provide favorable information to candidates (Van Maanen, 1975) and often exaggerate positive parts of a new job and their organization (Ilgen, 1971; Wanous, 1974). Those positive expectations lead to positive job attitudes. During the adjustment stage, new employees face a different reality from their expectations and find negative sides of the new job and organization (Nelson, 1987; Wanous, 1992). New employees also experience congruence issues between their ability and the organization’s high demand. Moreover, most firms don’t provide “a unique set of resources and demand for each recruit” (Dubinsky et al., 1986). Especially due to the unique characteristics of a sales job which requires sales performance immediately after a job training, newly hired salespeople may experience more incompatibility between their ability and the organization’s demand. To cope with the incompatibility, new employees put special “cognitive and behavioral effort to master, reduce, or tolerate demands” of the new organization (Nelson, 1987, p. 315). Subsequently, new employees experience decreases in their job attitudes. As socialization proceeds, new employees accumulate
valuable resources (Dunford et al., 2012) such that they can get desirable support from others and acquire strategic information and skill sets (Schriesheim et al., 1998). Menguc et al. (2007) argue that supervisors’ performance feedback-seeking, information seeking, relationship building, and network building are key tactics to improve social interaction and task clarity that enable new employees to successfully accommodate to new organization. As a result, in this accommodation stage, new employees’ resources and abilities may meet or exceed the organization’s demand (Dunford et al., 2012), resulting in an increase in positive job attitudes.

3.2.4 Changes in Attitudes during Early Employment

We believe that the pattern of motivation of newly hired salespeople is not static but dynamic. Socialization theory supports the argument that during the adjustment period, motivation will decline. The adjustment to the new environment, in particular the sales environment, will result in lower motivation during the early adjustment period. After the adjustment period, salespeople who failed in socialization leave (Cheng, 2014; Griffeth and Hom, 2001; Turner, 2008), and salespeople who succeed in socialization will retain and experience an increase in motivation.

Studies of job-related outcomes show that satisfaction and burnout do not follow linear patterns over time. Boswell, Boudreau, and Tichy (2005) proposed and found that satisfaction among executives who voluntarily changed jobs was high at initial employment, then declined, and, in turn, rebounded over a period of 2 years. They referred to this as the honeymoon-hangover effect of satisfaction. Subsequently, Boswell, Shipp, Payne, and Culbertson (2009) found a similar effect and also showed that early outcomes in the new job commitment fulfillment and socialization levels moderated the trajectories of satisfaction. Wang, Hom, and Allen (2017) supported the socialization tactics as moderators for the hangover effects in early
employment. These studies show that the declining pattern of satisfaction and its subsequent upturn is common among newly hired employees who voluntarily left their previous jobs. A negative curvilinear pattern is found in the work of Dunford, et al., (2012) with burnout. They find that burnout is not static but dynamic. The burnout increases after a job change and then leaves off over time, and the burnout pattern is affected by types of career transitions (newcomer vs. internal job changer vs. insider).

3.3 HYPOTHESES

In this section, we conceptualize how motivation changes and what drives the difference in the motivation changes between salespeople. Expectancy Theory and Socialization theory provides a theoretical basis for the current study. The underlying premise is that motivation changes during the socialization process, starting with an initial level of overall motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, as well as the underlying components of Expectancy Theory, salesperson expectancy, instrumentality, and valence.

3.3.1 Changes in Motivation Components Over Time

Expectancy

Expectancy is defined by Vroom (1964) as a belief about the perceived probability that a certain behavior can be followed by the outcome of interest. In other words, it is about the degree to which one believes their exerted effort results in the achievement of a performance goal. However, no matter hard one may work, if they do not have the capability, it is challenging to meet the performance goal. Salespeople who are high in self-perceived ability (self-efficacy) were found to have higher expectancy (Chowdhury, 1993; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Steers et al., 2004; Teas, 1981; Walker et al., 1977). Role clarity is also related to expectancy. Salespeople with high in role clarity better understand what the company expects from them and thus result in
high expectancy (Chehade and El Hajjar, 2016; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Steers et al., 2004). Individuals usually accept a new job when they think they are capable of doing certain requirements, while people do not accept or even do not apply for a new job although the job is very fascinating. However, they may experience a decrease in expectancy because they have to adjust themselves to a new sales environment and meet a sales goal imposed right after initial training simultaneously during the adjustment period. After the adjustment period, salespeople may have a better understanding of what the company expects from them and enhanced skills and knowledge that increase self-efficacy (DeCarlo et al., 1997) such that they may experience an increase in expectancy. Therefore, we hypothesize:

\[ H_1: \text{Expectancy among newly hired salespeople will decline during the adjustment period and then increase afterward, resulting in U-shaped trajectory.} \]

**Instrumentality**

Instrumentality is defined as a belief about the perceived probability that the achieved outcome leads to the achievement of rewards (Vroom, 1964). In other words, it is about the degree to which one believes they will receive rewards once they meet a performance goal. If there are no rewards to compensate for their effort, although they achieve the desired performance set by a firm, they may lose their belief of instrumentality and thus motivation to achieve the goal. Intrinsic rewards such as personal growth, enjoyment of tasks, and an increased feeling of self-esteem are awarded by the individual himself after completing the certain tasks (Khusainova et al., 2018; Mallin et al., 2017; Miner, 2015). Therefore, intrinsic instrumentality is related to role and task variables such as job clarity and task significance (Tyagi, 1985a). Salespeople who understand their tasks clearly would also know whether they can achieve self-enjoyment through the tasks or not. Salespeople who perceive that their tasks and roles are very
important and significant are more likely to experience enhanced feelings of accomplishment when they complete the tasks (Tyagi, 1982). However, during the adjustment period, new salespeople may be still unclear about their role and responsibility as they face reality and experience incompatibility, resulting in a decrease in instrumentality. Once they complete accommodation to the new organization, salespeople have a clear understanding of the organization’s demand and resources to meet organization goals such that they have more room to enjoy tasks and, in turn, enhanced intrinsic instrumentality. Similarly, Dunford et al. (2012) found the trajectory of emotional exhaustion of new employees where a level of emotional exhaustion increases during the adjustment period and then leaves off overtime once new employees accommodate to the new organization. Considering a negative relationship between emotional exhaustion and self-esteem (Kemp et al., 2013) and self-esteem is one of the sources of intrinsic instrumentality, I assume that the trajectory of intrinsic instrumentality follows a negatively similar pattern of emotional exhaustion during early employment.

H2: Intrinsic instrumentality among newly hired salespeople will decline during the adjustment period and then increase after an adjustment period, resulting in a U-shaped trajectory.

Extrinsic rewards such as recognition, promotion, and salary increases are awarded by organizations after individuals meet the performance goal set by the organization (Khusainova et al., 2018; Mallin et al., 2017; Miner, 2015). Extrinsic instrumentality, thus, is related to organizational culture and systems such as trust in management (Tyagi, 1985a), human resource practices, management control systems (Miao and Evans, 2014), and organization climate (Tanner et al., 2015). When salespeople start new jobs, they usually have some knowledge of roles and responsibilities although a recruiting process but have limited knowledge of trust in management, organizational culture, and system. While salespeople go through socialization
during the adjustment period, they learn knowledge of the organizational system, such as how performance is evaluated and organizational rewards are awarded. They also build trust in management and thus believe that rewards are fairly awarded for their performance.

Salespeople would experience an increase in their extrinsic instrumentality with enhanced understanding and knowledge of the organization after the adjustment period, although they experience low extrinsic instrumentality because of limited knowledge and thus confounding in new environments during the adjustment period. Therefore, we hypothesize,

$$H_3:$$ Extrinsic instrumentality among newly hired salespeople will be low during the adjustment period and then increase after an adjustment period.

**Valence**

Valence refers to the desirability of the reward to be attained from desired performance to an individual (Dubinsky et al., 1993; Oliver, 1974; Vroom, 1964). Valence is associated with the degree of an individual’s attractiveness of the rewards to the individual (Robbins 2009). Intrinsic valence is the desirability of intrinsic rewards such as self-enjoyment, the feeling of fulfillment, and persona growth, while extrinsic valence is the desirability of extrinsic rewards such as job security, recognition, and promotion.

When salespeople start new jobs, they first try to adjust themselves to a new organization and do not have much room to consider self-enjoyment through their tasks. They may be more interested in organizational rewards than self-rewards during an adjustment period. Organization rewards are usually awarded to those who make contributions to the organization and thus can be regarded as outcomes of new salespeople's successful accommodation to the new organization. In such interests, salespeople may experience an increase in extrinsic valence and a decrease in intrinsic valence. However, once salespeople adapt to the new organization and prove their
required capability through the first performance evaluation, usually done between six months and one year, salespeople are likely to have room to consider their own enjoyment of tasks and a less strong desire for organizational rewards compared to adjustment period in terms of priority. Thus, we expect the intrinsic and extrinsic valences to grow in opposite directions. Therefore, we hypothesize:

H₄: Intrinsic valence among newly hired salespeople will be low and then decline during the adjustment period and then increase after an adjustment period.

H₅: Extrinsic valence among newly hired salespeople will increase during the early adjustment and then no decrease after an adjustment period.

**Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Overall Motivation**

Due to the nature of the multiplicative relationship of expectancy (H₁), intrinsic instrumentality(H₂), and intrinsic valence (H₄) for intrinsic motivation and of expectancy (H₁), extrinsic instrumentality (H₃) and extrinsic valence (H₅), the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation trajectories depend on each components’ change. Accordingly, intrinsic components grow in the same directions, whereas extrinsic components grow in the opposite directions, such that the intrinsic motivation trajectory will be a fast U shape and the extrinsic motivation trajectory will be a slow U shape. Therefore, we hypothesize,

H₆: Intrinsic motivation among newly hired salespeople will decline during the adjustment period and then increase after an adjustment period, resulting in a U-shaped trajectory.

H₇: Extrinsic motivation among newly hired salespeople will not significantly change over during early employment.

Overall motivation is composed of the sum of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Due to the nature of motivation based on the Expectancy Theory of motivation, the overall motivation growth curve is derived from intrinsic and extrinsic change trajectories. Because we expect that
intrinsic motivation significantly changes and makes a U-shaped trajectory and that extrinsic motivation does not significantly change over time, the shape of overall motivation change would result from intrinsic motivation. Therefore, we hypothesize,

\[ H_8: \text{Overall motivation among newly hired salespeople will decline during the adjustment period and then increase after an adjustment period, resulting in a U-shaped trajectory.} \]

3.3.2 Moderators of Changes in Motivation Components

This last part of the hypothesis attempts to demonstrate what alters a general temporal pattern of motivation among newly hired salespeople, whereas the first part of the hypothesis attempts to discover the trajectory of motivation change among newly hired salespeople over time during their early employment. We predict that the motivation change of salespeople may be affected by pre-employment experiences and onboarding experiences. Specially we examine the moderating effects of industry-specific sales experience among pre-employment experiences and a RJP among onboarding experiences. Industry and task-specific experience and RJP have not been explored in motivation literature in the sales domain, although they have played critical roles in literature in other disciplines such as psychology and economics (Chehade and El Hajjar, 2016; Gibbons and Waldman, 2004; Judge and Cable, 1997; Neal, 1995; Wanous, 1974). We expect these two factors also play critical roles in temporal changes in motivation among newly hired salespeople during their early employment.

*Industry-specific sales experience*

Previous similar professional experience can lead to better performance. Newly hired employees with similar work experience can be adjusted more quickly to a new work environment and can make a performance with existing relevant knowledge than others who do not have similar professional experience (Gibbons and Waldman, 2004; Neal, 1995). Moreover,
sales jobs in some industries need more professional knowledge. For example, in the insurance sales industry, previous insurance sales experience would be beneficial because understanding insurance policy and financing calculations is not easy. Moreover, there are too many different insurance products. Experienced salespeople can better persuade customers to purchase their insurance products with expert knowledge of insurance products, resulting in a good performance. Such salespeople have high self-efficacy because they already know what to do and are more confident that they will make performance more quickly than others without insurance sales experience. High self-efficacy leads to high expectancy and, in turn, high motivation (Chehade and El Hajjar, 2016; Chowdhury, 1993; Kohli, 1985; Román and Iacobucci, 2010; Teas, 1981; Tyagi, 1985).

However, these comparatively positive effects of industry-specific sales experience on motivation may gradually diminish after a certain period. After the adjustment period where socialization takes place, all salespeople become those with industry-specific sales experience. Therefore, salespeople with insurance sales experience are likely to experience a higher level of expectancy and motivation initially and a weaker decline during the adjustment period, but they are not likely to show the difference in expectancy and motivation change, compared to the natural pattern, after the adjustment period.

H₀: Industry-specific sales experience will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that industry-specific sales experience will be positively related to a higher start and weaker decline in expectancy of salespeople during the adjustment period.

H₁₀: Industry-specific sales experience will moderate the change in the motivation of salespeople, such that industry-specific sales experience will be positively related to a higher start and weaker decline in motivation of salespeople during the adjustment period.

Realistic Job Preview
Realistic job preview (RJP) derives from realism. Realism in socialization literature means the extent to which newly hired employees accurately understand reality in the new organization. (Barksdale et al. 2003). Realism is assessed by perceptions of RJP. RJP is attained by presenting job candidates with both favorable and unfavorable information about a job itself, roles and responsibilities, supervisor, team, work environment, and organization (Breaugh, 1983). The RJP decreases the discrepancies between the perception of the job and the organization before getting the job and the reality the candidates will face after getting the job in the workplace (Ingram and Siga, 2015). In this interest, a RJP is a critical issue for fit between the candidate and the job (Ingram and Siga, 2015; T. Judge and Cable, 1997; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Barksdale et al. (2003) found that a RJP improves the role clarity of Salesforce. Role clarity can improve outcome expectancy, intrinsic instrumentality, and extrinsic instrumentality, resulting in enhanced intrinsic, extrinsic, and global motivation of the salesforce (Kohli, 1985; Roman and Iacobucci, 2010). For example, salespeople who understand their role clearly via a RJP can be more confident that their efforts on the job will lead to good performance (expectancy). They are also more likely to perceive that their performance will be appropriately rewarded with organizational outcomes (extrinsic instrumentality) and intrinsic outcomes (intrinsic instrumentality) (Kohli, 1985; Tyagi, 1985a; Walker et al., 1977).

With respect to the temporal change of motivation, a higher level of RJP can mitigate the natural drop after a honeymoon period, the first couple of months of a new job, whereas those with a low level of RJP are likely to experience a stronger decline. Salespeople with a high level of perception on RJP are likely have less disillusionment when they actually face negative sides of their jobs which they have already been aware of. New hires tend to have high expectations about a new job because of the newness and positive sides of a new job (Boswell et al., 2005,
2009). Furthermore, in the case that newly hired salespeople do not have information on negative features of the new job because of a low level of RJP, their expectancy and instrumentality could be exaggerated at the beginning of the job. According to the role of realism (Phillips, 1998; Wanous, 1977), the exaggerated expectations are followed by subsequent disappointments (Boswell et al., 2009), resulting in a stronger drop in intrinsic, extrinsic, and thus global motivation. During the accommodation stage, the natural recovery period of motivation which comes after the adjustment stage, we expect that the recovery patterns are also different. The salespeople who experienced a strong drop in motivation due to a low level of the perception of RJP may have a high probability of having turnover intention, and those with high turnover intention have negative job attitudes. Considerable studies reported that a RJP is significantly associated to turnover or/and turnover intention (e.g., Barksdale Jr et al., 2003; Earnest et al., 2011; Phillips, 1998), and turnover intention is related to negative job attitudes (e.g., Griffeth et al., 2000; Hom and Kinicki, 2001; Janssen et al., 1999). Thus, those salespeople are likely to remain with low expectancy, intrinsic, and extrinsic instrumentality, resulting in a slower recovery of motivation during the accommodation period, the natural recovery period.

H11: Realistic job preview will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that a low level of RJP will be related to a lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in expectancy of salespeople during the early employment.

H12: RJP will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that a low level of RJP will be related to a lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in the intrinsic instrumentality of salespeople during the early employment.

H13: RJP will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that low level of RJP will be related to lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in the intrinsic motivation of salespeople during the early employment.

H14: RJP will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that a low level of RJP will be related to a lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in the extrinsic instrumentality of salespeople during the early employment.
$H_{15}$: RJP will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that a low level of RJP will be related to a lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in the extrinsic motivation of salespeople during the early employment.

$H_{16}$: RJP will moderate the change in expectancy of salespeople, such that a low level of RJP will be related to a lower start, stronger decline, and slower recovery in the motivation of salespeople during the early employment.

### 3.4 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.4.1 Context: The Early Employment

This presented dissertation focuses on salespeople during their early employment period within their current organization. The early employment period is critical to salespeople as well as firms in that socialization takes place during this period, and job attitudes and job performance change over time in different directions.

The early employment period in the sales environment is critical because salespeople go through socialization during this period. In the process of socialization, they learn organizational culture and task-related skills, including technical as well as social skills for coworkers and customers. According to socialization theory, socialization has a significant impact on job attitudes and job performance (Bauer et al., 2007; Cheng, 2014; Hart et al., 2003).

Moreover, the early employment period is important to investigate the relationship between salespeople’s job attitudes and job performance in that growth natures of job attitudes and performance have different directions over time. Previous research found that the level of job satisfaction was highest when an individual joined a firm and gradually decreased to a certain level (Boswell et al., 2005, 2009). An employee’s level of morale also drastically decreases after their first six months and then steadily declines for years (Sirota et al., 2011). Meanwhile, the level of performance gradually increased to a certain level and then decreased over time, presenting an inverted U shape (Avolio et al., 1990; McEvoy and Cascio, 1989; Sturman et al.,
2012). Unlike during the mid to late employment period, where both salespeople’s job satisfaction and performance decrease or maintain a certain low level, salespeople experience negative growth in job satisfaction and positive growth of job performance during the early employment period. Therefore, each employment period may differently impact the interaction of salespeople’s job attitudes and job performance.

### 3.4.2 Sample and Data description

The participants of this research are approximately 5,000 salespeople in the insurance industry across the United States and Canada. They are full-time, multiple-line exclusive salesforces from 60 different insurance companies. The dataset consists of the responses from four surveys conducted at the beginning of employment, six months, one year, and two years.

There were 5,090 newly hired salespeople answering the initial questionnaire for a response rate of 27 percent. The questionnaire measured main constructs such as expectancy, instrumentalities, valences, feedback, turnover intention, RJP, training, commitment, managerial powers, and efforts. In addition, the first questionnaire included the personal influences such as demographic information, job expectation, and circumstance of job choice (Pierce and Dunham 1987; Johnston, Parasuraman, Futrell and Black 1990). The following questionnaires were sent to the salespeople who answered the previous questionnaire.

The second questionnaire was sent to the salespeople who answered the first questionnaire and were still in the same company after six months of their employment. 2,488 salespeople answered the second survey at a response rate of 48.88 percent. The third questionnaire was sent to 2,488 sales representatives one year and answered by 1,685 (67.72%) who did not leave their companies. The fourth questionnaire was sent to 1,685 salespeople and answered by 947 (56.20%) at their two years of employment. The final dataset includes four
different consists of the responses of 1,685 salespeople who answered at least one questionnaire. We deleted 249 respondents who answered in only one survey because one-time responses does not include time effects. The final sample comprises 1,436 salespeople who answered more than two surveys.

To reduce common method bias the data collection adheres to recommendations for a priori and post hoc methods (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Kock, Berbekova, & Assaf, 2021). The survey used a longitudinal design (Jap and Anderson 2004), different question formats (e.g., Likert scale, single choice scale, multiple-choice, open-ended), and changed the order of questions between administrations (Hulland et al. 2017).

### 3.4.3 Measures

#### Motivation components

Motivation variables have different measurement scales. Valance and instrumentality items were measured by 5-point Likert scale only whereas expectancy item was measured by 0-100 scale and 5-point Likert scale. Motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation were calculated by the formula Walker et al. (1997) defined.

**Valence:** Valence measure consists of eight items categorized into four intrinsic valance items and four extrinsic valance items by exploratory factor analysis (Appendix 2). The reliabilities, means and standard deviations of intrinsic and extrinsic valance respectively are .78 and .76 (Cronbach’s alpha), 4.04 and 3.14 (means), and 0.76 and 1.09 (std deviations). The items were assessed by a five-point scale which asks salespeople: “Below is a list of outcomes that a person may receive from working. Use scale provided to rate the outcomes according to how desirable it is to you.” The response scales are 1 = not desirable; 2 = somewhat desirable; 3 = desirable; 4 = very desirable; 5 = extremely desirable.
**Instrumentality:** Instrumentality was measured with the same eight items as those used to measure valance. Eight items were consistently divided into four intrinsic valance items and four extrinsic valance items by exploratory factor analysis (Appendix 3). Although we use the same response items, the questions asking valance and instrumentality are different. The items were assessed using a five-point scale that asks: “Now consider your current position and how well you are doing. Using the same outcomes, what are the chances that you will achieve each of the outcomes from your current job? Rate it using the scale below.” The scales were 1 = no chance at all; 2 = a small chance; 3 = a moderate chance; 4 = a good chance; 5 = an extremely good chance. The reliabilities of the intrinsic and extrinsic instrumentality measure, assessed by Cronbach’s alpha, are .88 and .85, respectively. The means are 4.09 and 3.48. Standard deviations are .81 and 1.03.

**Expectancy:** Expectancy was measured by two items. Respondents were asked “How likely is it that you will succeed in your current position? Place on “X” on the scale below to indicate your chance of success. 100 being the greatest chance and zero representing no chance of success.” The respondents were also asked “ Rate the following statement according to how much you agree or disagree.” The statement “I believe I will be very successful in this position” was rated on a 5-point scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Due to the different measurement scales, the first item with 0-100 scale was divided by 20. The reliability of expectancy by Cronbach’s alpha is .735. The mean is 4.19, and the standard deviation is .73.

**Moderators**

*Insurance sales experience and other sales experience (non-insurance):* The respondents were asked, “which of following best describes your occupation prior to your current position?” The respondents answered by checking one from 17 different occupations, including “insurance
sales” and “other sales (non-insurance)”. For the insurance sales experience variable, “insurance sales experience” was coded as 1, and the others were 0. For other sales experiences, “other sales (non-insurance) was coded as 1, and the others were 0. The mean and standard deviation are .20 and .01 for insurance sales experience and .19 and .01 for other sales experiences.

*Realistic job preview:* RJP was measured on the first survey by new hires. The construct consists of two items, and we used the average of two items. The first item was “how accurate was what you were told about your current position before contracting and during your initial training?” The respondents answered by five-point scale that ranges from 5 = very accurate; 4 = somewhat accurate; 3 = neither accurate not inaccurate; 2 = somewhat inaccurate; 1 = very inaccurate. The respondents were asked for the other item, “Rate the statement below according to how much you agree or disagree.” The five-point scale used for this item was 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral / do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree. The reliability by Cronbach’s alpha is .74. The mean is 4.08, and the standard deviation is .92.

*Control Variables:* For all analyses, we controlled for four important variables that are likely to produce alternative explanations for motivation changes: Age, gender, education, and training. Prior research suggested that age is negatively related to motivation (Churchill, Ford, and Walker, 1979, Churchill, et al., 1985; Judge and Hulin, 1993; Sturman, 2003). Age was measured in the initial survey, and 1 was added every year. There may be gender impacts on motivation because important gender effects were found in the perception of organizational support and stress (Rutherford et al., 2014) that are closely related to motivation (DeCarlo et al., 1997; Kemp et al., 2013; Tyagi, 1982, 1985a). *Gender* was coded as a dummy variable into 0 = male and 1 = female. *Education* was also added as a control variable given its potential role to valance and, thus, motivation (Churchill, Ford and Walker, 1979). Associate or higher degree
was coded to 1 and otherwise was 0. Training improves self-efficacy (Barksdale Jr et al., 2003; Gist, 1989; Saks, 1995; Tannenbaum et al., 1991), which is one of the key factors that increase expectancy and, thus, motivation (Chowdhury, 1993; Teas, 1981). Moreover, some training programs are specifically designed to improve trainees’ motivation (Kanfer and Ackerman, 1989; Tannenbaum et al., 1991). Thus, we included training to control variables. Training was measured by twelve items with a 6-point scale in the second survey. We use the average of the responses about twelve items for Training measure. Twelve items includes (1) Activity plans and review, (2) Case preparation and review, (3) Advanced underwriting, (4) Agency meetings/classes, (5) New agent class, (6) Answering your questions, (7) Role playing, (8) Joint calls, (9) Self-study training sessions, (10) Selling skills, (11) Home office training sessions, (12) Product/technical knowledge. Respondents were asked, “how would you rate the training you have received in each of the following areas?” 0 = received none; 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = neutral/unsure; 4 = good; 5 = very good. The alpha for the reliability of items is 0.88. The mean is 3.257, and the standard deviation is 1.36.

3.4.4 Model Specification

We investigate the trajectory of motivation, and its components change among newly hired salespeople and moderating effects of pre-employment experience and onboarding experience. To examine changes in a salesperson’s (1) expectancy, (2) intrinsic/ (3) extrinsic instrumentality, (4) intrinsic/ (5) extrinsic valence, (6) intrinsic/ (7) extrinsic motivation, (8) motivation, we need to develop eight models. Except for a motivation type as a dependent variable, all of the eight models have the same structure and same components. Therefore, we explain this model (Model 1 in Table 3) based on the model for motivation (8) here. The model is of the form:
Salespeople Motivation Growth Curve: Model 1

Level-1 Model

\[ Motivation_{ij} = \pi_0i + \pi_{1i}(TIME_{ti}) + \pi_{2i}(TIME^2_{ti}) + e_{ti} \]

Level-2 Model

\[ \pi_0i = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01i}(Age_i) + \beta_{02i}(Gender_i) + \beta_{03i}(Education_i) + \beta_{04i}(Training_i) + r_{0i} \]
\[ \pi_{1i} = \beta_{10} + r_{1i} \]
\[ \pi_{2i} = \beta_{20} + r_{2i} \]

Mixed Model

\[ Motivation_{ii} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01i}(Age_i) + \beta_{02i}(Gender_i) + \beta_{03i}(Education_i) + \beta_{04i}(Training_i) \]
\[ + \beta_{10i}(Time_{ti}) \]
\[ + \beta_{20i}(Time^2_{ti}) \]
\[ + r_{0i} + r_{1i}(Time_{ti}) + r_{2i}(Time^2_{ti}) + e_{ii} \]

Motivation is the dependent variable, and time variables are used as predictors. A linear model is our baseline model, and quadratic is added to find the best fit. The coefficients \( \beta_{10} \) and \( \beta_{20} \) in Mixed Model are used to test hypotheses 1 through 8. The terms \( r_{0i} \), \( r_{1i} \) and \( r_{2i} \) are random effects, which represent unobserved time invariant characteristics of individuals. These random effects allow the intercept, and coefficients for time and time squared to vary randomly across persons. Random variation means that the covariance between these parameters and the independent variables in the model is forced to be 0; hence the model does not control for these unobserved characteristics.

To test hypotheses 9 through 16 we use a second model (Model 2 in Table 3) which is of the following form, again using the example of the outcome Motivation.
Salespeople Motivation Growth Curve: Model 2

Level-1 Model

\[ \text{Motivation}_{ij} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i} \ast (TIME_{ij}) + \pi_{2i} \ast (TIME^2_{ij}) + e_{ij} \]

Level-2 Model

\[ \pi_{0i} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{02} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{03} \ast (RJP_i) + \beta_{04} \ast (\text{Age}_i) + \beta_{05} \ast (\text{Gender}_i) + \beta_{06} \ast (\text{Education}_i) + \beta_{07} \ast (\text{Training}_i) + r_{0i} \]
\[ \pi_{1i} = \beta_{10} + \beta_{11} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{12} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{13} \ast (RJP_i) + r_{1i} \]
\[ \pi_{2i} = \beta_{20} + \beta_{21} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{22} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{23} \ast (RJP_i) + r_{2i} \]

Mixed Model

\[ \text{Motivation}_i = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{02} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i) + \beta_{03} \ast (RJP_i) + \beta_{04} \ast (\text{Age}_i) + \beta_{05} \ast (\text{Gender}_i) + \beta_{06} \ast (\text{Education}_i) + \beta_{07} \ast (\text{Training}_i) + \beta_{10} \ast (\text{Time}_i) + \beta_{11} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i \ast \text{Time}_i) + \beta_{12} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i \ast \text{Time}_i) + \beta_{13} \ast (RJP_i \ast \text{Time}_i) + \beta_{20} \ast (\text{Time}^2_i) + \beta_{21} \ast (\text{Insurance Sales Experience}_i \ast \text{Time}^2_i) + \beta_{22} \ast (\text{Other Sales Experience}_i \ast \text{Time}^2_i) + \beta_{23} \ast (RJP_i \ast \text{Time}^2_i) + r_{0i} + r_{1i} \ast (\text{Time}_i) + r_{2i} \ast (\text{Time}^2_i) + e_{ii} \]

In model 2, the coefficients \( \beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \beta_{21} \) and \( \beta_{22} \) in mixed model are used to test hypotheses 9 and 10 and the coefficients \( \beta_{13} \) and \( \beta_{23} \) are used to test hypotheses 11 through 16. The terms \( r_{0i}, r_{1i}, \) and \( r_{2i} \) are the random effects for Model 2. The form for Model 2 for expectancy is identical to the sample Model 2 for motivation above. For intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, the interaction terms between insurance sales and other sales experience with time and time squared are not included in Model 2, since hypotheses about the moderating effect of sales experience do not apply to these outcomes. No Model 2 is estimated for extrinsic valence or intrinsic valence.
3.4.5 Model Estimation

We run the hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) and STATA with a full maximum likelihood function to test the hypotheses. The full maximum likelihood function allows using missing data at a one or more time point such that the entire sample of respondents (N = 1,436) can be used. To estimate Model 1 and Model 2, mixed models are used.

3.5 RESULTS

Descriptive statistics and correlation are summarized in Table 5. To test Hypotheses 1 through 8, we ran eight versions of model 1 described above, one for each of the eight outcome variables and used the coefficients for time and time squared determine the shape of Expectancy (H1), Intrinsic Instrumentality (H2), Extrinsic Instrumentality (H3), Intrinsic Valance (H4), Extrinsic Motivation (H5), Intrinsic Motivation (H6), extrinsic motivation (H7), and global motivation changes over time (H8). We ran a linear model and quadratic model with each dependent variable and compared model improvements. By a general linear hypothesis test, we found a quadratic model is a better fit for all dependent variables except for Intrinsic Valance. In the Model 1, the linear coefficient and quadratic coefficient depict an overall linear trend and strength of a curve, respectively.

Hypothesis 1 proposed that salespeople’s Expectancy will grow in a U-shaped trajectory. As shown in Table 3, we found significant linear (β = -.46, p < .001) and quadratic (β = .16, p < .001) trends. To find a better model fit, we ran a general linear hypothesis test and found a quadratic model is a significantly better fit to our data ($\chi^2$ (03) = 1256.40, p < .000). The growth trajectory of Expectancy show in Figure 2 finds a negative linear trend until a significant turn at $T_{1.5}$ and then a positive trend. This result supports H1.
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>- .06*</td>
<td>- .12*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RJP</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ISE</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>- .13*</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .11*</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OSE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .06*</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .25*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. E (T0)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. E (T0.5)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. E (T1)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .08*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. E (T2)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. II (T0)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. II (T0.5)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .07*</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. II (T1)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .08*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. II (T2)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>- .08*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*... Continued*) Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. EI (T0)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. EI (T0.5)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. EI (T1)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. EI (T2)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. IV (T0)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. IV (T0.5)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. IV (T1)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. IV (T2)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. EV (T0)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. EV (T0.5)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. EV (T1)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. EV (T2)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Ei (T0)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ei (T0.5)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ei (T1)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ei (T2)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. IV (T0)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. IV (T0.5)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. IV (T1)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. IV (T2)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. EV (T0)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. EV (T0.5)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. EV (T1)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. EV (T2)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses 2 described Intrinsic Instrumentality’s growth trajectory of initial decrease followed by an upward trend. The results demonstrate significant linear ($\beta = -.10, p < .001$) and quadratic ($\beta = .07, p < .001$) trends. A general linear hypothesis test confirmed that a quadratic model has a significantly better fit to our data ($\chi^2 (03) = 45.44, p < .001$). Intrinsic Instrumentality grows in a negative linear trend until its bottom point between $T_{.5}$ and $T_1$, and then rebounds until leaving off at $T_2$. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypotheses 3 proposed that salespeople’s Extrinsic Instrumentality will grow in an upward trend during the accommodation period following a stationary state during the adjustment period. We found an insignificant linear trend ($\beta = -.06, p < .10$) and a significant quadratic ($\beta = .06, p < .001$) trend. A quadratic model was chosen by a general linear hypothesis test for a better fit between linear and quadratic models ($\chi^2 (03) = 47.95, p < .001$). Figure 2 (3) depicts no visible change between $T_0$ and $T_1$, followed by an overall upward trend between $T_1$ and $T_2$. The pattern is compatible with Hypothesis 3. To further confirm Hypothesis 3, we also examined changes between $T_0$ and $T_1$ and between $T_1$ and $T_2$ by chi-square test. The results demonstrated extrinsic instrumentalities at $T_0$ and $T_1$ are not significantly different ($\chi^2 (01) = 2.29, p = .13$), whereas those at $T_1$ and $T_2$ are significantly different ($\chi^2 (01) = 4.72, p = .02$). All together, these results support Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4 focused on the change of Intrinsic Valance, proposing that its growth trajectory will be in a U shape. We ran a linear model and a quadratic model of Intrinsic Valence and found a quadratic model did not improve model fit from a linear model ($\chi^2 (03) = 2.91, p \geq .500$). Based on the law of parsimony, we chose a linear model for Intrinsic Valance. As in Table 3, Intrinsic Valance grows in a positive linear trend ($\beta = .05, p < .01$), not in a U shape, until it leaves off at $T_2$. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is not supported.
Hypothesis 5 focused on Extrinsic Valance change in the opposite direction to Intrinsic Valance, proposing that it will grow in the inverted U-shape trajectory. The result in Table 3 shows that Extrinsic Valance has significant linear ($\beta = .12, p < .001$) and quadratic ($\beta = -.06, p < .001$) trends. A general linear hypothesis test result shows that a quadratic model is a better fit for our data ($\chi^2 (0.3) = 25.64, p < .001$). As shown in Figure 2, Extrinsic Valance trends upward before turning downward at T1. The results support Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6 proposed that Intrinsic Motivation would show an initial decrease followed by a turning point to an upward trend, resulting in a strong, U-shaped trajectory. The pattern in the result is consistent with Hypothesis 6. We found significant linear ($\beta = -.64, p < .000$) and quadratic ($\beta = .29, p < .000$) trends. Based on a general linear hypothesis test, we confirmed that a quadratic model is better fitted for our data ($\chi^2 (0.3) = 55.71, p < .001$). The growth trajectory of Intrinsic Motivation shows a downward trend until the lowest point at T1, followed by an upward trend to leave off. Hypothesis 6 is supported.

Hypothesis 7 described the growth trajectory of Extrinsic Motivation as a U-shape. The results show a significant linear ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$) and quadratic ($\beta = .11, p < .05$) trends. A general linear hypothesis test confirmed quadratic model is a significantly better fit for our data ($\chi^2 (0.3) = 26.64, p < .001$). Extrinsic Motivation trends downward by the lowest point at T1 and then rebounds. Its growth pattern depicts a weak U-shape. The results support Hypothesis 7.

Hypothesis 8 proposed that Motivation will grow in a downward trend during the adjustment period and then in an upward trend during the accommodation period. The result found a significant linear ($\beta = -.89, p < .001$) and quadratic ($\beta = .40, p < .001$) trends. A general linear hypothesis test confirmed that a quadratic model is a winner in terms of model fit for our
Motivation changes in a downward trend by T1 and in an upward trend to level off at T2. These results support Hypothesis 8.

For further analysis involving moderators in Hypotheses 9 through 16, we chose a linear model for Intrinsic Valance and a quadratic model for the others as a baseline and then included interaction terms between variables for imposed previous job experience and realistic job preview variables and the variable(s) for time. Hypotheses 9 focused on a moderating effect of previous job experience on the pattern of Expectancy change and proposed that newly hired salespeople would have higher Expectancy value at the start (T0) and weaker Expectancy decline during the adjustment period when they had the same industry and task specific experience (insurance sales experience) as a new job. As shown in Table 3, the results found that a significantly higher Expectancy value at the start (T0) emerged among salespeople with insurance sales experience ($\beta = .19, p < .001$), but insurance sales experience did not interact with linear ($\beta = -.07, p > .10$) or quadratic ($\beta = .04, p > .10$) terms. Thus, salespeople with the same industry and task-specific experience have higher Expectancy when they start a new job, but this does not influence the trajectory of Expectancy change over time (Figure 3), and Hypothesis 9 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 10 also focused on the moderating effect of previous job experience and described a higher Motivation level at the beginning (T0) and a weaker Motivation decline among newly hired salespeople with industry and task-specific job experience during the adjustment period. Similar to previous job experience’s moderating effect on Expectancy, the results found a significantly higher initial Motivation level at T0 ($\beta = .79, p < .01$) but no significant interaction between insurance sales experience and linear ($\beta = -.56, p < .10$) or quadratic ($\beta = .26, p < .10$) terms of Motivation change. Therefore, newly hired salespeople with
the same industry and task-specific experience start a new job with higher Motivation and maintain higher Motivation over time than those without this experience. However, this industry task-specific experience does not alter the pattern of Motivation change (Figure 3). Altogether Hypothesis 10 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 11 examined the moderating effect of the perception of the RJP and proposed that salespeople with a low level of perception of RJP would be related to a lower start (T₀), greater decline, and slower recovery of the Expectancy growth curve than those with a high level of perception of RJP. As shown in Table 3, we found that the coefficient of the interaction between the RJP and the linear term was negative and significant (β = -.10, p < .01), whereas that of the interaction with the quadratic term was positive and significant at only one-tailed test (β = .03, p < .10), resulting in marginal support for moderating effect of RJP on Expectancy change. However, part of the hypothesis was supported as the RJP had a positive, significant impact on Expectancy at T₀ (β = .18, p < .001). Therefore, Salespeople with a low level of RJP have significantly lower Expectancy at the initial period of employment, less decline, and slower recovery but this moderating effect is marginally apparent. Thus, Hypothesis 11 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 12 focused on RJP as a moderator for Intrinsic Instrumentality change over time and described that a low level of realistic job preview would be associated with a lower start (T₀), greater decline, and slower recovery of Intrinsic Instrumentality pattern over time. We found that RJP positively affects an initial level of Intrinsic Instrumentality (β = .14, p < .001) and that a realistic job preview significantly interacts with the linear term (β = -.09, p < .01) but only significantly interact with the quadratic term at one tail test (β = .02, p < .10) (Table 6). Salespeople with a lower level of a RJP start their new job with lower Intrinsic
Instrumentality, and their Intrinsic Instrumentality stays lower than that of salespeople who started a new job with a high level of RJP, but they do not experience a decline nor recovery in their Intrinsic Instrumentality. Together, Hypothesis 12 was partially supported.

Table 6: Hierarchical Linear Models Predicting Motivation Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expectancy</th>
<th>Intrinsic Instrumentality</th>
<th>Extrinsic Instrumentality</th>
<th>Intrinsic Valence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>-0.04***</td>
<td>-0.48***</td>
<td>-0.10***</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.00*</td>
<td>-0.00**</td>
<td>-0.00**</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJP</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x RJP</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x OSE</td>
<td>0.17†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x ISE</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x RJP</td>
<td>-0.03†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x OSE</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x ISE</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.35***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05 (two-tailed tests); † p < .05 (one-tailed test).

Note: RJP = Realistic Job Preview. OSE = Other Sales Experience. ISE = Insurance Sales Experience.
Table 6: Hierarchical Linear Models Predicting Motivation Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extrinsic Valence</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.64***</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>-.06***</td>
<td>-.06***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>-0.01*</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.06†</td>
<td>-0.06†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJP</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x RJP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x OSE</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear x ISE</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x RJP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x OSE</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic x ISE</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.10***</td>
<td>3.11***</td>
<td>7.40***</td>
<td>7.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05 (two-tailed tests); † p < .05 (one-tailed test)
Note: RJP= Realistic Job Preview. OSE= Other Sales Experience. ISE= Insurance Sales Experience.
Figure 2. Growth Trajectories of Salesperson Motivations over Time
Figure 3. Moderating Effects of Previous Job Experience

![Graph showing the moderating effects of previous job experience.](image)

Note: Redline = the High level (75th percentile) of realistic job preview; blue line = low level (25th percentile) of realistic job preview.

Figure 4. Moderating Effects of Realistic Job Preview

![Graph showing the moderating effects of realistic job preview.](image)

(1) Extrinsic Instrumentality
(2) Extrinsic Motivation
(3) Motivation

Note: Redline = the High level (75th percentile) of realistic job preview; blue line = low level (25th percentile) of realistic job preview.
Hypothesis 13 proposed a lower start ($T_0$), greater decline, and slower recovery in Extrinsic Instrumentality of salespeople with a lower level of RJP. As shown in Table 6, the initial level of Extrinsic Instrumentality is significantly affected by RJP ($\beta = .12, p < .001$), and both linear and quadratic terms significantly interacted with RJP ($\beta = -.09, p < .05; \beta = .04, p < .05$). Salespeople with a lower level of RJP have a lower initial level of Extrinsic Instrumentality, and their Extrinsic Instrumentality stays at a lower level than that of salespeople with a higher level of RJP all the time. However, they don’t experience greater decline nor slower recovery in Extrinsic Instrumentality (Figure 4. (1)). Thus, the results partially support Hypothesis 13.

Hypothesis 14 focused on the moderating effect of the perception of RJP on Intrinsic Motivation change over time and examined that the perception of RJP would positively influence the initial level ($T_0$), decline, and recovery of Intrinsic Motivation. We found that RJP significantly interacted with the linear term ($\beta = -.34, p < .01$), but it did not interact with the quadratic term related to decline and recovery ($\beta = .08, p > .10$). However, we found support for part of Hypotheses 14 as RJP had a significant impact on the initial level of Intrinsic Motivation ($\beta = .60, p < .001$). The results mean that salespeople who have acquired a lower level of RJP during a hiring process have a lower level of initial Intrinsic Motivation when they start a new sales job, and they maintain their Intrinsic Motivation at a lower level all the time than the others, but RJP does not function as a factor to alter the natural pattern of Intrinsic Motivation change. Therefore, Hypothesis 14 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 15 proposed that RJP is associated with a lower initial level ($T_0$), greater decline, and slower recovery of Extrinsic Motivation over time. As shown in Table 6, RJP significantly influences the initial level of Extrinsic Motivation ($\beta = .35, p < .001$) ($T_0$),
significantly interacts with the linear term ($\beta = -.31, p < .01$), and also significantly interacts with the quadratic term ($\beta = .14, p < .01$). RJP significantly affects the natural pattern of Extrinsic Motivation change. Salespeople with a lower level of RJP have a lower extrinsic motivation at the beginning of their new sales job and their extrinsic motivation stays at a lower level than that of salespeople who achieved a higher level of RJP during the hiring process. Moreover, they experience a weak decline and slower recovery whereas salespeople with a high level of RJP experience a stronger decline and recovery (Figure 4. (2)). Together, Hypothesis 15 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 16 addressed a moderating effect of the perception of RJP on Motivation and its change over time and proposed that a low level of RJP would be associated with a lower level of initial Motivation ($T_0$), greater decline, and slower recovery of Motivation. We found that realistic preview significantly affected the initial level of Motivation ($\beta = .96, p < .001$), significantly interacted with the linear term ($\beta = -.66, p < .01$), and the quadratic term ($\beta = .22, p < .05$) (Table 6). Salespeople with a lower level of RJP show a lower level of initial Motivation ($T_0$) when they start a new sales job and maintain Motivation at a lower level than salespeople with a higher level of RJP all the time. Salespeople with a lower level of RJP do not experience a stronger drop in Motivation nor recovery whereas salespeople with a higher level of RJP experience a stronger drop in motivation and strong recovery (Figure 4.(3)). Therefore, in Hypothesis 16, RJP’s effect on Motivation is only supported, but its moderating effect on motivation change over time is not supported.

3.6 DISCUSSION

The present study provides answers to two key questions: How does salespeople’s motivation change over time? What factors change the trajectory of salespeople motivation
change? We address those questions by examining trajectory of motivation and its components – Expectancy, Intrinsic Instrumentality, Extrinsic Instrumentality, Intrinsic Valance, and Extrinsic Valance – and two salient factors – RJP and Previous Job Experience – during early employment. Our study establishes that salespeople’s Expectancy, Intrinsic/Extrinsic Instrumentality, Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation and global Motivation follow in U-shape trajectory during the early employment, whereas Extrinsic Valence changes in the growth trajectory of an inverted U-shape. Intrinsic Valance increases linearly, not curvilinearly. Salespeople experience a slump in Expectancy in around a year and a half, in Intrinsic Instrumentality between half a year and a year, and in Extrinsic Instrumentality in around half a year in their employment, but they experience a peak in Intrinsic Valance in around two years and in Extrinsic Valance in around a year. This study also reveals that salespeople maintain higher intrinsic motivation and its components than extrinsic motivation and its components, and their Intrinsic Motivation is more significantly changes and their Extrinsic Motivation.

Meanwhile, we found Industry and Task Specific Experience does not alter the trajectory of salespeople’s Expectancy change nor Motivation change in the U-shape although salespeople with Industry and Task specific experience have significantly higher Expectancy and Motivation in the beginning of the employment. Rather, Task specific experience significantly moderated the trajectory of salespeople Expectancy and Motivation. When they start a new employment, their Expectancy or Motivation levels are indifferent from those with no sales experience. However, their Expectancy and Motivation continue to decrease without recovery until leave off while the others experience a slump and a recovery in their Expectancy and Motivation over time for two years. This study indicates that RJP is a salient factor to moderate a growth curve of salespeople Motivation over time. Extrinsic Instrumentality, Extrinsic Motivation, and
Motivation of salespeople with high level of RJP apparently grow in a U shape than of salespeople with low level of RJP. Moreover, Extrinsic Motivation of salespeople with low level of RJP does almost not change over time. Salespeople with high degree of RJP sustain higher Extrinsic Instrumentality, thus, Extrinsic Motivation, and Global Motivation all the time than those with low degree of RJP.

3.6.1 Theoretical Contributions

The current study extends sales research literature based on the Expectancy Theory of Motivation and Organizational Socialization Theory by investigating the pattern of newly hired salespeople motivation change during the first two years. Our findings will advance motivation and socialization literature in several ways. First, we use a longitudinal study design and hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) with large sample (N=1,436) to find the trajectories of salespeople motivation changes. To our knowledge, there have been no longitudinal studies that investigated the change in salespeople’s motivation over time, even though there has been a strong call for the longitudinal study (Bolander et al., 2017; Khusainova et al., 2018). None has used the hierarchical linear modeling method to find the trajectories of motivation change. Therefore, we employ a longitudinal study to investigate (1) trajectories of motivation changes over time and (2) trajectory difference between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation change.

Second, we examine all Motivation, Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation, Expectancy, Intrinsic/Extrinsic Instrumentality, and Intrinsic/Extrinsic Valance. Early motivation literature more likely examined motivation only or three separate motivation components such as valence, instrumentality, and expectancy (Ingram and Bellenger, 1983; Kohli, 1985; Oliver, 1974; Teas, 1981; Walker et al., 1977). On the other hand, recent literature tends to examine intrinsic and
extrinsic motivation separately (Hansen and Levin, 2016; Miao and Evans, 2014; Tanner, Tanner, and Wakefield, 2015) or only focus on intrinsic motivation (Dubinsky and Skinner, 2002; Miao and Evans, 2012; Román and Iacobucci, 2010). In reality, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation does not exist incompatibly. Rather, people in most work situations are motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically (Amabile, 1993). Therefore, by examining all Motivations and all components of motivations, we contribute to extending our knowledge on nature of motivations and their components’ changes over time with more realistic, practical results.

Third, this study established how previous experience and RJP as factors during pre-entry and onboarding respectively affect the growth trajectories of motivations and their components. Industry and Task Specific – insurance sales experience here in our research – experience helps salespeople maintain higher Expectancy and Motivation, but Task Specific experience – sales experience here in our research – deteriorates long term Motivation such as 1.5 years or more after salespeople hired. RJP positively influences Motivations and all of their components all the time over two years and more. Our findings contribute to sales and human resource literature by providing insight to who to hire to maintain high motivation, that critically affects performance (Good et al., 2022; Khusainova et al., 2018).

Finally, we focus on salespeople during the early employment period from new hired to their third year in the same organization. Socialization that has significant impact on job attitudes and performance (Bauer et al., 2007) and critical organizational problems such as salespeople's early turnover happen during this period (Cheng, 2014). Our results reveal where newly hired salespeople place more values on and what they expect from the new organizations and themselves over time during the early employment by examining Intrinsic/Extrinsic Valances
and Instrumentalities. Thus, by focusing on newly hired salespeople based on socialization theory and Expectancy theory, we contribute to early employment literature.

3.6.2 Managerial Implication

The study also contributes managerial practices by providing practitioners with insights to How Motivation changes, When Motivation drops, Which Motivation to be focused, Whom to hire, and What is important in Motivation changes. First, our results help managers understand natural patterns of salespeople motivations and their components change over time and when newly hired salespeople experience the bottom lines of motivations, enabling managers’ timely intervention. For example, salespeople intrinsic motivation changes in the pattern of U-shape and hits a bottom between a year and a year and half of new employment, mainly resulted from Expectancy and Intrinsic Instrumentality decline during the period. To cope with this decline, organizations should intervene with programs that enhance salespeople’s Expectancy such as sales education and sales skill training, and managers can actively share their experience on increased feeling of accomplishment and self-efficacy when they successfully achieved their goal that improve salespeople’s Intrinsic Instrumentality.

Managers should also consider the different patterns of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation changes. Based on our results, managers can use more powerful rewards between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to control the motivation levels of newly hired salespeople. Salespeople tend to have the strongest desire for extrinsic rewards between around a year and a year and half while their desire for the intrinsic rewards continuously increases over time. Therefore, managers would batter focus on extrinsic rewards such as incentive, promotion, and recognition for newly hired salespeople in less than a year and half of their employment to manipulate their Extrinsic Motivation, and intrinsic rewards such as such as autonomy, connection, and self-
accomplishment for those who have longer organization tenure to boost their Intrinsic Motivation.

In addition, our findings provide important implications for practitioners on who to hire based on their experience. Generally, firms prefer experienced salespeople when they hire but our research found sales experience is not always a good indicator of newly hired salespeople’s Motivation. Rather, sales experience itself deteriorate their Motivation as time goes on. Salespeople without any sales experience sustain higher motivation than those with sales experience for long term. Only when sales experience was built in the same industry, the experience helps salespeople sustain high Motivation. Managers should consider these results when they recruit their new salespeople.

Finally, we suggest that managers provide candidates with RJP to maintain new salespeople’s motivation, especially Extrinsic Instrumentality and Extrinsic Motivation. Our results confirm that RJP has a critical role for salespeople’s motivation. Salespeople who acquired higher level of RJP during the recruitment process begin their new employment with higher Extrinsic Instrumentality, Extrinsic Motivation, and, thus, Motivation and maintain them higher than the others.

3.6.3 Limitation and Future Research Direction

More samples and more time points would provide more powerful results to support our current results for future research. If we found significant variability between salespeople, it would be interesting to examine why and how motivation changes differently with other moderatos. For example, because one of the essential roles of managers is to manage the motivation of salespeople, manager’s leadership, manager’s different powers, and manager changes would be a good start to investigate the difference in the motivation changes between
newly hired salespeople. Another opportunity for future research is found in the team-based working environment. Teams have different team dynamics and interactions among team members. It would be necessary to examine how those team differences affect motivation changes at the salesperson and team levels in a hierarchical model. Finally, exploring the motivation change drawing on the Temporal Motivation Theory would be interesting, where time to deadline is a predictor of utilities (satisfaction and motivation) (Steel and König, 2006). Time to the deadline, time to be rewarded, and time to the feedback would be good moderators to investigate their effects on changes in salespeople motivation.
### APPENDIX

#### A2: Exploratory Factor Analysis – Valance items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Skills</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Skills</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution To Others</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A3: Exploratory Factor Analysis – Instrumentality items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Skills</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of Skills</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Others</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 4
A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF SALESPERSON MOTIVATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Motivation at work "remains one of the most enduring and compelling topics" in the academy (Kanfer et al., 2017, p.338; Steers et al., 2004). Salespeople's motivation has also been one of the most important topics for sales researchers (Hansen and Levin, 2016; Pullins, 2001; Williams and Plouffe, 2007). The distinction is necessary as Roe (2017) takes note that motivation at work cannot be generalized across different positions and job demands. Therefore, continued research on motivation in the sales role is necessary. Motivation has been linked to performance (e.g., Good, Hughes, and Wang, 2022), career longevity (e.g., Sathyanarayan and Lavanya, 2018) and well-being (e.g., Dust et al., 2022). Salespeople's motivation is a critical issue for firms because salespeople's performance directly impacts a firm's performance in a significant portion. When salespeople do not meet their budgets, sales executives blame and overhaul the salesforce compensation plan, a representative motivator at the organizational level (Steenburgh and Ahearne, 2012). Sales managers devote excessive time listening to salespeople for the sales compensation satisfaction (Chung, 2015). Sales researchers have investigated salesperson motivation and compiled a considerable body of knowledge about motivating salespeople for about 50 years.

Despite the efforts sales researchers have put into the salesperson motivation research, there have been only three review studies (e.g., Evans et al., 1982; Good, Hughes, Kirca, et al., 2022; Khusainova et al., 2018). Two of them are qualitative, one is quantitative, and none is bibliometric literature reviews. The most recent literature review was a meta-analysis conducted by Good, Hughes, Kirca, et al. (2022). Although the study is a quantitative literature review,
their meta-analysis only emphasized the investigation of the relationships between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and performance. Accordingly, they systematically ignored many antecedents and outcomes to review.

The lack of quantitative literature review to examine the evolution of salesperson motivation research remains a gap in our understanding of the motivation literature in sales. Bibliometric assessment is worthwhile, given the body of salesperson motivation research. The next gap in the literature is the lack of systematic synthesis of research topics and themes over time. It is essential to understand the intellectual structure of motivation literature in the sales domain and its evolution. The lack of literature analysis at different levels is also another gap. This is effective science mapping to find missing areas and priorities for future research themes and topics in motivation literature development. To respond to the gaps in the motivation literature in the sales domain addressed above, we propose research questions that will be answered in the remainder of the current paper:

- What is the growth trajectory of motivation research over time?
- Which journals published the most studies on salespeople motivation?
- What are the most impactful studies, authors, and journals?
- What are research themes, and how have the research themes changed in the two time periods?
- What are emerging themes and topics at an individual, manager, and organizational level?
- What are future research topics at different levels?

As the first bibliometric literature review, the current study attempts to contribute to motivation literature by systemically synthesizing all findings from studies on salespeople's motivation in management and applied psychology fields. We will fill the gaps in three ways. First, we will conduct a performance analysis. In the performance analysis, we trace the overall growth trajectory of salesperson motivation research over time and find the most impactful studies, authors, and journals. Through the performance analysis, we contribute to the
understanding of the current development status of salesperson motivation research. Second, we conduct a co-word analysis using keywords of salesperson motivation studies to locate the development of research topics and themes. This analysis identifies research themes and their development on salesperson motivation research. We run these thematic analyses comparatively based on literature before 2000 and after 2000. 2000 is an important turning point for the sales literature. Since 2000, the prevailing motivation theory has shifted to Self-determination theory (Khusainova et al., 2018) and Post-Baby Boomer generations has been recruited for the sales positions. Moreover, the usage rate of the mobile phone and internet exploded in 2000 (Ritchie et al., 2023) that changed sales activities and increased salesperson’s locus of control. The comparative analysis provides how the motivation literature's lay of the land changed. Finally, we uncover research front and future research directions. We conduct bibliometric coupling analysis to find research front theme and then extract the future research direction from articles that belong to each front theme at three different levels: individual, manager, and organization level. The findings provide researchers with future research opportunities at each level and prolifically enhance the body of knowledge on salespeople's motivation.

The current study is organized in the following way. We begin with the methodology section where we explain bibliometrics analysis, research design, and data collection. Then, in the background of the study section, we introduce three major motivation theories that we adapt keywords for search keywords from. Next, we present performance analysis and findings for the most impactful studies, authors, and journals. Then key research themes of before and after 2020 by co-word analysis are summarized in the next section. Finally, we conclude with research fronts and future research directions.
4.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

4.2.1 Salesperson Motivation

Motivation is viewed as a process that drives individuals to exert efforts to accomplish a task (Vroom, 1964). Sales researchers extend this view and define a salesperson's work motivation as "the amount of effort the salesman desires to expand on each of the activities or tasks associated with his job" (Walker, Churchill, and Ford, 1977, p.162). In other words, motivation is a psychological state that stimulates a salesperson to complete a task and explains his willingness to engage in the task completion (Brown and Peterson, 1994; Jaramillo et al., 2007; Jaramillo and Mulki, 2008; Spector, 2006). Along the same line, psychologists view motivation as an energizer of certain behaviors such as performance and positive job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organization commitment (Locke and Latham, 1990; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Sonnentag, 2003; Steers et al., 2004; Steers and Porter, 1991). There are three major theories that have dominated literature on salespeople's motivation: Expectancy theory of work motivation by Vroom (1964), Self-determination theory by Attribution theory Deci and Ryan (1985), and Attribution theory by Heider (1958). Expectancy theory views work motivation as the interaction of drivers named *expectancy, instrumentality, and valence*, and the magnitude of motivation is determined by the multiplication of such three drivers (Vroom, 1964). *Expectancy* refers to an individual's belief about the perceived probability that his effort will lead to his desired performance, *instrumentality* is concerned with an individual's belief about the perceived probability that the attained performance will result in a reward; *valence* refers to the degree of value the individual assign on the attained reward from the performance. Self-determination theory suggests that an individual is intrinsically motivated for growth, integration, and self-development when the individual is satisfied with three basic needs:
autonomy, competence, and connection (Gagné and Deci, 2005). Attribution theory explained how individuals deal with information to draw causal explanations for events. It examines what information is used and how the information is processed for causal judgement. (Fiske and Taylor, 1991). It views attribution of failure as a motivator for a salesperson to choose work harder (extrinsic motivation) or work smarter (intrinsic motivation) (Sujan, 1986).

4.3 METHODOLOGY

4.3.1 Bibliometrics Analysis

The term "bibliometrics" originated from "statistical bibliography" first named by Hulme (1923) (P. Kumar et al., 2019) and defined as "the assembling and interpretation of statistics relating to books and periodicals . . . to demonstrate historical movements, to determine the national or universal research use of books and journals, and to ascertain in many local situations the general use of books and journals" (Groos and Pritchard, 1969, p. 450; Raisig, 1962, p.348). Later, researchers questioned the term "statistical bibliography" because of its confusion with statistics per se or bibliographies on statistics and suggested new name "bibliometrics" (Groos and Pritchard, 1969). The definition of bibliometrics are first introduced in 1969 as "the application of mathematics and statistical methods to books and other media of communication" (Groos and Pritchard, 1969, p.349) although the discussion of a concept on bibliometrics started in 1956 (Fano, 1956). Its definition was more delineated as "the application of quantitative tools to bibliographic data" (Broadus, 1987; Donthu, et al., 2021b, p.759). Compared to other literature review methods, bibliometrics analysis has unique advantages such as (1) dealing with large volume of literature, (2) quantitative analysis for objective results, and (3) analyzing intellectual structural relationships in a field by mapping scientific knowledge (Nerur et al., 2008). Therefore, bibliometrics study is useful to take an overview of scientific development of
the filed, to find knowledge gaps, to identify future research topics, and to position their future research (Donthu, et al., 2021a; Donthu, et al., 2021b; Elleegaard and Wallin, 2015). Although the concept of bibliometrics started in 1950s and even its origin was much earlier in 1920s, bibliometrics remains relatively new method in business literature and studies using bibliometrics has recently proliferated (Donthu, Kumar, Mukherjee, et al., 2021). The bibliometrics method has been applied for literature review in various research areas in business such as strategic management (Fernandes et al., 2022; Ferreira et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2021), market orientation (Hu et al., 2019), key account management (Kumar et al., 2019), B2B marketing (Backhaus et al., 2011), and international marketing (Samiee and Chabowski, 2012).

The current bibliometrics study is conducted by three steps suggested by previous bibliometrics studies (Donthu, Kumar, Mukherjee, et al., 2021; Hashemi et al., 2022). First, we collect relevant peer reviewed journal articles in English using keywords search in Web of Science in the area of management and business only. The second step, includes a performance analysis to take an overview of knowledge development and determine the influence of research units on salesperson motivation research: publications, authors, and journals. In the final step, we generate science mapping by applying co-word analysis and bibliographic coupling analysis. Co-word analysis is used to identify research themes and trend change, while bibliographic coupling analysis is utilized to find research fronts and future research directions.

4.3.2 Data Collection and Process

We adopted the procedure of Hashemi, Rajabi, and Brashear- Alejandro 2022 for the data collection and borrowed and adjusted search keywords for salesperson motivation research from three major motivation theories: expectancy theory of motivation (Vroom, 1964), attribution theory (Sujan, 1986), and self-determination theory (Gagné and Deci, 2005). We determined
search keywords that included "salesforce*","sales force*,"salespeople,"salesman,"
salesmen,"salesperson*"sales representative*" or "sales rep*. In addition to these
keywords, the article had to include motivation and it’s proxies: "motivate*","extrinsic;"
"pay*","commission*","compensation*","incentive*","reward*","recognition,"Intrinsic,"
"enjoyment,"challenge,"autonomy*","connection,"or "self-efficacy." The keyword search
was set to find those keywords from titles, abstracts, topics, or keywords in Web of Science. We
included four criteria in our keyword search: time span, source type, document type, and
language. Time span was set to include all years, and only academic journal articles written in
the English language are considered for our review. The initial search identified 2159 articles.
Then by refining the results in Web of Science categories of management and business, we
decreased the number of articles to 1096. Next, we manually reviewed 1096 articles to exclude
irrelevant articles, resulting in a pool of 994 articles. These 994 articles are the base pool of the
performance analysis. The description of our database is shown in Table 7. Finally, to include
only key journal articles for the science mapping, we restricted journals to 19 key journals for
sales research publications described in Khusainova, Jong, Lee, Marshall, and Rudd (2018) and
Richards, Moncrief, and Marshall (2010). 19 key journals are Journal of Marketing, Journal of
Marketing Research, Marketing Science, Journal of the Academy of Marketing science, Journal
of Personal Selling & Sales Management, Industrial Marketing Management, Journal of
Management, Journal of Business Ethics, Marketing Letters, Journal of Marketing Theory and
Practice, Journal of Consumer Marketing, Journal of Strategic Marketing, Psychology and
{Citation}Marketing, Business Horizons, International Journal of Research in Marketing.

1 The asterisk picks up words with the same stem.

Co-ward analysis and bibliographic coupling analysis followed the procedure of Donthu, Kumar, Pandey, Pandey, and Mishra (2020).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Database Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications before 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications since 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications since 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contributing authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of cited publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Analysis

For our bibliometrics analysis on salesperson motivation, we use bibliometric network mapping, commonly used for a bibliometric review that analyzes dynamic relationships of a research domain (Chen, 2006; Hallinger and Kovačević, 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). We use VOSviewer, as our bibliometric analysis tool to find the most impactful studies, authors, and journals, co-word analysis for thematic analysis to find existing research topics and trends, while bibliography coupling determines research fronts and future research questions.

4.4 PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Performance analysis presents the productivity and impact of research units in the focal research field. In the pool of 994 articles, we assessed the yearly number of publications and the contribution of the most impactful articles, authors, and journals in the research domain of salesperson motivation. Influential articles were determined based on the number of global
citations (Google Scholar) while influential authors and journals were determined based on the number of local h-index that calculated with articles and citations within our database.

4.4.1. Year-Wise Publications

We report year-wise publication trends in Figure 5. All years include yearly total publications, but the year 2003 only reflects the number of articles published from January through May 2023. The result presents a consistent increase in the number of publications over the year. In the new millennium, there has been drastic growth in the publication. This growth can be attributed to increased interest in salesperson motivation research because of demographic change in sales force from Baby-Boomers to Post Baby-Boomers including X, Y, and Z generations that have different values and psychology from Baby-Boomers, technical development such as explosion of mobile and internet usage that change sales activities, and prevailing theory change to Self- Determination theory that more put value in intrinsic than extrinsic motivation.

Figure 5. Year-Wise Publication on Salesperson Motivation Research
4.4.2 Most Impactful Articles

The most impactful studies in salesperson motivation field are reported in Table 8. The most impactful study is Brown and Leigh (1996) that has been cited 694 times with 26 average citation per year since it was published in 1996. This article examines how psychological climates motivate salespeople for their job-related outcomes. The next impactful article is Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp (2005) that have received 628 total citation and 35 average citation per year. This article focuses on the motivating effects of leadership empowerment on customer satisfaction and salesperson performance. The article is followed by Sujan, Weitz, and Kummar (1994) that have been cited 628 total citation with 22 average citations per year. This article is one of the representative motivation papers drawing on attribution theory. The authors investigate how two motivational orientations, learning orientation and performance orientation, influence salespeople to work smart and hard.

4.4.3 Most Impactful Authors

Figure 9 presents the most impactful authors determined by local h-index. The most impactful author is Evans, KR with the 14 of h-index, the highest h index. His 14 salesperson motivation articles received at least 14 citations each. Moreover, he received 991 total citations and published 16 total articles in the salesperson motivation field. The second impactful author in the field is Ahearne, M who has h-index of 11, 1581 total citations, and 13 publications about salesperson motivation. Ahearne, M is followed by Dubinsky, A whose h-index is 11 with 521 total citations and 13 total publications in the field.

4.4.4 Most Impactful Journals

The most influential journals in the sales motivation research are also accessed by local h-index. Figure 9 presents the most impactful journals in salesperson motivation field. The most
The influential journal is *Journal of Marketing* that has 34 h-index, 7256 total citations, and 52 total publications. Among 52 salesperson motivation articles, 34 articles have been cited at least 34 times. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* has been ranked the second most impactful journal. The journal has the second highest h-index with 31 and its total 52 articles in

Note: TC= Total Citation. C/Y= Yearly Citation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>C/Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahearne, M; Mathieu, J; Rapp, A</td>
<td>To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujan, H; Weitz, BA; Kumar, N</td>
<td>Learning orientation, working smart, and effective selling</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, TA</td>
<td>Supply chain coordination under channel rebates with sales effort effects</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrick, MR; Mount, MK; Strauss, JP</td>
<td>Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives - test of the mediating effects of goal setting</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrick, MR; Stewart, GL; Piotrowski, M</td>
<td>Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, RL; Anderson, E</td>
<td>An empirical-test of the consequences of behavior - and outcome-based sales control-systems</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netemeyer, RG; Boles, JS; McKee, DO; McMurrian, R</td>
<td>An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, SP; Peterson, RA</td>
<td>The effect of effort on sales performance and job-satisfaction</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie, SB; Podaskoff, PM; Fetter, R</td>
<td>The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VandeWalle, D; Brown, SP; Cron, WL; Slocum, JW Cravens, DW;</td>
<td>The influence of goal orientation and self-regulation tactics on sales performance: A longitudinal field test</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram, TN; Laforge, RW; Young, CE</td>
<td>Behavior-based and outcome-based salesforce control-systems</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, SP; Cron, WL; Slocum, JW</td>
<td>Effects of trait competitiveness and perceived intraorganizational competition on salesperson goal setting and performance</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the field have been cited 2856 times. The third impactful journal for the salesperson motivation research is *Industrial Marketing Management* with 28 h-index, 2017 total citations, and 81 total publications.

**Figure 6: The Most Impactful Authors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>h-index</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans, KR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahearne, M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubinsky, A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnihotri, R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaramillo, F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homburg, C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, SP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao, C.F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapp, A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheer, LK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravens, DW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: The Most Impactful Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>h-index</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Marketing</em></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7256</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Personal Selling &amp; Sales Management</em></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Industrial Marketing Management</em></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Business Research</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Marketing Research</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4040</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Applied Psychology</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Marketing Science</em></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Management Science</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Business &amp; Industrial Marketing</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5 Thematic Analysis**
We conducted thematic analysis to identify the intellectual structure of salesperson motivation field and compare landscape change of scholar works in before 2000 and after 2000. The present study applies co-word analysis. Authors select keywords in their article as the words stand for the theme of their research. Therefore, keywords and their co-occurrence can provide insights on the thematic structure of the field (Castriotta et al., 2019). We utilized a core list of articles to include only high quality journal articles for thematic analysis. This core list was generated based on the list of Richards, Moncrief, and Marshall (2010) who highlighted 19 the most important journals for sales research. Their list of 19 journals are identical to the list of 19 most impactful journals in our database.

We analyzed intellectual development of salesperson motivation research with two groups of research. Articles published before 2000 belong to group one and articles published in 2000 or after 2000 belong to group 2. The reason behind this separation is attributed to the importance of 2000 as a turning point in three ways. First, historical technology adaption such as explosion of internet and mobile usage occurred in 2000 (Ritchie et al., 2023). The change enabled to growth of CRM software that changed transactional marketing to relationship marketing (Ahearne et al., 2004). According to this sales paradigm shift, relationship management that required more affective works became one of main parts of sales activities. Salesperson’s locus of control was also expended due to mobile phone usage explosion. Second, there was demographic change in the sales force around 2000. The baby boomers started retiring and Generation X started to fill the gap in the salesforce. We expect different rewards to motivate post- baby boomers who are more independent and put more value on work-life balance and meaningful works than baby boomers (Kerin et al., 2023). Finally, the prevailing motivation theory in motivation literature changed to self-determination theory (see figure 2 in
Khusainova et al. (2018)). Literatures have more relied on the intrinsic motivation self-determination theory focused on. The number of publications based on self-determination theory have exceeded the number of publications based on any other motivation theories since 2000. Considering all reasons described above, we expect there have been changes in the landscapes of intellectual structure in the salesperson motivation research.

We used VOS viewer, a software for bibliometrics analysis package, to identify research theme clusters. Before conducting the analysis, we manually merged similar keywords. For example, we replaced “salesperson performance” and “sales representative performance” with performance. We only analyzed keywords that co-occur at least three times in our dataset, resulting in a minimum number of 5 clusters. The number of keywords used were 27 out of 179 keywords in before 2000 dataset and 345 keywords out of 2020 keywords in before 2000 dataset. The co-world analysis categorized keywords into four themes for before 2000 articles and nine themes for after 2000 articles.

Figure 8 presents the network of author keywords and thematic clusters and Table 9 summarizes each them and example articles. The same node and tie imply the same research theme and the thickness of the tie among keywords imply the conceptual closeness (Hashemi et al., 2022). Following the procedure of Hashemi, Rajabi, and Brashear (2022), we labeled themes by backtracking keywords in each cluster and analyzing publications that the keywords belong to and then categorized themes into two levels: Organizational level and Individual level. Organizational level includes manager/supervisor level and management level, and Individual level includes individual characteristics and perceptions and emotion on role and task characteristics. We did not include performance to a particular theme as almost all literature in motivation literate includes performance in their research (see Figure 8). The core of salespeople
motivation research is to motivate salespeople for better performance (Good, Hughes, Kirca, et al., 2022), such that motivation is called work motivation.

4.5.1 Organizational Level

4.5.1.1 Research Theme before 2000

Organizational Rewards and Control System are detected as two main themes at organizational level. We introduce keywords and summarize studies in each theme for the before 2000.

4.5.1.1.1 Organizational Rewards. Organizational Rewards reflects research interest in extrinsic motivation by investigating organizational rewards’ impact on job consequences. For example, Hunt and Vasquez-Parraga (1993) founds that salespeople’s ethic is a determinant when sales managers decide to use either discipline or reward salespeople’s behaviors. (Darmon (1982) suggests a framework for finding a compensation plan maximize both management’s and salespeople’s objectives. Joseph and Thevaranjan (1998) examined the roles of monitoring and incentives in sales control system.

4.5.1.1.2 Control System. In the theme of Control Systems, the studies concern control systems and their related outcomes such as performance and job satisfaction. For example, Oliver and Anderson (1994) empirically testes the impact of outcome and behavior control systems on their outcome variables such as motivation, performance, and job satisfaction. Especially, they report that outcome control is related to extrinsic motivation whereas behavior control is related to intrinsic motivation. Next, Ramaseshan et al., (2006) established that marketing control system negatively impact performance as they demotivate salespeople with limited autonomy and trust. Netemeyer et al., (1997) found that management’s leadership
support and reward allocation impact work outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors.

4.5.1.2 Research Theme After 2000

We find five main themes at the organizational level in salesperson motivation research after 2000: Organizational Rewards, Technology, Organizational Climate, Intrinsic Motivation, and Leadership. Organizational Rewards remain a strong contributor to the salesperson motivation research domain. Technology, Organizational climate, Intrinsic Motivation, and Leadership are new trends after 2000. These researched in these themes before 2000 but the amount of research were not enough to form an independent research cluster. These emerging themes are attributed to drastic expansion of body of scholarly works in the field.

4.5.1.2.1 Organizational Rewards. Organizational Reward theme still remains one of core research areas in the salesperson motivation research domain. This theme focuses on organizational extrinsic rewards and their impact on performances. For instant, Kalra and Shi (2001) investigates how to develop an optimal sales contest to motivate salespeople and their results suggest that the total number of winners be increased whereas the spread be decreased. Murphy et al., (2004) also examines sales contest as a special incentive program and found preferences for sales contest components. Boichuk et al. (2019) indicates that a deep sales bench is a strong tool to motivate laggards in salesforce.

4.5.1.2.2 Technology. Technology is a new theme after 2000. The theme summarizes how technology is used to motivate salespeople and how to motivate salespeople to adopt technology. For example, Rayburn et al. (2021) reports that techno-efficacy improved continuing technology training significantly motivate salespeople for better performance. Avlonitis and Panagopoulos, (2005) specifies how to motivate salespeople to accept CRM and specify consequences of CRM
acceptance. Leclercq-Vandelannoitte (2017) address ethical perspective on characteristics and outcomes of ubiquitous IT-based sales control.

4.5.1.2.3 Organization Climate. This theme contains organizational justice, climate, and culture as keywords. Authors are interested in how these organizational cultures affect salespeople motivation for performance and other outcomes. In the line of the interests, Schwepker Jr. (2016) indicates that distribute justice motivates salespeople to commit superior customer value. Kalra et al. (2021) establishes dual impacts of competitive work culture. This environment motivates salespeople to work smart and thus increase performance. However, it also increase emotional stress and thus decreases performance. Tanner et al. (2015) investigates moderating effects of ethical climate on the relationship between motivation and outcomes. The results address that ethical climate moderates a relationship between motivation and job satisfaction, but it does not moderates a relationship between motivation and performance.

4.5.1.2.4 Intrinsic Motivation. After 2000, there is an evident pattern of increased interest in intrinsic motivation and self-determination theory. Studies in this theme put the lens into importance of intrinsic motivation and how to increase salesperson intrinsic motivation. For example, Good et al. (2022) reports their meta-analysis result that salesperson intrinsic motivation more significant factor influence performance than extrinsic motivation. Good, Hughes, and Wang, (2022) finds that the sense of purpose is salient for salesperson intrinsic motivation. It also reports that intrinsic motivation is more positively related to salesperson effort, adaptivity, and performance than extrinsic motivation, especially for younger salespeople. Miao and Evans (2012) indicates that when capability and outcome control are combined, they have positive impact on salesperson intrinsic motivation and mitigate role ambiguity. However, when activity and capability controls are combined, they are detrimental to intrinsic motivation.
Figure 8: Co-Word Network of Salesperson Motivation literature
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 2020 Theme</th>
<th>Before 2020 Keywords</th>
<th>Before 2020 Sample of Studies</th>
<th>After 2020 Theme</th>
<th>After 2021 Keywords</th>
<th>After 2021 Sample of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the Organization level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational justice, Organizational culture, Ethical climate</td>
<td>Schwepker (2016), Kalra et al.(2018), Tanner et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and Leadership (Pink)</td>
<td>Transformational leadership, Empowerment, Sales manager</td>
<td>Mallin et al. (2022), Murphy and Anderson (2020), Ahearne et al. (2005).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the individual level

|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
4.5.1.2.5 Leadership. Leadership forms another theme in salesperson motivation research after 2000. Articles in this theme focus on manager/supervisor’s leadership and management style and their impact on motivation and other outcomes. For example, Mallin et al. (2022) reports that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation mediate the relationship between a salesperson’s personal identification with their manager and outcomes such as performance and turnover intention. Murphy and Anderson (2020) establishes that transformational leadership positively influences salesperson’s psychological empowerment and self-efficacy that significantly affects accomplishment striving. In turn, the salesperson’s accomplishment striving positively influence performance. Ahearne et al. (2005) finds that empowerment behavior motivate salespeople with low levels of product/industry knowledge and experience for performance and customer satisfaction, but it does not motivate salespeople with high level of knowledge and experience.

4.5.2 Individual Level

4.5.2.1 Research Theme Before 2000

Three key themes appeared at the individual level: Goal Orientation and Individual Differences. A considerable number of studies were devoted to Goal Orientation before 2000.

4.5.2.1.1 Goal Orientation. The literature in competitiveness them regards achievement (orientation), self-efficacy, and leadership as important motivational factors. Authors in this theme examine how different goal orientations motivate salespeople. For instance, Sujan et al., (1994) reported achievement orientation motivates salespeople to work harder only, whereas learning orientation motivates salespeople to work harder and smarter. However, VandeWalle et al., (1999) reported differently that learning orientation positively influence performance but
achievement orientation does not. Kohli et al., (1998) find that supervisor behaviors are critical to salespeople’s learning and performance orientations.

4.5.2.1.2 Individual Differences. This theme contains keywords of personality and role-conflict. Literature in this theme explores the relationship among individual differences and perceptions, motivation, and outcomes. For example, Klein and Verbeke, (1999) indicate that individual difference in autonomic feedback is not related to burnout but not role conflict. It is also positively related to extra-role performance and job satisfaction while they are not related to in-role performance. Stewart (1996) reports that reward structure moderates the relationship between salesperson’s extraversion and performance, such that an explicit reward plan strengthen the relationship between extraversion and performance. The result in Lee (1998) indicate that the salary-based compensation plan more effectively motivates intrinsic reward-oriented salespeople while the commission-based compensation plan more effectively motivates extrinsic reward-oriented salespeople.

4.5.2.2 Research Theme After 2000

Our results indicated four main research themes at the individual level. They are Value, Competitiveness, Task and Role factors and Job Attitudes, and Decision-Making. Different from the database of before 2000 where goal orientation forms an independent theme, the database of after 2000 includes goal orientation into value theme. The number of research on Task and Role factors and Job Attitudes, and Decision-Making were negligible such that they were included in individual differences and other themes in the database of before 2000 but they form separate themes in the database of after 2000. Competitiveness is a new area after 2000.

4.5.2.2.1 Value. Value encompasses goal orientation, perspective, salesperson’s sales ethic, and trust. Articles in this theme are interested in the role of salesperson’s value to motivate
salesperson for organizational outcomes. Harris et al. (2005) reports that learning orientation is a motivator for customer orientation while performance orientation is a motivator for selling orientation. Ahearne et al. (2010) indicates that salesperson learning orientation is associated with stronger initial declines, faster recovery slopes, and higher stabilization levels in performance trajectories. On the other hand, salespeople performance orientation is associated with weaker initial declines, slower recovery slopes, and lower stabilization levels. Bolander et al. (2017) establishes that repeated periods of sales failure motivates salespeople to unethically behave and interventions for salespeople to behave for customers rather worsens salesperson’s unethical behaviors under a non-contingent plan. Yoo et al. (2014) finds that motivation mediates a negative relationship between salespeople’s trust and their deviant behaviors.

4.5.2.2.2 Competitiveness. Competitiveness contains relevant keywords such self-efficacy, working smart, and trait competitiveness. Authors in the theme focus on examination of competitiveness’s impact on organizational outcomes via motivation. Dugan et al. (2019) reports that grit motivates salespeople to perform better and enjoy enhanced job satisfaction. Locander et al. (2020) addresses that salesperson trait competitiveness and intuitive judgement positively influence adaptive selling. Wang and Netemeyer (2002) also examines on trait competitiveness. They find that salesperson’s learning efforts trait competitiveness, job autonomy, and customer demandingness affects learning effort, self-efficacy, and, in turn, performance.

4.5.2.2.3 Task and Role factors and Job Attitudes. This theme summarizes salesperson’s psychological status derived from roles and tasks and their impact on salesperson’s attitudes. Boles et al. (2007) reports that satisfaction with job/work, pay, and company policy among various facets of job satisfaction are significantly related to salesperson’s organization commitment. Miao and Evans (2007) indicates that cognitive intrinsic motivation decreases role
conflict and affective motivation mitigate role ambiguity. On the other hand, cognitive extrinsic motivation negatively affects both role conflict and ambiguity, but affective extrinsic motivation increases role conflict. They also report role conflict positively affect outcome performance while role ambiguity negatively affects behavioral performance. Srivastava and Rangarajan (2008) finds that job challenge and job involvement strengthen the linkage between feedback and salesperson’s job satisfaction.

4.5.2.2.4 Decision-Making. Articles in this theme include keywords such as decision-making, perceptions, and behaviors and focuses on salesperson’s decision-making factors. For example, Rostami et al. (2019) indicates that salesperson’s decision making is influenced by time pressure, a significant motivator for salespeople to exert more effort to conduct more creative behaviors. Guesalaga and Kapelianis (2015) reported that the strategic value of customer’s business and the concreteness of the opportunity significantly influence salesperson’s decision-making to pursue the opportunity or not.

4.6 RESEARCH FRONTS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

We conducted bibliographic coupling analysis to find current research fronts and future research questions. Bibliographic coupling categorizes two articles into the same cluster if they share a high portion of reference section. Based on this logic, Bibliographic coupling techniques is well used to find recent thematic trends. Following previous literature (e.g., Donthu, Kumar, Pandey, et al., 2021; Kwak et al., 2019), we analyzed the articles published in the last three years. As shown in Table 9, our results present five current research fronts: Technology, Emotion, Intrinsic Emotion, Monetary Rewards, and Sales Strategies. Technology forms the biggest trend in research fronts. Monetary Rewards are steadily investigated but their domain decreased in the field. On the other hand, research interest in Intrinsic motivation exceeded that
in extrinsic motivation. Finally, *Emotion*, especially negative emotion, and *Sales Strategies* are newly highlighted research fronts.

**4.6.1 Research Front 1: Technology**

Reflecting current sales trend using various technologies such as social media, online selling, internet marketing, digital automation, researchers in the research front examine how technologies motivate salespeople to perform well and how organization motivate salespeople to adopt new technologies in their sales activities. For example, Terho et al., (2022) establishes that social influence and sales technology orientation are key motivators for social selling that predict thought leadership, acquisition performance, and sales performance. Guenzi and Nijssen (2020) also finds key motivators for salesperson’s social media usage. They report that market readiness, peer influence, and organizational supports affect salesperson motivation and salesperson’s ability to apply social media to their sales activities, resulting in increased use of social media in sales. Peer social media usage’s positive impact on salesperson’s social media usage is supported by other literature (e.g., Bowen et al., 2021). Based on the articles in this research fronts, future research questions are addressed as follows,

**Future Research Questions in Motivation and Technology**

1. What is the comprehensive measure of social media usage to capture salesperson’s motivation toward specific tasks (e.g., prospecting, relationship management with existing customers, new customer development)?
2. How do incentives, leadership styles, and sales team structure influence salesperson’s motivation to use social media in sales?
3. How do marketing and sales organizations play a role to extend salespeople’s social selling effort?
4. How differently do we design techno- trainings for salespeople with different motivation orientations (Intrinsic vs. extrinsic)?
5. How does motivation orientation the relationship techno- training and performance?
4.6.2 Research Front 2: Emotion

The second largest research front in salesperson motivation research is Emotion, especially negative emotion. As transactions get complicated, salespeople experience negative emotions such as task stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout and get more interest in psychological wellbeing at work. Many authors investigated various impacts of emotional exhaustion. For example, Lussier et al. (2021) finds that emotional exhaustion is a motivator for unethical behaviors that lead to low performance. Matthews and Edmondson (2022) reposts that inside salespeople has stronger impact of extrinsic motivation on emotional exhaustion than outside salespeople, but the inside salespeople’s emotional exhaustion not strongly associated with turnover intention of side salespeople. Kalra et al. (2021) indicates that internal competitiveness at work motivate salespeople to work smarter. However, it also increases emotional exhaustion that demotivates salespeople, resulting in a negative impact on performance. Future research questions are generated from the articles in this them below.

Future Research Questions in Motivation and Emotion

1. How does cultural difference among countries (countries in low competition vs. countries in high competition) moderate a relationship among competitive organizational culture, emotional exhaustion, motivation, and performance?
2. How does manager’s motivation impact organizational competitiveness and emotional exhaustion?
3. Can compensation for sales managers motivate sales managers to intervene in a relationship between salesperson’s emotional exhaustion and unethical behaviors?
4. What kind of organizational rewards are effective for sales manager’s intervention for the relationship between emotional exhaustion and unethical behaviors?
Figure 9: Salesperson Motivation Research Fronts: 2020-2023
4.6.3 Research Front 3: *Intrinsic Motivation*

Increased research interest in *Intrinsic Motivation* is apparent in terms of the number of studies in the front and the number of citations. This trend is attributable to the structure change in salesforce. Baby-boomers retire, and the sales positions are being replaced with millennials who have different value (Kerin et al., 2023) The replacement was predicted to reach 50% of the workforce by 2020 (Khusainova et al., 2018). Good, Hughes, Kirca, et al (2022) empirically supports millennials’ preference in intrinsic motivation. Most of the researchers in this front emphasize the importance of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation. One such researcher is Valery Good who leads this research front with four recent publications in the last two years. For example, Good, Hughes, Kirca, et al. (2022) reports that intrinsic motivation is more significantly associated with performance than extrinsic is. The relationship is stronger when salespeople are female, have longer job tenure have longer sales experience, and sell in B2B industry. Good, Hughes, and Wang, (2022b) emphasizes the importance of a sense of purpose in intrinsic motivation and Good et al., (2021) again address importance of intrinsic motivation with their finding that intrinsically motivated salespeople experience more resilience than extrinsically motivated salespeople. Next, below are future research questions from those articles described above.

**Future Research Questions in Motivation and Intrinsic Motivation**

1. How does the positive association between salesperson motivation and performance evolve under advanced technology conditions?

2. Can interconnectedness impact cultural influences in salesperson motivation?
3. Contrast to existing research who reports negative impact on extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation, are there some extrinsic rewards that have positive impact on intrinsic motivation (e.g., feedback)?

4. How important is a salesperson’s sense of purpose in a post pandemic world, in digital sales environment, and in remote working practice?

5. Can the relationship among salesperson’s sense of purpose, motivation, and consequences change when discordance exists between salespersons’ environmental consciousness and their organization’s?

4.6.4 Research Front 4: Extrinsic Rewards

Research on extrinsic rewards is a steady seller. The first research on salesperson motivation by Oliver (1974) was also about extrinsic rewards’ impact on performance. Since then, this research theme has been a research front. Habel et al., (2021) highlights how compensations affect salesperson’s health and finds that increasing compensation share (increasing portion of pay-for-performance in salesperson’s compensation structure) attenuate salesperson’s work stress that leads to emotional exhaustion and more sickbays. Homburg et al., (2021) reports that sales unit incentives are effective to increase sales unit performance, but individual incentives have significant negative impact on sales unit performance. Magnotta et al., (2020) focuses on multilevel effects of incentive and training. They indicate that providing distributor sales manager with greater incentives attenuates the association between their sales representatives’ training and effort, but it improves the association between the sales representatives’ incentives and effort. Below are future research questions extracted from research in this theme.

Future Research Questions in Motivation and Extrinsic Rewards
1. Are multilevel effects of incentive and training similar or different between B2b and B2C settings?

2. Do team incentives differently influence salesperson’s stress from individual incentives?

3. Do different incentives moderate the relationships among compensation, stress, health?

4. How do variable compensation plan influence salesperson’s stress, health, and productivity in the long-term?

4.6.5 **Research Front 5: Sales Strategies**

*Sales strategies* in research front contains research interest in how to motivate salespeople to adapt a certain sales strategies/approach such as effectual selling, value-based selling, and entrepreneurial selling. For example, drawing on the motivation, opportunity, and ability framework, Wang et al., (2020) suggest that different salesperson characteristics, sales manager’s leadership, and organizational level characteristics motivate salespeople to conduct effectual selling behaviors. Edwards et al., (2022) reports entrepreneurial self-efficacy motivate salespeople for creative selling and sales innovativeness, resulting in sales performance. Finally, relevant future research questions are addressed.

**Future Research Questions in Motivation and Sales Strategies**

1. What is the long-term effect of entrepreneurial sales action on salesperson’s motivation and performance?

2. Do entrepreneurial sales approaches influence other outcomes than performance?
3. Is value based selling an effective motivator for salespeople to get engaged with solution selling in other solution providers such as service solution or consumer product solution providers?

4.7. CONCLUSION

The present study contributes to the salesperson motivation research by bibliometric review of over 500 articles. We present the performance of the salesperson motivation research, landscape changes of the field by thematic analysis, research fronts, and future research questions.
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