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Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to examine the effects of job design and sales managers’ behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople. Furthermore, we aim to examine if any of the factors included in our model have an effect on performance of Company X’s salespeople. Thus, our research questions are:

What impacts do job design and sales managers’ behaviors have on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople? What kind of differences exist between high- and low performance sales teams considering these factors?

Our study has been carried out on commission for Company X where we studied their Customer Service salespeople, which are working in a business to consumer context in the Swedish electricity market. The study makes theoretical contributions to motivation research in the field of Selling and Sales management by developing and testing a conceptual model with a unique combination of motivating variables. Our model was inspired by Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Characteristics Model, but we extended this model and added organizational variables that had not been examined in relation to this model by prior research. Thus, no previous research has, to our knowledge, tested the effects of our chosen variables of job design and sales managers behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation. To deepen our study and our understanding of what effect our variables of job design and sales managers behavior have on performance, we received secondary data from Company X. This additional data analysis enabled us to compare whether there were differences across our key variables between sales teams with high performance and low performance.

We adopted a quantitative strategy and data collection method. Thus, we distributed questionnaires to our target population – salespeople working in Company X Customer Service. Both primary and secondary data were entered and processed by the statistical analysis program SPSS. On our primary data we performed Cronbach's alpha tests, cross-tabulations, bivariate regression analysis and multiple regression analysis to test hypothesized effects. Our secondary data in combination with our primary data were analyzed by a two-sample t-test to identify differences between high-, and low performance teams.

Our hypotheses were partially supported and findings showed that the critical psychological states: experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility had positive effects on intrinsic motivation. Experienced responsibility in combination with role ambiguity had positive effects on customer orientation. Similarly, intrinsic motivation was found to affect customer orientation. The other variables of job design and sales managers’ behavior were not found to have significant effects on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation. Variables affecting performance were coaching; positive behavioral feedback and role ambiguity, and they differed significantly between high-, and low performance teams.

Our study provides practical recommendations for Company X and other companies in the electricity market. Our findings can be used to improve marketing strategies and motivation of salespeople in other business to consumer contexts.
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1. Introduction

In this section, we present the company, its industry and market to create an understanding for our topic. We motivate why this subject should be considered important and describe the fundamental background of our research problem. Relevant concepts and current research trends regarding intrinsic motivation and customer orientation are presented and, thereafter, our research questions and purpose stated.

1.1 Problem background

1.1.1 Complexity of the Swedish electricity market

Tougher competition in the selling environment has caused greater complexity for salespeople (Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 172). The availability of information through new channels (e.g. Internet) other than direct communication, make customers change their expectations on salespeople and it implies that salespeople need to be more creative (Pullins, 2001, p. 404; Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 172). Specifically, customers require salespeople to improve their knowledge, response, communication, information and product/service offerings (Jones et al., 2005, p. 106; Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 106). Moreover, customers expect that salespeople should exactly understand their problem and act as consultants in order to solve their problems (Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 172). As the selling environment changed, it placed heavier requirements on the salespeople through ”increasing product complexity, customer demands, technological innovation, regulatory oversight, and competition” (Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 106).

The electricity market is unique in the sense that the product provided to customers is identical regardless, of which electricity retailer the customer buys from (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 53). Only the price and service aspects of the product differ between companies (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 53) and electricity is often categorized as a service (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 131). With services benefits being less tangible, a service cannot be stored or displayed, and it is often the person providing the service who sells it (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 131, 133; Zeithaml et al, 1985, p. 33). Therefore, service salespeople are of crucial importance, especially those in contact with customers since they have an effect on how the service is perceived by the customer (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004, p. 23). Therefore it is important that employees handling customers are knowledgeable, friendly, helpful and listen to the customer (Bendapudi & Berry, 1997, p. 16). Services are often more difficult to sell because services are abstract, thus building trust is very important to reduce the perceived risk of buying the service (Bendapudi & Berry, 1997, p. 16; Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 133; Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004, p. 23). Building a favorable image of the company is also important when selling services because it too reduces the perceived risk (Bendapudi & Berry, 1997, p. 16; Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 133; Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004, p. 23). For companies operating in the service sector, it is especially important to emphasize customer-oriented selling and relationship building (Grönroos, 2008, p. 22).

1.1.2 The Swedish Electricity Market

The company we are writing on commission for operates in the Swedish electricity market. It is a complex market which regulations, organizational strategies and the
product itself certainly induce a very complex sales environment (Company X, 2014). Before 1996, the government owned the company Vattenfall, had a monopoly on the Swedish electricity market (Svensk energi, n.d.a; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013b). The market opened at 1996 but it was not until 1999 that the customers could choose completely freely among different electricity retailers (Svensk energi, n.d.a; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013b). Today, there are more than 120 electricity retail companies for customers to choose from (Svensk energi, n.d.a). However, there is a continued monopoly on electricity distribution, customers are assigned the company who owns the electricity grid where the customer lives (Svensk energi, n.d.b; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013a). Vattenfall, Fortum and E.on are the largest actors in the market; together they own the main part of the electricity grid and account for most of the production in the Swedish market (Fortum, 2014a). These companies have three sources of income: production, distribution and sales, which mean they do not entirely rely on their sales departments to make a profit (Svensk energi, n.d.a). Most of the electricity produced is sold on the Nordic electricity market (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland) and the electricity trading between producers and retailers is handled at NordPool Spot, accordingly production companies cannot sell directly to customers (Svensk energi, n.d.c). Distribution companies are not allowed to make a profit; everything they earn must be reinvested in the grid (SFS 2009:892; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013a). Therefore, sales departments cannot take advantage of their company owning the grid. As mentioned before, some companies have a monopoly on the distribution and if the sales departments would be allowed to take advantage of that, it would not be possible for other companies to compete with these companies (SFS 2011:712; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013a).

Due to cheap electricity, cold weather and electricity intensive industries, the Nordic countries use more electricity per capita than other countries in Europe (EEA, Svensk energi, n.d.d). Thusly, the Nordic electricity producers need to provide most of the demand (Svensk energi, n.d.e). Sweden’s primary goal is to reduce the energy consumption by 20 % by 2020 (Svensk energi, n.d.f). Requirements from society put pressure on consumers to optimize the energy consumption and, therefore, consumers consider the energy usage (Svensk energi, n.d.f). Many electricity retailers have responded to this trend by providing value adding products and services, e.g. free energy advisory services, energy saving software, solar cells, heat pumps, timers and compact fluorescent bulbs, that help customers take control of and reduce their consumption (e.g. Fortum, n.d.b; E.on, n.d.; Vattenfall, n.d.). As technology moves forward, the demand for electricity is forecasted to decline and the producers will end up with an overcapacity in production (Company X, 2014). Producers’ margin will fall in relation to decreasing consumer prices if the electricity retailers do not find new markets to export to. When the revenues for production companies decreases it will be important that their electricity retailers compensate this loss of income by performing well in terms of sales and profit.

1.1.3 Consumers Trust in the Electricity Market
The Swedish electricity market is characterized by intense competition and has the least satisfied customers (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 34-35; 41). It is also the market on which consumers are most prices sensitive (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 36). Despite the competition between several retailers, customers also perceive that it is difficult to switch suppliers (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 34-35). A report conducted by Swedish Consumer Agency (2013, p. 53) further suggests that one
of the main problems within the electricity market is the disinterested and uninvolved consumers; especially when it comes to comparing the electricity suppliers, which is frequently done by customers, rather they only look at prices without fully understanding conditions and what service is provided in the contract. In comparison to other markets it was determined that the factors causing the problems in the electricity market appeared to be correlated to the understanding, complexity and reliance of retailers (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 53).

Electricity represents a large part of many Swedish households expenses (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013 p. 46). We argue that this makes it even more important that salespeople working in this industry act responsibly and give good advice to customers. Even though the electricity market is characterized by the large dependency on their consumers’ demand, it is still a market that has unfavorable conditions for its customers (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 46). Furthermore, the overall trust towards salespeople in the electricity market is low (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 33). Markets that induce insecure feelings of the reliance to salespeople could indicate that information from retailers is vague, that marketing strategies of the products is too complex, or that the business models appears non reliant (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013 p. 33). Low trust in a given market can indicate that firms act misleadingly, violate regulations or offer unacceptable contract agreements (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013 p. 33). In general, notifications regarding telephone sellers to the Swedish Consumer Agency have increased comprehensively in recent years (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). On average, every sixth notification during 2012 concerned sales over the telephone. Some areas had an exceptional difference compared to others and the sales of electricity contracts were one of them (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). One of the main problems have occurred to be situations where consumers have sought to gain information and instead found themselves to end up in a costly agreement about an electricity contract (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). Other concerns have been lacking information, or denied withdrawals of agreements (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). The main problem is rooted in agreements that are presented as free of charge but sometimes induce high costs on customers anyway (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). Another aspect that has been criticized is the firm's systematic use of certain segments, for example, older people (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 15). We argue that these problems indicate that many companies operating in this market have a sales-oriented strategy. The bad image caused by these unethical sales-oriented behaviors damages the customers’ trust in all companies.

Lack of knowledge among firms and its salespeople have an impact on the trust among customers (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 57). The lack of knowledge could sometimes make companies appear to not be acting in alignment of the rules and regulations of the industry. In order to improve these deficiencies, it is of crucial importance to make companies aware of them and also make sure that they follow the rules and regulations (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 57). In order to create long-term survival, a company that operates in consumer markets depends on consumers’ trust (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 374). By improving this, companies can become more attractive (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p.57). We argue that the complexity in the market and the selling environment highly contributes to consumers’ dissatisfaction. Therefore this requires salespeople to create a deeper understanding for
the customers’ needs. However this insight could be seen as difficult to assess and develop for the salesforce without any support or motivation from management.

1.2 Company X

Company X focuses on three different segments: large enterprises, small and medium enterprises and consumers (Company X, 2014). Since it has become increasingly important for electricity companies to get their electricity retailers to sell more it is of vital importance for Company X to improve salespeople’s performance. Today their retail department is divided into two different sales forces: customer service and telemarketing sales (Company X, 2014). The Customer Service salesforce operates differently from telemarketing (Company X, 2014). Unlike the telemarketing salesforce who calls customers for direct selling, Customer Service receives calls from customers (Company X, 2014). The telemarketing salespeople’s task is to sell, while Customer Service salespeople are there to answer customers’ questions and sell if possible (Company X, 2014). The main part of the telemarketing salesforce is outsourced (Company X, 2014) and therefore our study will investigate their Customer Service salesforce. As mentioned before, Customer Service answers incoming calls regarding questions related to both distribution and sales and respond to a large amount of customers daily (Company X, 2014). Most of the incoming calls are sales opportunities as well and therefore Customer Service also represents a significant part of the salesforce (Company X, 2014). However legal restrictions imply that Customer Service salespeople cannot sell in some situations and it makes it more complex for them to sell (Company X, 2014). If customers have questions about distribution, Customer Service is not allowed to talk about electricity contracts since they are restricted to not take advantage of that they own the electricity grid (SFS 2011:712; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013a). However, if the customer expresses it interest in other electricity contracts and brings up a request regarding this they are able to present the customers options and sell new contracts (SFS 2011:712; Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013a).

This information has strengthened our perception of that it could be of crucial importance for the company to examine what motivational factors Customer Service actually considers as relevant. However regulations has also implied great complexity of their work tasks which could potentially have an impact on their motivation. Therefore it is important to determine what motivational factors that have an impact on salespeople’s performance, i.e. increase the company’s profit margins. Therefore we have chosen to focus on the Customer Service salespeople’s intrinsic motivation. Company X emphasizes the importance of increasing their sales efficiency in order to cut costs. Simultaneously, they want to improve customer satisfaction, they mean that more satisfied employees also bring more satisfied customers. Company X’s vision is that they shall have the most satisfied and loyal customers in the Nordic electricity market (Company X, 2014). Customer Service plays an important role in their strategy, as they will create value and competitive advantage for Company X by increased efforts to obtain customer satisfaction and loyalty through customer-oriented selling. Previously the company’s focus has been mainly on sales efficiency and service levels (Company X, 2014). Efficiency is still important but now the focus is more on being customer oriented and using qualitative measurements, e.g. customer satisfaction index and value adding service ratio, rather than quantitative, e.g. calls per hour and sales ratio (Company X, 2014). Their core values, which are: safety, cooperation, performance,
customer orientation (Company X, 2014), indicates that they do not necessarily want to exclude efficiency but rather combine it with customer orientation. Competition in the market is getting tougher and their vision is to create sustainable financial results and to enable sustainable consumption, therefore their strategy is to develop operational excellence. Hence, it is important for Company X to achieve good results without reducing their customers’ satisfaction.

To further improve service levels, customer satisfaction and add more value in every contact with customers, Customer Service has implemented a special conversation technique (Company X, 2014). This implies that when employees interact with customers, they should present all opportunities available for the client (Company X, 2014). They are trained in recognizing different personalities to be better able to customize the service (Company X, 2014). A core aspect would be to listen to the client, find specific needs and fulfill them. Salespeople should be engaged in all conversations they have with customers and have the ability to help clients in the best possible way (Company X, 2014). They shall do their utmost to understand the customer's real needs and solve the need at first contact in order to avoid future non-value adding contacts (Company X, 2014). They should strive for solutions that are beneficial to the customer, the environment and the company as well as explore all possibilities available for the client at Company X in every conversation with clients (Company X, 2014). We argue that this demands more from the employees since it could take more time to negotiate a mutual agreement with the customer.

The organization’s goal is to be perceived as: fun, stimulating, informative and motivating by employees; value creating, professional, simple, understanding and pleasant by customers; professional, easy to work with and value creating by the principals (Company X, 2014). Therefore, Company X wants us to find out what factors motivates their employees to improve performance and customer-oriented selling.

1.3 Problem Formulation and Research Gap
The sales literature is relatively young compared to the marketing literature (Fine, 2007, p. 187) and effective selling and sales management represent a substantial source for market success (Jones et al., 2005, p. 105). However, the research in this field has stagnated and fallen behind other areas of marketing (Jones et al., 2005, p. 105), which gives us an indication that more research is needed in this field. Early research on sales orientation gives a picture of selling techniques as dubious, even dishonest and this view derives from the sales-orientated era, 1920’s-1950’s (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16). It implies that firms seek to stimulate demand of products/services produced, rather than producing products/services in response to customer needs (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p.343). Many companies still adopt this sales-orientated strategy to sell but this approach tends to evoke negative even hostile feelings in people (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16; Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 51). Later, in 1950’s, organizations realized that a sales-orientated approach could damage the company’s image (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 4). Therefore, the marketing concept started to emerge and the concept of customer-oriented selling was brought to the forefront by Saxe and Weitz (1982). They define it as “the degree to which salespeople practice the marketing concept by trying to help their customers make purchase decisions that will satisfy customer needs” (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 344). This concept is a key to successful and
profitable businesses and must be central to business planning (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.17; Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 343).

New purchase habits and expectations among customers have required salespeople and their managers to adapt their abilities and strategies in order to achieve the new performance standards (Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 105-106). Salespeople interact with customers every day and in this way they play an important role due to their ability to effectively communicate and satisfy customers’ needs (Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 106; 108). However, the understanding of what influences customers’ decision-making has become more challenging and therefore it is more difficult to establish and maintain relationships with them (Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 108). We argue that since salespeople are the organizations link to customers they play a crucial role for the company’s success. Therefore it is of significant importance that they feel appreciated and wants to engage in their job. The changing sales environment (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2002, p.617; Jones et al., 2005, p.106) and the increasing importance of customer orientation in the field of selling (Pullins, 2001, p. 404; Rackham & DeVincentis, 1999, p. 108) constitutes a need for sales managers to make sure that their salespeople are motivated.

Lopez et al. (2006, p. 389) argue that more research has to be drawn on motivation and especially with respect to the changing selling environment. The success of an organization is highly dependent on personal selling (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51) and in order to motivate a sales force, sales managers are required to understand salespeople’s needs (Jobber & Lee, 1994, p. 325). Classical theories on motivation suggest that people value needs differently (Herzberg et al., 2007; Maslow 1970; Vroom, 1966). Maslow (1970) suggested a hierarchy of needs that fosters motivation. On the contrary Herzberg et al. (2007, p. Xiii) argue that all factors do not work as motivators, some are simply dissatisfiers. Vroom (1966, p. 280) emphasize that employees will not be motivated to perform better if they do not expect that their effort will result in higher performance (Vroom, 1966, p. 280). These classical theories also laid a basis for new developments in the field of motivation. Findings have determined that individuals engage in activities if they receive satisfying rewards that do not interfere with their ability to satisfy basic needs (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 14).

However, individuals are driven by different factors, Amabile et al. (1994, p. 950) assess that some are simply motivated by their genuine interest in activities whereas others are more motivated by the external inducements a job can provide (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 650). These different types of motivation constitute two categories: extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation. Most companies today use financial incentives to motivate their salesforce (Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 171) and they generally generate extrinsic motivation that is primarily concerned with the willingness to reach a specific goal or result (Pullins et al., 2009, p. 469). Research has indicated completely relying on financial rewards may facilitate inappropriate sales behavior that hurts a company’s performance (Lopez et al., 2006, p. 389; Zoltners et al., 2012, p.172) which managers have expressed their concerns for this (Pullins, 2001, p.404). However, there are other powerful incentives to increase effectiveness of the salesforce, induce appropriate behaviors and enhance a company’s performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1997, p. 1143; Zoltners et al. (2012, p.171). Further, Pullins (2001, p. 406) argue that it is important to determine motivational factors that elicit intrinsic motivation of salespeople. However, there is still little guidance for sales managers on how to assess the most important factors for motivation among their salespeople (Lopez et al., 2006,
p. 381; Shipley & Kjely, 2007, p. 28) and therefore we argue that is of significant importance that each organization investigate what their specific salespeople are motivated by.

Further, Harmon et al. (2002, p. 44) enhanced that managing salespeople's behavior will increase due to that organizations have changed their focus towards a customer oriented approach and relationship building. There it is needed to determine how motivation influences sellers and their customer relationships (Pullins, 2001, p. 405). Since, it takes more time and effort to be customer oriented (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590) we argue that it indicates that a job's design can have an impact on salespeople’s motivation. Thus, when a job gets redesigned and enriched it may diminish dysfunctional and counterproductive behavior (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 91). Hackman and Oldham, (1980, p. 91) mean that enriched job can provide favorable outcomes such as intrinsic motivation and work effectiveness. Thus, Work design theory has received increased attention (Devaro et al., 2007, p. 986) and the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham is used to determine the motivating potential of a job and its design (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p.585; Wagner et al., 2008, p. 6364). However, most of the previous research we read on the JCM only test specific parts of the model and Johns et al. (1992, p. 658) means that the whole model is so infrequently tested that it actually creates a research gap. The fact that the whole model is relatively untested provides a fundamental argument that it would be subject for extended research.

The JCM is constituted by core job characteristics, critical psychological states and outcomes; additionally Hackman and Oldham (1980) consider three moderating effects on these factors. Several studies have tested the JCM and modified or extended it by using varying sets of job characteristics or outcomes (Johlke & Iyer, 2013; DeVaro et al., 2007; Johns et al., 1992; Thankor & Joshi, 2005). Some tested core job characteristics on job satisfaction, customer orientation and sales performance (Johlke & Iyer, 2013, p. 59) others on outcomes such as: “labor productivity, product quality and work satisfaction” (DeVaro et al., 2007, p. 987). Thus, core job characteristics of the model are often researched with a single intention: to find what outcomes they are affecting (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). However, many times researchers have excluded the mediating psychological states (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658) but there is also research that mainly focused on them. Thankor and Joshi (2005, p. 590) tested whether “experienced meaningfulness, organizational identification and pay satisfaction” were critical psychological states of relevance for salespeople’s customer orientation.

DeVaro et al. (2007, p. 987) tested the moderating effect of context satisfaction whereas other studies mainly integrated sales managers’ behavioral impact and other contextual factors as moderators in the JCM (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980). We argue that contextual factors, i.e. defined as managerial feedback, pay for performance, and relationships with managers and co-workers (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 86) deserve more attention. Thus, we argue that sales managers influence salespeople’s motivation and customer-oriented behavior and therefore these aspects deserve more research in combination with work design.

Company X requested us to particularly examine sales managers behavior and their responsibility to provide feedback, coaching and roles clarity. Some extensive research has been done on these concepts and role stress concerns the individual’s perceived role in an organization and is constituted by two variables: role conflict and role ambiguity (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 155). A jobs’ design and potential effect on effectiveness implies
that it is necessary for managers to provide clear roles and this gives us an indication of
that role stress could have an impact on other outcomes as well. Previous research on
role perception and its effect on performance have been inconsistent (Sohi, 1996, p.55),
which suggest that more work is required to determine the relationship between these
variables. It is recommended that future research should try to determine the motivating
potential of job characteristics, role conflict and role ambiguity in order to establish
their relation between theory and practice (Singh, 1998, p.84). Role conflict and role
ambiguity have been included in the job characteristics model previously (e.g. Coelho,
et al., 2011; Singh, 1998) but has not, to our knowledge, been tested with the exact
combination of variables we use. Furthermore, previous research on feedback (e.g.
Carter, 2006; Jaworski & Kohli, 1991; Harmon et al., 2002) and coaching (Carter, 2006;
Onyemah, 2007; Rich, 1998) also indicates that sales managers’ behavior have a
significant effect on salespeople. When we reviewed literature on these managerial
behaviors we found that they were rarely tested in combination with job design. Thus,
the lack of research of the direct effects of contextual factors (Hackman & Oldham,
1980, p. 86) and the scarce guidelines for how sales managers’ should behave to
influence salespeople sufficient sales behavior (Fine, 2007, p. 189) constitutes a
research gap. Additionally, complexity to manage salespeople in organizations with
customer-oriented strategies (Fine, 2007, p. 185) constitutes arguments for why we
consider it as important to research these factors.

Thus, previous research has not, to our knowledge, tested these variables in the same
combination and on the same outcomes as we do. By testing these effects we aim to
contribute with new knowledge to motivation research in the field of Selling and Sales
management. From the above presentation of previous research indicates that some
factors have been tested in the Job Characteristics Model, while some have not been.
Even though some researchers have combined different factors in this previous models
no one has, to our knowledge, combined the factors used in our model the same way we
do.

Lastly, Singh, (1998, p. 80) suggest future studies to involve sampling boundary-
spanning roles, relevant to marketing, such as customer service representatives and
salespeople since it is rare combination in studies. To our knowledge no previous
research has studied sales representatives in a customer service in regard to JCM. Thus,
we argue that our research can contribute with an extra dimension to this field and have
reason to believe that role stress might be even greater for a sales representative in a
customer service department than other salespeople. Thus, the boundary-spanning role
may affect how sales representatives at a customer service perceive their job differently
than other salespeople. Further, they could also perceive the way sales managers give
feedback and coach differently.

1.4 Research Questions
What impacts do job design and sales managers’ behaviors have on intrinsic motivation
and customer orientation of salespeople?

What kind of differences exist between high- and low performance sales teams considering these factors?
1.5 Purpose
The main purpose of our study is to examine the effects of job design and sales managers’ behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople. Furthermore, we aim to examine if any of the factors included in our model have an effect on performance of Company X’s salespeople.

We aim to assess what impact these motivational factors have on salespeople’s behavior in order to make managerial implications for Company X and other companies in the electricity market. We want to clarify that motivation in our study refers to salespeople’s motivation to engage in activities and behaviors that align with the organization’s goals.

1.6 Definitions
**Motivation** - “motivation is the process that activates behavior” (Shipley & Kiely, 2007, p. 18).

**Extrinsic Motivation** - “the motivation to work primarily in response to something apart from the work itself, such as reward or recognition or the dictates of other people” (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950).

**Intrinsic Motivation** - “the motivation to engage in work primarily for its own sake, because the work itself is interesting, engaging, or in some way satisfying” (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950).

**Customer-Oriented selling** – “the degree to which salespeople practice the marketing concept by trying to help their customers make purchase decisions that will satisfy customer needs” Saxe and Weitz (1982, p.344).

**Sales Management** - “part of the strategic marketing” (Forsyth, 2002, p. 5). Sales management is now concerned with the analysis of customers’ needs and wants and, through the company’s total marketing efforts, with the provision of benefits to satisfy these needs and wants (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 37).

**Feedback** - a sales manager's praise or recognition directed toward a subordinate salesperson performing at or above expectations (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 190).

**Coaching** - “using skills, experience, and direction to help someone improve their performance” (Carter, 2006, p. 113).

**Role Conflict** - “role conflict arises when the salesperson believes that the role demands of two or more of his role partners are incompatible and he cannot possibly satisfy them all at the same time (Churchill et al., 1977, p.159).

**Role Ambiguity** - “role ambiguity occurs when the salesperson feels he does not have the information necessary to perform his job adequately” (Churchill et al., 1977, p.159).
2. Scientific Method

This chapter will explain why we have chosen to study motivation and what our pre-understandings in this field were. Furthermore, we describe our research philosophy, research method and research approach - the foundation for the design of our study. Lastly, we examine theories and sources that we consider suitable for our degree project.

2.1 Choice of Subject

We, Elina Hedelius and Sara Nilsson, are currently completing our master studies at Umeå School of Business and Economics at Umeå University. Elina has studied the Supply Chain Management and Retail Program with specialization in Marketing and Supply Chain on master level. Sara has studied the International Business Program with specialization in Management on master level. Since we come from different academic backgrounds we wanted to combine the fields of marketing and management in our research. Thus, we found the field of sales management appropriate for us, our previous work experiences and general interest of organizational structure were reasons for why we found motivation an adequate topic to write our thesis on.

We wanted to write about a current practical problem to be able to apply theories in real life. Therefore we applied to various companies’ and used our contact network to write on commission for a company. We came in contact with Company X through an acquaintance of Elina, who worked as a manager at Company X’s customer service and the company suited our interests. We had predetermined idea of what the thesis would be about and pitched it for Company X that found it interesting. Thus, they wanted us to write on commission for them and accepted the idea to examine motivational factors of Company X’s salesforce. They suggested that we could carry out our study on their Customer Service department since this department work towards their largest segment, consumers and have problems of reaching their sales goals. They also forecast to face future challenges in this segment due to changing market models, increased competition and regulations from the Swedish government (Company X, 2014). Motivation and customer-oriented behaviors are very important for the salespeople in Company X Customer Services since they talk to about 2000 customers each day. Company X goes through internal changes at the moment and is focusing more on soft values and customer orientation instead of hard values and outcomes. Thus, they focus less on quantitative measurements and rewards; instead they want to enhance the intrinsic motivation of their employees to work more efficiently and customer oriented. Based on sales people's’ opinions we aim to find what motivational factors that can increase their intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance (i.e. sales ratio and added value services ratio) among them.

2.2 Pre-understanding

While studying at Umeå University we have acquired a wide range of knowledge. We have deepened our knowledge in the marketing and management fields and both of us have taken courses of sales management and motivation. Both of us have work experiences as salespeople and customer services; Elina has even worked at Company X. Our backgrounds could influence our research by for example our choice of sources, argumentations and how we think. Some argue that researchers are likely to be influenced by previous knowledge (e.g. Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 414). In contrast we
argue that it is not necessarily negative and that limited practical and theoretical knowledge can create obstacles. Especially in our case where the market and the context Company X operate in is very complex. We argue that a lack of pre-understandings of how salespeople at Company X works could have made it more difficult for us to carry out our study. However, a negative aspect of our pre-understandings could be the risk that we become subjective. Objectivity in research is extremely important because subjectivity makes it hard for others to replicate the results (Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 82). Thus, it is important that our study is replicable and therefore we intend to carry out our study as objectively we can to decrease negative effects of pre-understandings. Sara has no previous experience from the electricity business and we argue that she could process our topic more objectively. Thus, she is able to view the branch and sales activities with “fresh eyes” and therefore we complement each other that can be beneficial for our study. To decrease the risk for subjectivity we will reflect on how we collect our quantitative data and examine variables effect, so all steps in our research process are carried out in an objective and value-free way.

2.3 Research Philosophy

2.3.1 Ontology

Before conducting study researchers should define what research philosophy they adopt, because philosophical views provide important assumptions of how researchers perceive the world (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 108). Research philosophy regards practical considerations and explain researchers perception of the how the process of knowledge should be attained and developed (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 108). It is important that researchers consider epistemological and ontological views and their underlying assumptions as it will guide a study's research strategy and method (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.16; 22; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 108).

Ontology regards the nature of reality and explains what assumptions researchers have of how their surroundings operate (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 109). There are two ontological views: objectivism and constructivism. Objectivism ”implies that social phenomena confront us as external factors that are beyond our reach or influence” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 21). Thus, objectivists view social entities as an external reality for social actors (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 110) and therefore they can and should be regarded as objective entities (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 20). Hence, social phenomena or entity's existence is unrelated to social actors. Categories such as organizations are often described as tangible objects with a reality external to individuals operating in it but put requirements on them which implies employees have to adapt to the limitations from organizations (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 21).

Constructionism is another ontological view that is a counterpart to objectivism. Accordingly, constructivism implies that "social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 22). Thus, social entities are rather built by perceptions and commitments of social actors in contrast to objectivism they are not prearranged external realities that social actors cannot be in charge of (Saunders et al., 2009, p.111). Individuals attach meaning to social phenomena (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111), which means that instead of pre-existing rules, regulations, norms, procedures and instructions they are rather developed by social actors themselves. In constructionism, reality is assumed to be socially constructed (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111) and therefore built up by interactions and
implies that social order is frequently changing (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 22). Social actors interpret situations in various ways and therefore experience them differently depending on how they perceive their surrounding environment, which influences their actions and interactions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111). Thus, constructionists aim to understand the subjective meanings of what motivates social actors to a certain actions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111).

Our ontological view is objectivism and we will examine the relationships between the social entity (i.e. Company X) and its social actors (i.e. salespeople). We consider Company X as a social order where norms, rules, standardized procedures and managerial instructions imply limitations to salespeople. As we view the reality as objectivists we view Company X as an external entity for the employees working there. We mean that the organization has an own tangible reality and our primary concern is to objectively examine the chosen social phenomena. Our primary purpose is to investigate what effects job design and sales managers behaviors have on employees’ intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance. We argue that these aspects are part of an organizations reality and therefore external to the control of social actors. Thus, a view of constructivism would be less appropriate due to that our intentions are not to examine the different subjective meanings among employees. Though constructionists view could give valuable insights regarding social actors but we will not adopt this philosophical stance in our research.

2.3.2 Epistemology

Epistemology concerns what type of knowledge that should be regarded as acceptable (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 112). In other words how knowledge is gathered, examined and validated (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15). A central issue of epistemology concerns whether the same principles and procedures used in natural sciences can and should be applied to the social world (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15).

There are three main views of epistemology: positivism, interpretivism and realism (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15-19; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 113). Positivists favors applications of natural science methods to studies of social reality and make a clear distinction between research and theory (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15). This view enables researchers to test theories and in order to obtain reliable data researchers should use existing theory to evolve hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 113). Researchers test and confirm hypotheses, which constitutes a foundation to draw conclusions of relationships in data and gives them an opportunity to generalize findings to law-like implications (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 114). It implies further assessments of the theoretical field that could constitute a source for further research (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 113). Additionally, it means that researchers adopting an approach of positivism examine facts rather than impressions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 114). Positivist merely means that observable phenomena are providing reliable data and that insusceptible data is not regarded as completely scientific (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15). This relationship between theory and research suggests that research should be conducted in a value-free way (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 114).

Interpretivism is related to the ontological stance of constructivism (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111). Thus, interpretivism is an epistemological stance more often related to
qualitative studies. In contrary to positivism, interpretivism enhance that a research method needs to acknowledge the difference between humans and natural sciences (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 115). Thus, interpretivists argue that a study of social phenomena requires a different research method that creates an understanding of the fundamental differences between humans and natural orders (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 16). Saunders et al. (2009, p. 115) argues that social actors are too complex to be defined by theoretical laws and that insights are lost if one does not consider the complexity. Thus, researchers are required to comprehend an understanding for differences among social actors, i.e. humans (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 16; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 116). Hence, individuals have different interpretations of their social roles and respectively add a meaning to these roles (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 116). The same process is applied when humans consider the social role of others. It is of importance for interpretivist to adopt an empathetic stance where they are able to be involved in the social world of the individuals and create an understanding for their behaviors from their perspective (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 116).

Lastly, realism partly relates to positivism and shares the view that natural and social sciences can apply the same methods to collect and explain data (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 17). Realists also share that there is an external reality that researchers aim to conceptualize (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 17). Thus, it is how they explain they know reality but in contrary they disagree with positivist in terms of that theoretical explanations of situations are acceptable and not amenable for observation (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 17).

We are positivists and consider natural science methods appropriate for the purpose of our study. Thus, we view our concepts to describe parts of the reality and therefore they are considered to induce valuable insights for the social world. We will constitute a theoretical framework used to develop our hypotheses that will be tested by the examination of primary collected data from regarding salespeople's perceived motivation and customer oriented behavior. Thus, we view this type of knowledge and information gathering acceptable to constitute new insights and knowledge to our field of research.

Organizational behavior, marketing and human resource management are often considered as complex business situations (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 116) and we are aware of that these theoretical fields may be argued as more suitable for a stance of interpretivism. However, one should note that explaining human behavior through different aspects that influence it is a core consideration in a positivist approach, whereas interpretivists are more concerned with the understanding of human behavior and their actions (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 16). As positivists we argue that interpretivists are more concerned to understand the subjective meaning of social actions. In contrast to interpretivists our method focus is simply examine what motivational factors that have an effect on our outcome variables and we therefore considered this view as inappropriate. Thus, the purpose of this study is not to seek a deeper understanding for why salespeople’s motivation and customer oriented sales techniques occurs. We are rather concerned to find generalizations for Company X to be drawn on above-mentioned notions. Regarding realism their view of reality partly aligns with ours but this epistemological stance deviates from our when it concerns how we aim to attain knowledge and evaluation it.
2.4 Research Strategy

Both quantitative and qualitative researchers are interested in what individuals do and think, but they investigate these aspects with diverse approaches (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 260). Quantitative and qualitative research strategies deviate in their research approach and their ontological and epistemological positions. It is suggested to deliberate on both research approaches before one decides which method to use because it is of significance that it aligns with the problem statement and purpose of the study, thus it needs to be considered before one starts to collect data (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 109). Quantitative research strategy tests hypotheses composed and verified from concepts in previous theory (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 151). Constructs are then tested on respondents of interest that typically entails numeric data that allow researchers to analyze relationships between theory and the empirical results (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 150). Qualitative research strategy is more concerned with words since data is mainly collected by interviews and observations (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 386). Thus, interpretations of qualitative data contribute to the conceptual framework (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 386) and the ability for researchers to find patterns to reinforce in established theories (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 125).

Writing on commission implies that it is important for us to also consider Company X's objectives with our study. Therefore, we met with our mentor at Company X and deliberated about their expectations of our study. We concluded that they were aiming to obtain a general view of what factors their salespeople become motivated by. Further, they wanted to determine whether these aspects also lead to customer-oriented behaviors. We proposed a quantitative study where we aim to find a generalization regarding factors motivating salespeople's at Company X Customer Service. We argue that a quantitative study is more suitable for our degree project since our intentions are to only examine motivational factors effect on our outcomes variables. Thus, we deduce hypotheses from previous theory and collect numerical data from salespeople in order to examine those relationships between our variables. Further, this research strategy aligns with our positions of objectivism and positivism.

We were considering conducting a mixed method study of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Thus, interviews could have been a complementary approach to deepen our understanding for why certain factors had an effect on motivation and customer oriented behavior. However, this idea was reconsidered and eliminated due to a limited time preference. Similarly, a single qualitative approach may have fostered a greater understanding for the salespeople's behavior. Nevertheless, we want to investigate effects of motivational factors and therefore we considered a qualitative study as most appropriate it also aligned with Company X’s initial objectives of our study.

2.5 Research Approach

Researchers can view the relationship between theory and research in two ways, either with a deductive approach or inductive approach. A deductive approach is the most frequently used relationship between theory and research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11). It implies that researchers must be able to embed concepts from previous theoretical findings into hypotheses and test them with aid from collected data (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 124) Thus, it enables rejection or confirmation of hypotheses that give researchers a foundation to revise theory. The process of deduction
may be perceived as simple and linear but could be complex in reality in terms of obstacles related to data collection mismatched with hypotheses or a lack of relevance (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 12). Deductive studies could be subject to revision if new theoretical findings have an impact on researchers unpublished study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 12). In this degree project we review previous theoretical findings, develop an own conceptual model and state hypotheses regarding our variables, which implies that we can analyze their effects on motivation and customer orientation among salespeople at Company X. Thus, we are using a deductive approach to define the relationship between theory and research. Further, this approach is consistent with our ontological view of objectivism and epistemological orientation of positivism.

An alternative research method would be to adopt an inductive approach where the main objective is to build new theories from findings through observations (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 125). This approach is widely used in qualitative studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 13) and gives researchers the ability to analyze detected patterns and contribute to established theories (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 125). Thus, findings are fed back into the domain of research as “new theory” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11). However, this relationship between theory and research was not suitable for our research, as we wanted to assess effects and not patterns. Thus, it does not align with the purpose of our study and was not considered.

### 2.6 Choice of Theories

Saunders et al. (2009, p. 61) enhance that the purpose of a literature review is to clarify what type of findings that has been obtained in a particular field up to this date. The literature review will describe what other researchers found and potential gaps in their study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 61). Further, this will constitute the base for the development of our conceptual model. Therefore we review previous work in the field of selling and sales management, work design, role theory, motivation and customer orientation. It is important that our theoretical chapter considers previous sources that researched the same topics mentioned above. Thus, it will guide readers through the main contributions in these fields and create a better understanding for our research. This implies that we will use relevant theories and general explanations of phenomena in order to constitute a good overview for our subjects.

As customer orientation is one of our main concepts we considered it important to define it early in our theoretical framework. Customer orientation emerged from the Marketing Concept developed in the 1950’s (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 4) and is a relatively new sales approach. Customer orientation is defined as “the degree to which salespeople practice the marketing concept by trying to help their customers make purchase decisions that will satisfy customer needs” (Schwepker, 2003, p. 152). Increasing demands from better-educated customers have more or less enforced companies to adopt this selling approach (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 50). This concept is highly relevant for us since Company X has implemented this type of selling approach. Further, we found it interesting to investigate how their salespeople perceive their sales behavior as it could provide superior value for the organization. This type of selling approach constitutes implications for salespeople, customers and managers and by generally introducing customer orientation and its impact we also try to explain the complexity of the sales environment. Further, customer oriented selling has been found to have a relationship with intrinsic motivation (Mullin & Pullins, 2009, p. 774), which
also makes it highly relevant for us since intrinsic motivation is one of our other doctrines.

Subsequently the concept of motivation will be explained. Some might argue that early findings by Maslow (1943), Herzberg (2007), Alderfer (1969), Vroom (1966) and others may be irrelevant for today’s research. However, we regard these classical contributions in the field as valuable to draw conclusions. Therefore we first explain an historical development of the motivational concept and then narrow it down to the relatively new concept of intrinsic motivation. Motivation is considered to consist of different aspects and classical theories explain that there are several combined effects that could impact a salesperson’s motivation and lead to higher performance.

These classical theories also constitute the foundation for other theories in the field of motivation. In particular the customer oriented sales approach has paved way for other motivational theories. For example it has been suggested that there are both extrinsic and intrinsic reasons for employees to engage in specific behaviors (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2). Extrinsic rewards are undoubtedly powerful motivators but do not always lead to appropriate behaviors (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 14). However, this type of motivation has been found to be problematic (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 15). As we intend to seek factors that are affecting the customer oriented behavior we therefore have chosen to specifically focus on the concept of intrinsic motivation. This concept started to develop in 1970’s and have received increased attention in recent years. It has specifically been found to have a relation to customer orientation (Mullin & Pullins, 2009, p. 774). Several other findings supports that intrinsic motivation has an effect on a number of positive outcomes for an organization and its salespeople such as increased creativity, working smarter, win-win negotiation tactics, relaxed attitudes, adaptive selling approaches, enhancement of flexibility and relationship building (Hennessey, 2000; Hodgins et al., 1996, Pullins, 1996; Pullins, 2001; Ryan et al., 1983; Weitz et al., 1986). Both of these implications are why we argue that intrinsic motivation is a concept highly relevant. Hence, we want to assess what factors that leads to this type of motivation and its positive outcomes. This theory can help us reveal what motivational factors Company X’s salespeople are affected by and which ones that enhances intrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic motivation also creates a bridge over to the organization’s and sales managers’ ability to motivate salespeople. Hence, intrinsic motivation is needed to obtain certain behaviors; but what factors will enhance the motivation? In our opinion the organization has a great influence on how individuals perceive their work. Accordingly, the field of work design and the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) helps us to review what impact a well-designed job and its characteristics could have on employees’ motivation. Most of the times organizations design a job and let employees adapt after the new directions (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 76). This may not always be the most suitable approach to develop a workplace. Further, organizations also have the responsibility to provide employees with clear job descriptions, missions and responsibilities. Further, this theory also suggests that employees experience certain psychological states before characteristic affect outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 76). Since the critical psychological states are significant for customer-oriented behavior (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590) we found it important to also test them towards other outcomes. Hence, both the job characteristics and critical psychological states have previously been examined in relationship with different outcomes in the Job
Characteristic Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 90) and therefore we found it appropriate to serve as a foundation for our own conceptual model and a theory useful for our study.

Further, we argue that managers also have a great influence on salespeople’s behavior. Harmon et al. (2002, p. 44) states that in order to increase appropriate and productive behaviors it is of significant importance that sales managers provide feedback and coaching to their salesforce. Therefore we want to consider managers’ behavior and its impact on salespeople through the concepts of coaching and feedback. We want to extend the previous research of job characteristics and integrate additional characteristics affected by managers. In specific both coaching and feedback are leadership behaviors with a confirmed direct or indirect effect on employees intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance (Jaworski & Kohli, 1992, p. 192; Rich, 1998, p. 54). An organization is dependent on its sales people’s ability to sell and to best ensure this ability managerial functions such as feedback are crucial (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51). Sales managers feedback can increase salespeople’s productivity, efficiency, satisfaction and motivation (Carter, 2006, p.113). However, verbal feedback is not the only important leader behavior, and coaching is another important tool for sales managers (Rich, 1998, p. 53-55). Carter (2006, p. 113) defines coaching as “using skills, experience, and direction to help someone improve their performance”. As this leadership behavior has been found to have an effect on salespeople's attitudes and behaviors (Onyemah, 2007, p. 953) as well as an organizations overall performance (Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 172) we argue that this concept could provide valuable insights regarding the manager’s ability to contribute to salespeople's motivation, customer oriented behavior and performance. This is the foundational argument why we wanted to specifically assess how sales manager’s behavior impacts salespeople’s intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance in Company X. These two aspects and theories provided us with an understanding of what factors that potentially affect salespeople’s motivation. Hence, these concepts and their definitions contribute to the explanation of how we constituted our conceptual model.

Lastly, we also try to examine the cohesive relationship between the perceived role of salespeople on intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance. This aspect is also related to the organization and managers ability to provide a clear insight of what the salespeople’s roles in the organization are. A role is defined as a set of expectations about behavior for a position in a social structure (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 155; Walker, et al., 1975, p. 33; Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). Further, the role concept is divided in two aspects: role ambiguity and role conflict (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 155). Role conflict occurs when a person experiences incompatible job demands or expectations from and organization (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979 p.72; Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Walker et al, 1975, p. 32). While role ambiguity implies that an individual has inadequate knowledge or information about how to perform his or her job (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979 p.72; Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Walker et al, 1975, p. 32). Thus, we argue that it is important for organizations to clarify expectations and inform employees how to behave, in order to create a unified organization where salespeople behave in alignment with the organizations vision. Different demands and objectives from various sources may cause a certain perception of a salesperson’s role (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979, p.73; Sohi, 1996, p.51). Further, it is suggested that the perceived role could affect a salesperson’s performance (Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). We therefore found it interesting to also investigate whether it had an impact on the salespeople in Company X and their
performance. Our review of this concept also provide us with a greater insight of how it also potentially can affect customer oriented behavior and intrinsic motivation.

2.7 Choice of Literature Sources

Literature sources that contribute to the understanding and insights of previous research in a field is divided in three categories; primary, secondary and tertiary (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 68). These different categories explain how information flows from the original source: from primary to secondary to tertiary (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 68). Primary literature sources refer to the first time information occurs in a source, thus secondary sources refer to subsequent information referring back to primary literature (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 69). Tertiary literature is more concerned with abstracts and indexes that intend to introduce topics (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 69). We intend to mainly use primary literature sources in our study in order to create an extensive and cohesive literature review. Secondary references induce a risk that the core meaning of the original source is changed (Johansson-Lindfors, 1993, p. 117-118) and therefore we try to avoid them. We consider tertiary literature inappropriate for our degree project since we aim to gather reliable and scientific sources for our topics. Thus, it will not be used due that there is a risk that we do not understand underlying issues and effects by reading abstracts and therefore misinterpret the core meaning of the information.

We collected information from a vast variety of sources in order to obtain a wide range of knowledge from previous research in the different fields. We always tried to derive primary sources in order to decrease misinterpretations, use of invalid information or biases of our study. Further, our literature review is mainly based on primary sources from academic journals. Saunders et al. (2009, p. 70) describes these types of articles to often be written by authors with great experiences from a field and evaluated by experts in a research area before they are published. Therefore, we consider this type of source as eligible for our research. This contributed to an assurance of that we use reliable and sufficient information subject to appropriate interpretations. Hence, all sources were evaluated and considered as appropriate and relevant to our study before they were cited in our research. We started to generally gather information regarding selling, sales management and the complex environment of selling. In particular we started to collect information from the Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, which also constituted a good basis for our literature review. Articles gathered in this journal then referred to other academic articles in various fields. However, we decided to limit our review to the fields of marketing, management and work design. In order to attain an extensive understanding in the field of motivation we decided to review classical theories and more recent findings in this field. A similar approach was taken for the other concepts and by gradually going through research from early findings until today we acquired a broad overview of each subject.

Before anyone was cited we considered the author’s expertise, interest, reputation and frequency of citation in other articles. Further, the research relevance and novelty for our study and the field per se was considered. It was also useful to obtain new sources by searching for research cited by other authors. Some authors occurred frequently in relation to a certain subject. We consider this as an indication of that they made relevant contributions to the field and therefore evaluated their expertise as a sufficient source of information. Thus, additional information was obtained through the consideration of referenced articles. All these additional articles were judged in the same way as other
ones. Further, we also used relevant books related to the different topics that provided an opportunity for us to deepen the explanation of the certain concepts.

The scientific articles we used were retrieved from different databases and specifically from EBSCO, Business Source Premier (www.web.b.ebscohost.com), EMERALD Group Publishing (www.emeraldinsight.com), JSTOR Administrative Science Quarterly (www.jstor.org) and Google Scholar (www.scholar.google.com). We also retrieved information from edited book concerned with relevant topics. Our methodological chapters were founded on books written by Bryman and Bell (2011), Saunders et al. (2009) and Shiu et al. (2009). These books are written for the purpose of research in Business Administration and are based on several sources with methodological contributions. Thus, we considered these books as credible books to base the methodological chapter of our degree project upon. Other primary sources used are comprehensive reports and other information received directly from Company X. Also information provided by the Swedish Consumer Agency and the Swedish Energy Markets Inspectorate, which both are public institutions that inspect the Swedish electricity market, were used.

We used several keywords when searching in databases for relevant articles. As all concepts constitutes the foundation for our conceptual model all keywords related to the purpose of our study. Following keywords were used in several combinations; marketing concept, customer orientation, relationship selling, customer behavior, customer needs + selling and sales management, selling environment, complexity of selling, selling services, importance of salespeople + motivation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, hierarchy of needs, expectancy theory, motivation and behaviors + job characteristics model, job characteristics, critical psychological states + managerial behaviors, managerial support, feedback, positive behavioral feedback, negative behavioral feedback, positive output feedback, negative output feedback, coaching + role theory, role stress, role clarity, role conflict, role ambiguity.
3. Theoretical Framework

This chapter explains theories that constitute the foundation of our research. We regard different sales approaches and complexity of the sales job is discussed. We explain classical theories of motivation and more recent developments within the same field. Further, we identify how job design and sales managers’ behavior relate to salespeople's motivation. Finally, motivational factors and their predicted effects on intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance will be presented in our conceptual model.

3.1 Selling and Sales Management

3.1.1 Sales-oriented and Customer-oriented Selling

Marketing strategies’ success mainly depends on effective selling and sales management (Jones et al., 2005, p. 105). These notions appear closely related but selling is the “function to make a sale” (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.4) whereas sales management is concerned with analysis of customers’ needs through a company’s total marketing efforts, with the primary concern being to satisfy customers (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 37). If marketing strategies are poorly designed or not fully integrated among salespeople there are risks that they become ineffective (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 5). Thus, the success of an organization is highly dependent on the personal selling (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51). Arguments and inducements used by salespeople to win sales need to be considered and evaluated (Jones et al., 2005, p.109) because unfortunately salespeople are often perceived as dishonest and immoral people (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16). This view of selling has its origin in the selling-oriented concept (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16) and organizations using this concept of selling seeks to stimulate the demand for products it produces, rather than producing products in response to customer needs (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p.343). The underlying philosophy towards customers was therefore that it was necessary to push them to buy because when customers were to make their own decisions they were seen to be slow (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16). Therefore many hard sell techniques developed (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16), thus they stemmed from intensified competition, overproduction due to industrialization and economic crises (Bose, 2002, p. 89-90; Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16).

Many of these selling techniques were dubious, even dishonest, and the negative image accompanying selling derives from using them, but still many companies adopt a sales-orientated approach for selling (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.16; Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 51). We argue that this perception among customers makes selling more difficult for salespeople but that the primary problem lies in sales people's perception of selling. We mean that the concept of hard selling techniques have been so deeply integrated in organizational cultures that salespeople’s behaviors can be difficult to change. This is manifested by the reluctance to develop sales skills among salespeople in Company X and it constitutes a problem when it comes to motivating them to sell more. Thus, Company X does not want their salespeople to use sales-oriented behaviors when selling (Company X, 2014).

Later, in 1950's, organizations realized that a sales-orientated approach could damage companies’ image (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 4). Therefore, the marketing concept
started to emerge and the concept of customer-oriented selling was brought to the forefront by Saxe and Weitz (1982). They define it as “the degree to which salespeople practice the marketing concept by trying to help their customers make purchase decisions that will satisfy customer needs” (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 344). Central to this revolution in business thinking is the emphasis given to the needs and wants of the customer (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 17). Companies have come to recognize that this approach is essential in today’s selling environment (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 50) and to have any chance for success customer needs must be at the very center of business planning (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p.17; Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 343). Customer-oriented selling is a key to successful and profitable businesses (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 343). Highly customer-oriented salespeople engage in behaviors aimed at increasing long-term customer satisfaction (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 343-344). Further, customer-oriented salespeople avoid behaviors that could sacrifice customer interest on order to increase the probability an immediate sale (Saxe & Weitz, 1982, p. 343-344). From this we draw the conclusion that customer oriented selling requires each salesperson to understand the customer’s needs before presenting an offer.

A fundamental rule, according to Grönroos (2008, p. 22), implies that it is less expensive to keep customers than to find new ones. It is especially important for companies in the service sector that focus on building relationships with their customers (Grönroos, 2008, p. 22). Relationship building is crucial to obtain loyal customers (Grönroos, 2008, p. 22) and a behavior that affects customer orientation (Sharma et al., 1999, p. 609). Further, organization's survival and success are highly dependent on its ability to satisfy customers therefore it is also very important to understand customers’ behavior (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 52). Research suggests that relational selling provides direct and clear benefits to firms in terms of continuously assigned jobs, diminishing importance of price during negotiations, increased learning, positive word of mouth communications, and increased performance and efficiency from suppliers point of view (Sharma et al., 1999, p.609). Organizations spend considerable effort communicating to their customers about value creation, commitment building, and understanding and satisfying customer’s needs (Sharma et al. 1999, p.609). These goals will go unmet without in the inclusion of the salespeople (Sharma et al. 1999, p.609) because they deliver and reinforce organizations’ customer focus (Schweiker & Good, 2004, p. 173). Salespeople ultimately succeed or fail to demonstrate customer oriented behaviors and companies might benefit by directing efforts inward to better train, support and develop a climate that supports the marketing concept (Schweiker & Good, 2004, p. 173).

An electricity market is particularly hard for customers to understand and many customers are dissatisfied due to misunderstandings between buyers and sellers that occur regularly (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p 53). Saxe and Weitz (1982, p. 344) characterized customer-oriented selling as: “the desire to help customers make satisfactory purchase decisions, helping customers assess their needs, offering products that will satisfy those needs, describing products accurately, avoiding deceptive or manipulative influence tactics, avoiding the use of high pressure”. However, it is clear that information from sellers to buyers sometimes is vague and sometimes even misleading (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013 p. 33). Therefore trust of salespeople in the electricity business is low (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013 p. 33). Since the electricity market is complex we argue that it is of extra importance to adopt a customer oriented selling strategy. In our means it is important to make sure that customers fully
understand an offer and become satisfied. Further, we regard this selling approach as potentially more demanding for the salesforce since it might be difficult to explain the offer so that customers fully understand. Our reasoning is justified by Thankor & Joshi (2005, p. 590) who argue that customer-related interactions involve greater efforts from salespeople, but they require them to be motivated in order to engage in these selling behaviors. Company X’s main objective is to make customers more satisfied and customer orientation is included in their core values (Company X, 2014). Since customer-oriented sales behavior demands a higher effort from salespeople we consider it vital to study what factors that enhance their willingness to act customer-oriented.

3.1.2 Types of Selling

To fully understand customer-oriented selling we argue that it is important to understand existing types of selling. Selling is constituted of a very complex process due to that it includes principles, techniques, personal skills and different selling tasks (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.5). Since tasks may vary with different buying situations there are various types of selling (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.8) that are divided in three categories: order-takers, order-creators and order-getters. Order-takers only respond to already committed customers whereas order-creators only talk to specifies and do not handle the contact with the buyers (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.8). Thus order-creators do not receive any direct orders while order-getters talks to customers that can place an order directly (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.8). We refer to salespeople in Company X customer service as order-getters. This category of salespeople consists of front-line salespeople that try to create new sales to organizations or consumers (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.9). Salespeople in this category have the primary objective persuading customers to purchase, often in an environment of fierce competition (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.9-10). This kind of selling is challenging due to the diversity of tasks they perform (Belasco, 1966, p. 8; Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.9). Some skills needed to be a successful salesperson are the ability listen, find new prospects, identify customers’ needs (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p.10), persuade and negotiate (Belasco, 1966, p.7) and ultimately build new and profitable business (Sharma et al. 1999, p.609).

Electricity is categorized as a service (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 131) and therefore we argue that it is of superior importance to understand what behaviors that are desired from a salesforce. Selling services are particularly difficult because of its abstract nature (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004, p. 23) and its demand of extensive knowledge by salespeople (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 131). Services differ from products by their special characteristics: intangibility, difficulty to separate production from consumption, heterogeneity and that services are impossible to store (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004, p. 23; Zeithaml et al, 1985, p. 33). Salespeople are the company’s direct and most important link to customers (Sharma et al., 1999, p. 609). The contact with customers is specifically important if salespeople are selling services since they often are the ones selling and performing the service (Bendapudi & Berry, 1997, p. 16). Because personal selling is a crucial capability for organizations they also invest a lot of money in training their salespeople (Jobber & Lancaster, 2011, p. 17). Thus, salespeople providing services must receive training to perform them (Sharma et al., 1999, p. 609) as well as using an appropriate sales technique (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 133). Sales negotiation is an important aspect of the interaction but it is also important that close attention is paid to image building (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 133). When customers buy services they are unable to determine what they are to get before the service is
provided (Bendapudi and Berry, 1997, p. 16). Therefore it is of particular importance that salespeople instill a trustful image when building a relationship when selling services (Bendapudi & Berry, 1997, p. 16).

Salespeople at Company X customer service are front-line salespeople selling electricity, defined as a service, to consumers. This department serves a segment where they need to increase sales the most to reach the sales goals (Company X, 2014). Therefore it is important to find a way to motivate these salespeople to increase sales without decreasing the customer orientation.

### 3.2 Work Motivation of Salespeople

#### 3.2.1 Classical Motivation Theories

An understanding of salespeople's individual values and personalities can affect how well one can understands what they are motivated by (Pullins, 2001, p. 404). In order to understand what conditions that enhances motivation one needs to understand the relationships between “needs, drives and goals” and in a basic motivational process needs drives individuals to accomplish goals (Pullins, 2001, p. 404) In order to better understand the definition and importance of needs in relation to motivation we argue that it is useful to examine classical research on the topic. In 1943 Maslow made an early contribution in the field of motivation with his theory *Hierarchy of Needs*. It described how individuals prioritize human needs, which were divided hierarchically into five types (*Table 1*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>1 Physiological</td>
<td>The fundamentals of survival, e.g. hunger, thirst. Protection from the unpredictable happenings in life, e.g. accidents, ill health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3 Belongingness and love</td>
<td>Striving to be accepted by those to whom we feel close (especially family) and to be an important person to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Esteem and status</td>
<td>Striving to achieve a high standing relative to other people; a desire for prestige and a high reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5 Self-actualisation</td>
<td>The desire for self-fulfilment in achieving what one is capable of for one's own sake – ‘Actualised in what he is potentially’ (Maslow).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Jobber & Lancaster, 2009, p. 406)*

Each type has a certain priority, and the idea is that an individual will try to fulfill the lower level needs before they are concerned of fulfilling higher level needs (Maslow, 1943, p. 372). According to Maslow (1943) no levels could be excluded or overlooked therefore higher categories of needs are not considered important until lower level needs are met (Maslow, 1970, p.37). Thus, if an individual lacks physiological needs, that person’s focus will be to fulfill these basic needs and others become pushed away (Maslow; 1943, p. 373). Accordingly, this means that the focus shifts to the second level of needs first when the physiological needs are fulfilled (Maslow, 1970, p. 35, 37). In a work context, fulfilling physiological needs could mean that employees with low
salaries that overcome daily expenditures will be motivated to work harder to earn more money.

The second level regards safety needs and concerns avoidance of anxiety and fear (Maslow, 1970, p. 39). To do so people need security, stability, laws and order, this category may not be as strong as the desire to fulfill basic needs but everything else is equally true (Maslow, 1943, p. 376). In a job this could correspond to working conditions i.e. job security stability and order at work. thus, individuals who perceive their employment as uncertain could be motivated to overcome this unpleasant state. If both physiological needs and safety needs are gratified, people will continue to strive towards the fulfillment of social needs (Maslow, 1970, p.43) that could be related affiliation that can be described as a need for interpersonal relationships with supervisors and colleagues. Top categories in the Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1943) emphasize the importance of esteem and status. Thus, individuals have a need to be recognized by other people, receive appreciation and respect to build self-esteem and self-respect (Maslow, 1943, p. 381). Most people have a need and desire for a stable and high evaluation of themselves (Maslow, 1970, p.45). Lastly, self-actualization urges that an individual make use of all its resources and potential to make the best of oneself (Maslow, 1970, p.46). Individuals generally strive to find circumstances where they experience themselves as competent and challenged (Pullins, 2001, p. 401). However, it is not guaranteed that individuals reaching a certain level of needs will remain there. If they are unable to fulfill needs in a lower category they may return to that level (Maslow, 1970, p.59).

Alderfer's (1969) developed Maslow's (1943) theory, which resulted in the Existence, Relatedness and Growth theory (ERG theory). The ERG theory assumes that there are only three different core needs that humans strive to attain (Alderfer, 1969, p. 145). He categorized human needs differently than Maslow (1970) and suggested that physical needs and safety needs can be combined into one single category, which is existence needs that include all form of material and psychological desires (Alderfer, 1969, p. 145). Relatedness on the other hand concerns needs to socialize and have relationships with other people (Alderfer, 1969, p. 146). Satisfaction of this core need is determined by the person’s perception mutually shared thoughts and feelings but it may not necessarily need to be a ”positive effectual state for both or either person” (Alderfer, 1969, p. 146). Relatedness correspond to Maslow’s (1970) needs for belongingness, love and esteem since ”esteem is dependent upon the reactions from others” (Maslow, 1943, p. 381). Alderfer’s (1969) last core need, growth, is comprehended by individuals need to be involved in creative and productive activities in environments that contributes to its development (Alderfer, 1969, p. 146). He means that growth needs stems from individual’s engagement in problem solving where it can use and develop its capabilities. Hence this category represents the self-fulfilling activities that Maslow (1970) describes as being on top of the hierarchy (Alderfer, 1969, p. 147).

Alderfer (1969, p. 142) criticized the Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1943) and rejects the prerequisite of that a humans lower-level needs are required to be fulfilled in order for higher-level needs to emerge. He means that culture and individuals’ background affect the order in which needs are prioritized (Alderfer, 1969, p. 142). This argument was supported by Lewin and Johnston (1997, p. 246) who found that cultural values are important to consider when motivating employees. This implies that needs differ between employees and that everyone does not necessarily become motivated by the
same factors. These findings support our argument that it is important for each organization to investigate what the source of motivation is among their particular salespeople.

Herzberg et al. (2007) studied problems in the area of job satisfaction and wanted to assess what employees requires from their jobs, from this the dual factor theory developed. Unlike Maslow (1970) and Alderfer (1969), Herzberg et al. (2007, p. Xiii) argue that these first three levels of needs are hygiene factors and do not work as motivators, they only lead to dissatisfaction if not fulfilled. Hygiene factors i.e. physical working conditions, security, salary and interpersonal relationships, seldom satisfy employees. Findings showed that an inferior environment at people’s workplaces is what makes them feel dissatisfied (Herzberg et al., 2007, p. Xiii). Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 86) state that jobs can increase employees’ motivation but if they are concerned with chances of being laid off or underpaid, or do not get along with managers the person will feel less motivated. Thus, Hackman and Oldham (1980) argue similarly to Herzberg et al. (2007) and confirm that if the hygiene factors (first three levels of needs) are unfulfilled the person will remain unmotivated even though motivators are there.

Herzberg et al. (2007, p. Xiv – xv) argue that managers should make sure that hygiene factors are fulfilled but to really motivate their subordinates they need to focus on motivators. By looking at job enrichment they determined motivating factors to be: achievement (quality performance), recognition for achievement (feedback), work itself (client relationship, responsibility, advancement) and growth (new learning, on-the-job training leading to unique expertise) (Herzberg et al., 2007, p. Xiv – xv). Thus, Herzberg et al. (2007, p. xv) found that satisfaction and positive attitudes emerge both from behavior and performances. Below we provide our own summary of these classical theories and their relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiological (basic needs)</td>
<td>Existence needs</td>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety needs</td>
<td>Existence needs</td>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social needs (belongingness and love)</td>
<td>Relatedness needs</td>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for self-esteem</td>
<td>Relatedness needs</td>
<td>Motivational factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for self-actualization</td>
<td>Growth needs</td>
<td>Motivational factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Own summary of classical motivation theories.

However, Herzberg et al.’s (2007) dual factor theory received some criticism. Shipley and Kiely (2007, p.27) found that both hygiene-, and motivational factors could cause dissatisfaction and increase motivation among industrial salespeople. Herzberg et al. (2007) treated "work itself" as a motivator while Shipley & Kiely’s (2007, p. 27) respondents cited "tasks performed in the job itself" and "job responsibilities" as dissatisfiers. Thus, their respondents referred to job-context variables (hygiene factors) as motivating. On the other hand they found support for some motivational factors from the dual factor theory such as: "increased chance of promotion", "acknowledgement of effort" and "self-satisfaction from doing a good job" but also for some of the dissatisfying variables of "job status", "earnings" and "company policy" (Shipley &
Kiely, 2007, p.28). They conclude that factors cannot be divided into motivators and dissatisfiers among salespeople and sales managers should consider all factors in order to motivate them (Shipley & Kiely, 2007, p.27-28).

However, knowledge regarding which factors are motivating for employees is an important first step to improve performance but it is not enough (Vroom, 1966, p. 280). Vroom's Expectancy theory primarily concerns predicting the amount of effort an employee spend on tasks associated with their job (Walker et al., 1977, p. 158). Thus, expectancy theory provides insights concerning a salesforce motivation to work (Lopez et al., 2006, p. 382). The theory is based on three concepts: expectancy, instrumentality and valence (Vroom, 1966, p. 280-281). Expectancy refers to how the employee perceives the relationship between effort and performance (Vroom, 1966, p. 280-281). Similarly, Hackman and Oldham (1980, p.72) emphasizes the importance for employees to understand the connection between effort and performance. If employees perceive the relationship between effort and performance as high they will perform better i.e. if they expect increased effort will lead to high performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72, Vroom, 1966, p. 280-281). Instrumentality considers the relationship between performance and reward, i.e. to which extent employees believe a higher performance leads to promotion, and valence reflects how much employees value a reward (Vroom, 1966, p. 280-281). Vroom’s (1966) concepts do not have a specific order but since individual needs are of considerable importance, people with different needs (Alderfer, 1969, p. 142; Herzberg et al. 2007, p. XIV; Lewin & Johnston, 1997, p. 246; Maslow, 1970, p. 53-54; Shipley & Kiely, 2007, p. 28) will value rewards differently. We argue that Shipley & Kiely’s (2007) support for different factors by Herzberg et al.’s (2007) indicates that it is explicitly relevant for companies to identify what motivational variables sales managers should be concerned with. We conclude that all needs could be considered as independent and with an equal potential to impact on motivation, thus we will treat all factors as potential sources for motivation. Therefore we consider it of importance for each organization to determine what their specific employees are motivated by. Thus, we argue similarly to previous research and mean that the sources for motivation may vary between individuals, which may mean they value rewards differently.

3.2.2 Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

Some individuals are driven by deep enjoyment and involvement in their job; they simply are passionate for what they do (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950). In contrast, other individuals are more concerned about what external inducements a job can derive and become motivated by that (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950). These two different motivational settings are divided into two different categories: extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation. Further, extrinsic motivation is defined as the individual’s motivation to engage in work due the corresponding external response, e.g. rewards or recognition from other people (Amabile et al., 1994, p.950). Whereas intrinsic motivation drives human behavior and is defined as the motivation to primarily engage in work due to the work itself and its appearance of being interesting, engaging and satisfying (Amabile et al., 1994, p.950).

Early discoveries determined that if behaviors gave satisfying rewards, without interfering with the satisfaction of basic needs, individuals tend to engage in them (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 14). Sansone and Harackiewicz (2000, p. 1) suggest that needs and desires, i.e. biological needs and extrinsic rewards, to attain certain outcomes can
motivate certain behaviors. It is mainly assumed that monetary rewards are the most prominent motivator for salespeople (Walker et al., 1977, p. 157). This approach is mostly uses instruments of gains or penalties to influence individuals’ actions (Tyler, 2001, p. 152). Thus, individuals could be motivated by resource gains such as payments, promotions and bonuses for certain actions (Tyler, 2001, p.152). A second instrument would be to implicate a risk for fines or demotions to create disincentives to engage in undesired behavior (Tyler, 2001, p.152). Both of these instrumental strategies are concerned with external rewards and typically correspond to an individual's willingness to fulfill the first levels of needs in Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy. These types of reward typically generate an extrinsic motivation that is primarily related to the willingness to reach a specific goal or result of an activity (Pullins et al., 2009, p. 469).

Most of the work until the beginning of 1970’s adapted this traditional view (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2; Walker et al., 1977, p. 157). But it has been proposed that there are both extrinsic (rewards) and intrinsic (interest) reasons for individuals to engage in certain behaviors (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2). Typically individuals abandon the intrinsic reason to engage in certain behaviors in favor for the extrinsic rewards (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2). But in the absence of extrinsic rewards or punishments the intrinsic rewards had become and additional source of motivation for appropriate behaviors (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2). Thus, extrinsic rewards affect behavior and are undoubtedly powerful motivators but an important consideration of them is that they may not always bring about the appropriate behaviors (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 14). Thus, powerful extrinsic rewards could imply problems whereas the arbitrary rewards can override the intrinsic motivation and the value and meaning of certain actions and behaviors (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 15).

Research in the field of marketing found support for that non-monetary incentives (e.g. recognition and the opportunity to personal growth) have an effect on salespeople's motivation (Walker et al. 1977, p. 157). This type of motivation is called intrinsic motivation and is controlled by individuals’ internal forces (Tyler, 2001, p.152). Hence, personal attitudes and values are affecting the incentives to engage in a certain action (Tyler, 2001, p.152). Intrinsic rewards are for example “interest, challenge and an employee’s well-being” (Pullins et al., 2009, p. 469). It is primary the inclination of interest that spurs intrinsic motivation, hence individuals strive to develop and expand their capacities is what makes them engage in certain activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 16). Thus, intrinsic rewards and events that are perceived as supportive of autonomy and competence are fostering intrinsic motivation (Pullins et al., 2009, p. 469; Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 17). When people feel that the behavior itself constitutes an inherent satisfaction it have entailed them with intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 16). This type of motivation enhances the employee’s desire to accomplish the task itself and not the willingness to achieve certain goals or results for an activity (Pullins et al., 2009, p. 469).

Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 773) argue that the intrinsic motivation orientation of the salesperson is a measured by how much the “higher-order” rewards of selling are valued by the salesperson. They mean that high intrinsic motivation implies that the salesperson values things such as personal achievement and success as well as selling for the mere challenge and feeling of performing a useful service. These internal forces are long-term sources for motivation and they shape individuals’ behavior in certain situations (Tyler, 2001, p. 152) and therefore it is important to determine and
understand factors that influence intrinsic motivation in salespeople (Pullins, 2001, p. 406). However, these types of behaviors are voluntary (Tyler, 2001, p. 152) and we argue that the ability to motivate salespeople to increase their desire to engage in these behaviors could be challenging. Further, we argue that it is crucial for organizations to acknowledge what their specific salesforces feel intrinsically motivated by.

Note that the traditional view of incentives, i.e. extrinsic rewards, is not the primarily objective of this study. We considered it important to explain both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to provide readers with a clearer view of the differences between. Company X wants to determine what else they can do to motivate their employees besides giving monetary incentives. Therefore, we will merely investigate what factors that enhance the intrinsic motivation of Company X’s salesforce.

3.3 Job Design

3.3.1 Core Job Characteristics

The Job Characteristics model consists of five core job characteristics; skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 78; Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). Skill variety is the degree to which a person is required to use different skills and talents when performing the task (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.78). This job characteristic is likely to impact the extent an employee engage in the job. Increased skill variety demands employees stress their competence to use themselves more comprehensively when performing a job (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487). Hence, an increase in skill variety would induce that a worker engages in different activities that require a broader range of skills and talents (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487).

Task identity entails the degree that the job requires an employee is required to accomplish a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.78; Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487). It simply means that the more employees produce of the end product/service the more they are expected to engage themselves in it (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487). A third factor is task significance, which is the degree to which the job has an impact on the physical or psychological well-being of other people (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.79; Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487).

Autonomy implies that the more freedom, independence and discretion an individual person perceives as having in planning and decisions of how to carry out the work the more they will engage in it (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.79). Hence, a job with high autonomy demands that salespeople engage in the job to a great extent, invest thoughts and takes decisions with high presence. In order for employees to experience job autonomy, organizations must consider the independence of the job; different work procedures and how job-related problems are solved (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487). The last characteristic is comprised by job feedback. This is the degree to which carrying out the job gives the individual direct information about the effectiveness of its performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.80). For example when a salesperson closes a deal it immediately see the result of their work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.80).

Other researchers have tested job characteristics and their effect on various outcomes. Pierce et al. (2009, p.487) found that skills variety, task identity, task significance and job autonomy had an effect on the extent to which employees wanted to contribute in their job. Dubinsky and Skinner (1984, p.35) found that skill variety and task identity
had a positive effect on intrinsic work motivation. Moreover, it has been found that skill variety also builds commitment, whereas job feedback amplifies job satisfaction (Singh, 1998, p. 81). According to Singh (1998, p. 81) participation has consistent functional effects that support the view that autonomy and involvement in decision-making enhances feelings of control. In turn this affects results through positive psychological job outcomes e.g. intrinsic motivation (Singh, 1998, p. 81).

Further, there are positive outcomes of enriched work, for example intrinsic motivation (quality) and work effectiveness (quantity) increases (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.91-92). This means that both quality and quantity of a job can be increased by enriched jobs (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 91-92). Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 91) argue that the quantity increases because dysfunctional behaviors and engagement in counterproductive behavior are eliminated when the job gets redesigned and enriched. This means that hidden inefficiencies may be eliminated (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 92). Increased quantity does not come from feeling especially good about serving many customers since it often is necessary to “cut corners” in quality to do so (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 91). People who have enriched jobs and are working with services tend to be more helpful and considerate towards clients (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 91) and more customer-oriented (Wu et al., 2013, p. 446).

Salespeople at Company X have different level of skills depending on how much internal training they have received. The employees can partly affect their level of skills since they can ask for internal training if they want to develop their skills and if they do not want to develop their skills they are not forced to do so if it is not a qualification that all employees should have (Company X, 2014). Further, contrary to Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) theory, many of the employees at Company X oppose internal training because they will receive more complex tasks that take more time (Company X, 2014). Therefore, we find it interesting and important to find out if skill variety has an effect on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation.

The report from the Swedish Consumer Agency (2013, p. 36, 46) shows that electricity cost stands for a significant part of the consumers’ economy. We argue that salespeople at Company X does can in some ways affect people in a broader perspective since good advices can for example save the customer a lot of money. Therefore it is reasonable to think that some employees might feel that their tasks are of significance to others. Customers hardly ever speak to the same salesperson twice (Company X, 2014). We argue that might not always be clear what the result from a good service is clear, i.e. the job feedback. A sufficient service could lead to loyal customers but it may be impossible for salespeople determine if specifically their service made a customer stay with the company. Customers calling Company X are often tied to contracts and can therefore not change them even if they want to (Company X, 2014). They may however remember the sufficient service they received and therefore choose Company X when the contract expires (Company X, 2014). Most likely they will then speak with another salesperson than the original one who was the reason they decided to change electricity contract. This situation is common at Company X (Company X, 2014). Thus, if a salesperson is unable to close a deal due to that a customer wants to consider an offer it may never be confirmed to that specific salesperson that it was the source for the customer’s decision to stay with Company X.
Further, salespeople at Company X have almost no possibility at all to plan their day. Every minute of their workday is scheduled, they cannot decide when to take a break or lunch and their tasks are assigned to them through a system. However, we argue that it is possible that they feel some autonomy of their work. When they receive a call they have no specific restrictions to follow but they should follow Company X’s guidelines and suggested conversation approach. It gives them a freedom to steer the dialogue in whichever direction they feel suitable for the customers need. Thus, there may be some salespeople that think they can work freely, independently and therefore they feel responsible for their work whereas others do not and therefore neither experience intrinsic motivation.

Our hypotheses:
H1: Job characteristics such as: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy and e) job feedback have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H2: Job characteristics such as: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy and e) job feedback have a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.3.2 Critical Psychological States
According to Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 76) job characteristics affect the outcomes through critical psychological states. There are three key conditions that concern employees: knowing the result of the work activities, experiencing responsibility for the outcomes of the work and experiencing meaningfulness of the work (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p.72). Each of the job characteristics stimulates one of these specific psychological states (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). Outcomes from job characteristics are expected to anticipate when people perceive meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of result about their job, i.e. when they experience the critical psychological states (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). If any one of these three critical factors were to be removed, the intrinsic motivation would drop (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.73).

In the original model (Figure 4) Hackman and Oldham (1980, p.78) argues that skill variety, task identity and task significance all affect the critical psychological state of experienced meaningfulness. Employees experience work as meaningful in that sense that they do something that is valuable in their own value system, if they do not it is nothing to be proud of (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.73). When employees engage in activities that stretch and challenge their abilities they tend to experience any the task as meaningful (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p.78). The more skills they have to use the more meaningful it is perceived (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p.78). Further, the more liability a worker feel for their interactions with customers dealing their needs and problems it will find the work more meaningful (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.78). Research highlights the importance for managers to ensure that their salespeople perceive their job as meaningful (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590). If managers provide salespeople with a greater variety in their job and expand the scope of their job they could enhance experienced meaningfulness (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.71). A small change that enhances the perception of the salesperson being a service deliverer to customers instead of an order getter could make a significant difference in the experienced meaningfulness (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.71).
Secondly employees need to experience responsibility for the outcomes of the work. If employees do not feel personally proud and if they believe that the quality of work depend on external factors rather than their effort they will not experience that it was their responsibility (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 72). The more employees feel responsible for their work and the organization, the higher level of productivity they will have (Wu, et al., 2013, p. 444). This psychological state has similarities with Vroom’s (1966) theory. According to Vroom (1966, p. 280-281) employees will not be motivated to perform better if they do not expect that their effort will result in higher performance. Knowledge of the actual result of the work activities means that employees need to be able to see the results of their work. If they do not know whether their efforts resulted in something good or bad it cannot affect their feelings and thereby have no effect on outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 72). This can be related to Vroom’s (1966, p. 280-281) expectancy theory in which he explains the importance of understanding the relationship between effort and performance in order to motivate employees.

Previous researchers have tested how job characteristics affect outcomes through critical psychological states. Singh (1998, p. 81) supports the original predictions of the job characteristics model. He found that task variety holds motivational potential through experienced meaningfulness of the work and that job feedback serves to enhance satisfaction through its instrumental function e.g. knowledge of results. Thankor and Joshi (2005, p. 590) found that experienced meaningfulness had a positive effect on salespeople's customer orientation. Therefore they argue that it is of importance for managers to engage in psychological states due to that it has an effect on the salesperson's motivation (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590). Out of organizational identification, pay satisfaction and experienced meaningfulness the last was found to be the strongest determinant for a customer oriented behavior (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590).

Secondly employees need to experience responsibility for the outcomes of the work. If employees do not feel personally proud and if they believe that the quality of work depend on external factors rather than their effort they will not experience that it was their responsibility (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 72). The more employees feel responsible for their work and the organization, the higher level of productivity they will have (Wu, et al., 2013, p. 444). This psychological state has similarities with Vroom’s (1966) expectancy theory of that employees will not be motivated to perform better if they do not expect that their effort will result in higher performance. We argue that this will be the case if employees think that it is external factors affecting their performance because then they do not think that their effort have any effect on the performance. Fried and Ferris (1987, p. 306) found that the effect of critical psychological states on intrinsic motivation were stronger than the effect of job characteristics on intrinsic motivation. Their results also showed that two out of the three psychological states, i.e. experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility had the strongest effect on intrinsic work motivation.
In summary, the Job Characteristics Model aims to determine what specific job characteristics lead to advantageous outcomes such as: intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and efficiency (Figure 2) (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). Greasly (2006, p. 187) argues that even though the model was developed in late 1970’s, it is a theory that has contributed with a considerable impact on work design' and its behavioral aspects. This model served as an inspiration for our own conceptual model and due to its proved relevance we regard it as an appropriate foundation for our own model.

Figure 1. The Job Characteristics Model
(Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.90)

Our hypotheses:
H3: Critical psychological states such as: a) experienced meaningfulness, b) experienced responsibility and c) knowledge of results have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H4: Critical psychological states such as: a) experienced meaningfulness, b) experienced responsibility and c) knowledge of results have a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.4 Sales Managers’ Behavior
3.4.1 Sales Managers’ Role
Previously sales managers’ job was typically perceived to be dependent only on good selling skills but that has come subject for change (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p.50). Sales manager’s work environment has become more intense and complex and therefore the nature of the sales manager's job has become more challenging (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 50). It requires a greater variety of skills than previously (Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p.50) and the changing environment have induced higher demands on sales managers (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2002, p.617; Jones et al., 2005, p.106). Thus, sales managers’ are not only required to have good selling skills they also need the ability to plan, direct, and control selling activities (Metha et al., 2002, p. 429; Rosenbloom & Anderson, 1984, p. 50) Today a sales manager’s job
demands analytical abilities for sales forecasting and market segments, knowledge, leadership, motivational skills and estimation of salesperson’s performance (Metha et al., 2002, p.436). Thus, sales manager’s tasks and roles appear many but we primarily focus on their ability to motivate salespeople.

Zoltners et al. (2012, p. 172) confirm that among sales managers’ challenges are improving salespeople’s performance, creating an energetic environment, motivating employees increasing customers’ satisfaction and attaining sales objectives. Specifically, managing selling and salespeople in organizations that strive to achieve strategic goals through customer satisfaction is a highly complex challenge (Fine, 2007, p. 185). Thus, another responsibility of the sales manager is to make its salesforce aware and attentive to how they treat their customers (Jones et al., 2005, p. 109). Sales managers’ are recommended to determine the nature of behavior in organizations (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1997, p. 1143) and in order to motivate a salesforce they have to understand the salespeople’s needs (Jobber & Lee, 1994, p. 325). However, successful sales management does not have a predicted formula (Fine, 2007, p. 189) but it is vital to provide incentives that both satisfy salespeople and accomplish specific organizational goals (Jobber & Lee, 1994, p. 325). Thus, sales managers must investigate what their salespeople are motivated by (Jobber & Lee, 1994, p. 331) and since there is no predetermined approach of sales management it gives us an indication of that it is important for sales managers’ to determine what motivational factors their very own salesforce is affected by. We argue that sales managers play a significant role in salespeople every day practice and may have a direct or indirect affect their work tasks, behaviors and motivation.

3.4.2 Feedback

Feedback is typically defined as the sales manager’s ability to give praise or recognition to a salesperson in order for them to be performing at or above certain demands (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 190; Rich 1998, p. 57). Feedback is described to be the degree to which individuals receive clear information of how effective their job performance is (Tyagi, 1985, p. 77) from both managers as well as the job itself (Singh, 1998, p.81). This gives us a clear indication of that it is just as important to get feedback from the sales manager, as it is to get it from the job itself.

Feedback could have two different dimensions, i.e. locus and valence (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 191). Locus of feedback regards whether the feedback is concerned with the salespersons output (e.g., sales volume) or selling behavior (e.g., ability to build relationships through customer-oriented selling) (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 191; Rich, 1998, p.57). Valence on the other hand is concerned of whether the feedback is positive or negative (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.191; Rich, 1998, p.57) (see Figure 3).
These different types of feedback may occur simultaneously in various degrees but they are conceptually different from each other (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 191). It is clear from the statement that they could arise independently but it is assessed that providing only one type of feedback may not be as beneficial as one would assume (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 199). Hence, the locus of output- and behavioral feedback is signaling different things as well as the positive and negative valence do (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 199). Thus, we argue that even though feedback is considered as useful it may be necessary to know what type of feedback to use and this is why we have decided to include all four aspects of feedback in our model.

Anderson and Oliver (1987, p. 53) examine two different types of controls that managers could use to monitor their subordinates. Output control regards mainly sales volume or gross profits that are provided compared to objectives and therethrough gives feedback to the salesperson (Anderson & Oliver, 1987, p.53; Grant & Cravens 1996, p. 363). Harmon et al. (2002, p. 51) mean that managers should first determine and communicate quantitative performance measures to salespeople. This type of feedback works as a reminder for salespeople on the level they are expected to perform at as well as the goals they are supposed to achieve (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 191). Salespeople that receive this type of feedback often have a greater understanding for what objectives they are expected to attain, hence they have a better perception of what their role is (Jaworski & Kohli, p. 1991, p. 192).

A second approach for sales managers to monitor salespeople is to execute behavior-based control that focus on their behaviors (Anderson & Oliver, 1987, p.53; Grant & Cravens 1996, p. 363). Instead of measuring and comparing performance and objectives the manager instead uses a more subjective approach (Anderson & Oliver, 1987, p. 53). Further, this type of control is constituted of sales manager monitoring, directing, evaluating, and rewarding salespeople (Grant & Cravens 1996, p. 363). The focus is on salespeople's selling activities, such as how the person presents a product/service, ability to close deals and adapt their sale technique towards different customers (Anderson & Oliver, 1987, p. 53). Therefore behavioral feedback could be used as a tool to clarify what behaviors a salesperson is expected to use and how well their
current behaviors are in relation to the organizations expectations (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.193).

Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p. 199) also suggest that behavioral feedback could be of greater importance than output feedback. This due to that the behavioral feedback satisfies a desire for other aspects that could not be compensated with output feedback (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 199). Further, they also mean that behavioral feedback could help salespeople improve their selling techniques and strategies, which in some cases might be more satisfying for the salesperson (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 199). It could also be more appealing due to that the salesperson feels that they could actually control their behaviors in contrast to the output (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 199).

Harm on et al. (2002, p. 51) enhance that the dynamic market “requires sales managers to continually strive for improving salesperson performance and to anticipate changes in the marketplace if the firm is to remain competitive”. The value of personal selling is best ensured through managerial functions such as feedback (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51). As an organization is highly dependent on the personal selling the ability to give valuable feedback is of significant importance (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51). In order for a sales manager to give relevant and acceptable feedback there is a need for sales managers to understand salespeople's need for feedback (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 44). If a sales manager provide the feedback in direct relation to a specific issue it is more likely that the feedback will come across sufficiently (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51) However, feedback should also be based upon the salespeople's performance (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 44). A sales manager therefore also needs to determine what activities and behaviors are crucial to enhance performance and then also communicate these to the salesforce in order to influence the improvement of performance (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 44).

Our hypotheses:
H5: Feedback such as: a) positive behavioral feedback, b) negative behavioral feedback c) positive output feedback and d) negative output feedback have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H6: Feedback such as: a) positive behavioral feedback, b) negative behavioral feedback c) positive output feedback and d) negative output feedback have a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.4.3 Coaching
Rich (1998, p. 55) argues that verbal feedback is not the only important leader behavior. Selling strategies have changed in relation to the changing market but regardless of that coaching has continued to be an important tool for sales managers (Rich, 1998, p. 53). Coaching is defined as “using skills, experience, and direction to help someone improve their performance” (Carter, 2006, p. 113). Thus, sales managers’ have the ultimate responsibility for developing its team’s skills (Rich, 1998, p. 53). Carter (2006, p. 113) describes that coaching mainly consists of providing salespeople with feedback in order to encourage their appropriate behavior and to give suggestions for improvement. Ford et al. (2011, p. 157) describes coaching to involve a continuous flow of feedback whereas. Jolson et al. (cited in Carter, 2006, p. 113) means that it is a technique to teaching, mediating information and methods and creating an ability to complete tasks. Unlike Carter (2006) and Ford et al., (2011) we would like to enhance that we consider
feedback and coaching as separable terms. We agree with Carter (2006) that feedback encourages appropriate behavior but we think that suggestions for improvement are more in the nature of coaching. Hillman et al. (1990, p.23) reason more like us and suggest that feedback should be accompany coaching. They mean that coaching and feedback many times are interrelated but that there is some disparity between them (Hillman et al., 1990, p. 24). They suggest that “feedback is the information which describes performance and coaching is the assistance given to improve performance” (Hillman et al., 1990, p. 24). From this we conclude that coaching should be entailed with feedback as a complementary tool in providing salespeople with the appropriate behaviors in order to improve the performance. In this paper we argue that feedback is a first step to indicate whether or not a salesperson meets the expectations and coaching is a complementary tool to improve performance when feedback has been given. This is the perspective used in our paper and we will also consider the two concepts as separable terms throughout our research. Thus, we do consider feedback as a good source for information about how a salesperson is doing but we also argue that it is not enough to also change their behavior.

An early study by Likert (1961, p. 9) conducted research that related different characteristics and styles of supervision to performance. He found that sales managers’ own behaviors provide a set of standards that would also affect the behavior of their salespeople (Likert, 1961, p. 9). Deeter-Schmelz et al. (2002, p. 617) identified that the different roles a sales manager takes on could have an effect on motivation. An effective sales manager is mainly taking on roles as a: “communicator, motivator and coach” (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2002, p. 617) and one of the most important is acting like a coach (Carter, 2006, p.113). Thus, sales managers coaching their salespeople should consider themselves as role models and therethrough enhance appropriate behaviors (Rich, 1998, p. 115). This is certainly important since work habits; positive attitudes and goals tend to be imitated by their salespeople (Rich, 1998, p. 115).

Coaching is essentially comprehended by a set of activities that appears in direct and present setting and is primarily conducted by “continuing interaction, goal setting, and teaching improved behaviors” (Ford et al., 2011, p. 158). Effective sales organizations use their managers as a “coach and communicator” rather “than a commander and scorekeeper” (Carter, 2006, p. 114). Coaching has also been identified as a competitive skill with a significant importance for organizations (e.g. Corcoran et al. 1995; Dubinsky & Barry 1982; Richardson 1996). Corcoran et al. (1995, p. 115) mean that coaching is one of the most significant resources for and organization to influence salespeople's performance. Thus, coaching is a source for salespeople’s behaviors (Onyemah, 2007, p. 953) and sales managers’ ability to develop, coach and manage the sales force to success has a great influence on the company's overall performance (Zoltners et al., 2012, p. 172).

Environmental changes have also induced the critical importance for organizations to make sure that their salespeople reach their full potential and that they are able to adapt to new sales situations (Rich, 1998, p. 54). In order for salespeople to reach their full capacity it requires effective training but also managerial support that include frequent guidance and feedback from their sales manager (Rich, 1998, p. 53). Training is important to make salespeople more customer-oriented, specifically when selling services (Sharma et al. 1999, p.609) and therefore we want to determine if coaching has a direct effect on customer orientation.
If the sales manager has the ability to empower salespeople and infuse their confidence, provide feedback, encourage them and share practices that are appropriate, they become a resource for the salesperson (Rich, 1998, p. 116). Hillman et al. (1990, p. 21) mean that coaching and feedback could be important tools when sales managers’ want to motivate salespeople to perform at their full potential. In a climate where salespeople feel confident receiving appraisal for performance they experience belongingness and personal growth, managers concern and awareness could be perceived as rewards itself and affect the salespeople's motivation (Tyagi, 1982, p. 245). Thus, coaching could improve a salesperson’s confidence and intrinsic motivation in order to continuously improve (Rich, 1998, p. 54).

Other studies also expressed that coaching is an important aspect for sales managers ability to motivate their salespeople's outcomes (e.g. Challagalla & Shervani, 1996; Corcoran et al., 1995; Dubinsky and Barry, 1982; Deeter-Schmelz, 2002; Onyemah 2009; Rich, 1998). We primarily want to investigate what salespeople at Company X are motivated by and prior research suggest that coaching could have an effect on intrinsic motivation and salespeople’s behavior.

Our hypotheses:
H7: Coaching has a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.
H8: Coaching has a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.4.4 Role Stress: Role conflict and Role Ambiguity
A role is most typically defined as a set of expectations about behavior for a position in a social structure (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 155; Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). The role set consists of people in related positions, both within and outside of a company, who depend on other individuals’ performance in some way (Walker, et al., 1975, p. 33), e.g. a salesperson is affected by other members of the organization. Therefore they will all try to influence that person’s behavior in accordance with their own desires and objectives (Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). The "received role" is an individual’s perceptions of role expectations and pressures sent by members its role set, and its own idea of how the role should be performed (Walker, et al., 1975, p. 33).

One role concept, found in the literature, is role stress (role structure) and it includes two dimensions: role ambiguity and role conflict (role clarity) (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 155; Coelho et al., 2011, p.39). Role conflict occurs when an individual experience incompatible job demands or expectations from its role-set members and role ambiguity occurs when an individual has inadequate knowledge or information of how to perform its job (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979 p.72; Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Walker et al, 1975, p. 32).

It is necessary to understand the unique characteristics of salespeople’s job (Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Sohi, 1996, p. 49; Walker et al., 1975, p. 34) and the emotional demands that their position makes induce on them (Belasco, 1966, p.7). First, salespeople’s job performance is critical to the success and goal achievement of many other people within his own organization as well as of his customers (Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Walker et al., 1975, p. 34). Second, the job demand salespeople to engage in a wide range of behaviors and be flexible to adapt their behaviors to new customers, all with different
personalities and behaviors (Belasco, 1966, p.8; Ford et al., 1975, p. 95). Third, the salesperson’s role is extremely broad with many divergent role partners (Belasco, 1966, p.7). Thus, salespeople occupy a position of the firm where they often must reconcile the conflicting goals and demands from the organization and customers (Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Sohi, 1996, p. 49; Walker et al., 1975, p. 34). At any time the salesperson may occupy a role of persuader, serviceperson, information-gatherer, problem-definer, advocate, information-reporter, coordinator, display-arranger and customer relationship builder (Belasco, 1966, p.7). Thus, salespeople may perceive role conflict when simultaneously trying to meet company expectations and customer demands (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979, p.73; Sohi, 1996, p.51). The nature of the job therefore makes the salesperson particularly susceptible to perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity (Ford et al., 1975, p. 95; Walker et al, 1975, p.32).

Perceived role conflict exists when salespeople believe that the expectations and demands of two or more role set members are incompatible (Walker et al., 1975, p. 22; Walker et al., 1977, p.159). Salespeople who perceive that they cannot simultaneously satisfy all members in their role set experience conflicting role forces and psychological conflict within themselves (Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). Perceived role ambiguity occurs when salespeople lack necessary information to perform their role adequately, when a salesperson is uncertain about what members of its role set expect (Walker, et al., 1975, p. 33). Salespeople may be uncertain about what some or all of their role partners expect from them in certain situations, how they should satisfy expectations or how performance will be evaluated (Sohi, 1996, p.52; Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159). Sohi (1996, p.52) defines that unclear company policies and uncertainties about duties and responsibilities are some factors that increase role ambiguity. Thus, salespeople’s perceptions of their role partners’ expectations and demands strongly influence their definition of their role in the company (Walker, et al., 1977, p. 159).

Prior research has produced conflicting and unclear results with regard to the nature and strength of the relationships between role conflict and ambiguity (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983, p. 330). Research has provided little insight into the reasons underlying these different effects (Brown & Peterson, 1993, p. 75). Role stressors have been included in the JCM in prior research (e.g. Coelho, et al., 2011; Singh, 1998). Coelho et al. (2011) studied the relationship between job characteristics, role stress and intrinsic motivation effect on creativity and other factors. Like many other researchers (e.g. Singh 1998) they predicted a negative relationship between job characteristics and role conflict but did not obtained a significant effect. In contrast Singh (1998, p. 81) found a positive relationship between task variety and role conflict, task variety helps salespeople cope with perceived role conflict. The same author found a negative relationship between task variety and role ambiguity. Salespeople facing high levels of role ambiguity are less likely to view an increasing amount of task variety positively (Singh, 1998, p. 81). Coelho et al. (2011, p. 39) also found that job characteristics contribute negatively to role ambiguity, which in turn has a negative effect on intrinsic motivation (Coelho, et al., 2011, p. 39; Dubinsky & Skinner 1984, p.35). Although many researchers assume a negative effect of job characteristics on role stress researchers’ evidence is not clear-cut, some characteristics are found to affect role stress but not others. Coelho et al. (2011) measured all job characteristics together as one variable but Singh (1998) measured each and every one separately, this possibly explains why job characteristics as a composite measure, does not influence role conflict. We argue that the incoherent results from research done on role stress indicate that it is an important variable for
continuous research. Together with the proven effects on motivation and other outcomes we argue that role conflict and role ambiguity could reveal important findings for us, thus we include it our own conceptual model.

Results also suggest that the role of salespeople is more critical in a service setting than a product setting, and needs to be clearly defined (Sharma et al. 1999, p.609). Research has examined the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict and a variety of correlates such as: organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job performance (Tubre & Collins, 2000, p. 155). Flaherty, et al. (1999, p.12) tested role stress effect on customer orientation and found that role ambiguity and role conflict are intensively related with customer orientation. They argue that if employees feel that role conflict or role ambiguity are reduced they will become more customer oriented. In organizations adopting a customer-oriented selling it takes more time and effort to sell (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590) and this is one reason why we argue that some salespeople may find demands from organizations as incompatible. At Company X the service level and customer oriented behaviors are very important but simultaneously efficiency and selling needs to be maintained. If their job requires them to perform, i.e. sell, and at the same time make more time for customers create relationships it may be difficult know what to focus on. Thus, when Company X expresses a desire to increase sales they mean selling in terms of customer orientation but if salespeople’s perception of selling is negative they may interpret company policies unclear. Thus, there is a potential that salespeople in Company X feel both role conflict and role ambiguity. Further, role ambiguity has been determined to have a negative influence on work motivation (Dubinsky & Skinner, 1984, p.35). This gives us reason to consider the potential for role stress to have an effect on intrinsic motivation, thus perceived role stress will be tested to have an effect on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation in our model.

Our hypotheses:
H9: Role stress such as: a) role ambiguity and b) role conflict have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.
H10: Role stress such as: a) role ambiguity and b) role conflict have a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.5 Intrinsic Motivations Effect on Customer Orientation

Research has shown that high levels of intrinsic motivation could lead to several favorable effects (Pullins, 2001, p. 405) e.g. positive effects on work efficiency and job-satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72). It has also been confirmed intrinsic motivation increases when a salesperson’s customer orientation increases (Mullin & Pullins, 2009, p. 774). Pullins (2001, p. 405) argue that current research of intrinsic motivation suggest that if intrinsic motivation is high, salespeople approach events more positively and flexible. These behaviors have been determined to positively influence the strategy of building long-term relationships between individuals, they are behaviors needed to positively influence buyer-seller relationships (Pullins, 2001, p. 406). How long-term relationship building versus short-term value orientation has an impact on sales strategies is a particularly interesting aspect of motivation (Pullins, 2001, p. 404). A possible key aspect to determine the answer on this would be to investigate what effect intrinsic motivation have (Pullins, 2001, p.406) and there are strong reasons to believe it affects customer orientation. Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) findings enhance the importance to design a job carefully in order to increase intrinsic motivation and
efficiency. Salespeople who use a behavior that is efficient and in alignment with organizations expectations are more likely to perform better and increase outputs (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 193). Thus, intrinsic motivation has been found to also have a positive effect on efficiency. We argue that it would be of significant importance for managers to increase their employees’ intrinsic motivation if they want to establish long-term relationships with their customers. Thus, there is a potential that if intrinsic motivation increases salespeople’s customer oriented behaviors improve respectively.

Our hypothesis:
H11: Intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on customer orientation.

3.6 Performance

3.6.1 Intrinsic Motivation and Customer Orientation’s Effects on Performance

Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 71) explains that when people are well matched with their job, they want to work hard and perform well because it is rewarding and satisfying in itself. This is what we previously defined as intrinsic motivation. This type of motivation has a positive effect on how well a person performs on the job (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.71). If work situations and events are experienced as interesting the intrinsic motivation will increase (Pullins, 2001, p. 406). Sufficient performance is an occasion for self-reward and this motivates to continue to perform well (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72). However, if an employee is intrinsically motivated but perform less sufficiently and does not experience these positive feelings it may be motivated to try harder (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72). This creates a self-perpetuating cycle of positive work motivation powered by self-generated rewards for good work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72). From the classical views of motivation, described earlier, we can concluded that the higher a salesperson’s motivation the greater the effort, which potentially lead to higher performance. Oliver and Anderson (1994 p. 63) found that intrinsic motivation is positively related with a number of performance outcomes. Our literature review has enabled us to make our own summary for what other outcomes intrinsic motivation could lead to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amabile, 1983; Hennessey, 2000; Pullins, 2001</td>
<td>Increased creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujan, 1983; Weitz et al., 1986</td>
<td>Working smarter with a more adaptive selling approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujan, 1983</td>
<td>Hard working salespeople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullins, 1996</td>
<td>Increased use of win-win negotiation tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgins et al., 1996</td>
<td>Higher self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan et al., 1983</td>
<td>A more relaxed attitude and a less negative emotional tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullins, 2001</td>
<td>Enhancement of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullins, 2001</td>
<td>Enhanced flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Own summary of Positive outcomes from Intrinsic motivation
If managers succeed to maintain high intrinsic motivation among their salespeople, there is a greater possibility that they will approach their job with a more adaptive selling approach and perform their tasks with a more open mind, which lead to better performance (Pullins, 2001, p. 406). Thus, working smarter means that salespeople can perform more efficiently by choosing an appropriate approach (Sujan, 1986, p. 49; Weitz et al., 1986, p. 187). Salespeople positively affect an organization’s performance by using a customer-oriented approach to establish and maintain relationships with customers (Hellier et al., 2003, p. 1783; Williams & Attaway, 1996, p. 44; Wu et al., 2013, p. 444). Thus, salespeople’s actions influence the quality of customer service (Varey & Lewis, 2000, p. 118) and that quality in turn affects customers’ repurchase intention (Hellier et al., 2003, p. 1783). Simultaneously, good-quality customer service will lead to long-term relationships between customers and organizations (Wu et al., 2013, p. 444).

From this we conclude that to enhance the effects of a sales strategy it could be valuable for Company X to determine what their salespeople are intrinsically motivated by. Company X wants to establish long-term relationships with their customers and their primary goal is to successfully implement this selling orientation among their salespeople (Company X, 2014). In our means, a greater understanding for the organizations salespeople and their drives could affect the implementation of a customer-oriented strategy. We argue that increasing their salespeople's intrinsic motivation is one way to do it. This is confirmed by Pullins (2001, p. 404) that means that an improvement of intrinsic motivation is important to sales success. Since the performance of Company X salespeople in this study is determined by value adding services and sales ratio, it is important for them to simultaneously motivate customer-oriented selling and maintaining efficiency. Thus, it could be crucial to determine how job design and sales managers’ behavior also affect performance.

3.6.2 Feedback, Coaching and Role Stress Effects on Performance

Inaccurate role perceptions can influence salespeople to misjudge linkages between the effort they expended on the job, the level of performance they will achieve and what rewards they can attain as a result of that performance (Walker, et al., 1977, p.160). A general conclusion is that role ambiguity and role conflict tend to evoke negative valued states such as tension and low job satisfaction (Brown & Peterson, 1993, p. 72). Role ambiguity increases the probability that an individual will be dissatisfied with its role, experience anxiety, distort reality and therefore perform less effectively (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 151; Walker et al., 1977, p. 160). Accordingly the literature suggests a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job performance (Brown & Peterson, 1993, p. 72; Tubre & Collins, 2000, p. 164). Dubinsky and Skinner (1984, p. 35) found that autonomy had a positive impact on job performance, but role ambiguity had a negative effect on job performance. Further, Singh (1998, p. 81) argues that increased level of autonomy can have a negative impact on performance and be stressful if employees experience role ambiguity. Thus, in uncertain environments, the additional decision-making demands related to increased autonomy can elevate the negative effects of role ambiguity.

Tubre and Collins (2000, p. 165), and Brown and Peterson (1993, p. 72) did not find a relationship between role conflict and job performance, but Behrman and Perreault (1984, p.19) found a positive relationship. They argue that since role conflict is unavoidable in many frontline jobs employees simply must cope with it to be effective.
Unlike Behrman and Perreault (1984), Ford et al. (1975, p. 95) and Walker et al. (1975, p. 32) found that salespeople's perception of their various role partners hold conflicting expectations concerning the performance of their job and can have negative psychological effects. When expected behaviors of an individual are inconsistent it will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively than if the imposed expectations aligned (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 151). Thus, role conflict can cause decreased individual satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Walker et al., 1977, p. 160).

Classical organizational theory also deals with role ambiguity and enhance that every position in an organizational structure should have a specified set of tasks or position responsibilities (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 151). The role clarity-performance linkage depends on the simple argument that salespeople who are clear about what they are expected to accomplish can focus their efforts on the appropriate objectives and achieve higher performance (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.192). Additionally, salespeople who are provided clear objectives are likely to be more motivated to attain them (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.192). Rizzo et al. (1970, p. 151) mean that formal definitions of role requirements are intended to allow supervisors to hold subordinates accountable for specific performance and to provide guidance and directions for employees. If an employee does not know what authority it has and how it will be judged, it will hesitate to make decisions and rely on a trial and error approach in meeting the expectations of his superior (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 151). Feedback helps reduce the negative effects role conflict and role ambiguity have on salespeople, thus salespeople exposed to high levels of feedback appear to be unaffected by increasing levels of role conflict (Singh, 1998, p. 82). Thus, a sales manager that provides feedback and does it with an appropriate approach will experience that their sales people become more productive, efficient, satisfied and motivated (Carter, 2006, p.113). Feedback could be a source of control for sales manager to influence salespeople’s performance (Tyagi, 1985, p. 83) or to remind salespeople of what the right behaviors are and therethrough improve performance (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.192). Harmon et al. (2002, p. 51) argue that feedback could be used to acknowledge effective selling techniques and satisfying outcomes.

Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p. 194) argue that performance could be improved through the informational and motivational effects of feedback. They found that positive feedback (output and behavioral) contributes to salespeople's performance through role clarity or as a direct effect on performance (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.197). Negative feedback on the other hand (output and behavioral) was determined to not have any direct effects on performance but had an effect on role clarity (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 197). Positive feedback (output and behavioral) has both an informational and motivational effect on salespeople, in contrast negative feedback (output and behavioral) only had an informational effect (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.197). Hence, both types of feedback were found to affect role clarity while only the positive feedback was found to have a motivational effect and directly improve performance. Feedbacks’ (output and behavioral) effect on role clarity indicates that salespeople provided with information of what is expected from them also understand better what the objectives and appropriate behaviors are (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.198). Negative feedback (output and behavioral) has relatively small effects on performance (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.198). Positive feedback has a strong effect on performance and positive output feedback was found to be most influential of the two (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p.198). From this we expect that positive feedback have a considerable effect on performance.
Tyagi (1982, p. 245) addresses that if salespeople experience that their organization is supporting their efforts they will also interpret that their effort is important for enhancement of performance. Likert (1961, p. 109) argued that if sales managers have an open approach with their salesforce they would have easier to enable a good relation with them and create a greater understanding of what their needs and problems are. Sales managers’ have to supervise salespeople through feedback and frequent accompaniment on calls, which increases the visibility of their actual field behavior (Walker, et al. 1975, p. 38, Walker, et al. 1977, p. 161). Thus, sales managers’ coaching affect performance because a great coach has the ability to understand what skills a salesperson need and what help they need to receive in order to improve performance (Carter, 2006, p.113). Experienced salespeople perceive significantly less role stress than those with less experience, thus the extent and nature of sales training influence how salespeople perceive and cope with role stress (Dubinsky & Mattson, 1979, p. 84; Walker, et al. 1975, p. 38; Walker, et al. 1977, p. 161). This reasoning implies that coaching can provide important insights for salespeople’s development and performance. Salespeople’s behavior is more likely to be repeated if sales managers’ give praise and recognition (Rich, 1998, p. 57) and therefore we argue that it will be of significant importance to investigate if sales managers’ behavior have an impact on performance.

Our hypothesis:
H12: There is a difference between high performance groups and low performance groups on the motivational factors: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy, e) job feedback, f) experienced meaningfulness, g) experienced responsibility h) knowledge of results, i) positive behavioral feedback, j) negative behavioral feedback k) positive output feedback, l) negative output feedback, m) coaching, n) role ambiguity, o) role conflict, p) intrinsic motivation and q) customer orientation.

3.7 Conceptual Model

The Job Characteristics Model (JCM) can be used to analyze a job’s motivation potential (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p.585; Wagner et al., 2008, p. 6364). According to Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 76) motivation is mainly generated by how tasks are designed and managed, rather than dependent on individuals’ personal characteristics. Our study will investigate the same five core job characteristics and critical psychological states Hackman and Oldham (1980) used, it constitutes our job design variables.

To extend the JCM we add new variables derived from one of the original models’ moderators, i.e. context satisfaction. This moderator concerned pay, job security, and interactions with coworkers and managers (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.86). Thus, Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 86) argue that if a person is worried about getting fired, feels underpaid or does not get along with supervisors or colleagues, that person will not feel motivated. When we deliberated with Company X on what motivational factors to include, we got a clear indication of that this moderator deserves more attention in such a complex selling environment. To narrow the study further, we decided to only investigate the managerial aspect of the context satisfaction moderator.
Prior research on feedback (e.g. Carter, 2006; Jaworski & Kohli, 1991; Harmon et al., 2002), coaching (Carter, 2006; Onyemah, 2007; Rich, 1998) and role stress (e.g. Coelho, 2011; Thankor & Joshi, 2005; Walker, et. al., 1975) indicates that sales managers’ behaviors have a significant effect on salespeople. However, there are no absolute guidelines of how sales managers’ should behave (Fine, 2007, p. 189) but an organization that supports salespeople’s effort would affect salespeople's performance (Tyagi, 1982, p.245). However, it is specifically challenging to manage salespeople in organizations with a customer-oriented sales strategy (Fine, 2007, p. 185). Prior research implies that it is important for organizations to determine how job design and sales managers’ behavior facilitates our chosen outcomes: intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and performance. Thus, we have chosen to include three additional variables to represent sales managers’ behavior: feedback, coaching and roles stress.

The complexity of a jobs’ design in the electricity market and how it affects salespeople, in combination with the scarce guidelines for how sales managers’ should behave to influence them to appropriate sales behavior constitutes a research gap. Thus, previous research has not, to our knowledge, tested these variables in the same combination and on the same outcomes as we do. By testing these effects we aim to contribute with new knowledge to motivation research in the field of selling and sales management.

Figure 3. Our own Conceptual model
4. Practical Method

This chapter explains in detail our practical method and how it influences our research. We present our choice of population, sample and access. Further, we describe how we constructed our survey and collected our data. We also discuss data loss, preparation, source criticism and ethical considerations. Our intentions are to explain all steps in our methodological process carefully, in order to facilitate future replication of our study.

4.1 Research Method

Literature of research method determines three classifications of the research purpose: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 139). However, they also highlight that a research can be subject to different purposes and subject for several methods at the same time. Therefore, thinking about one's research purpose and question is important when choosing a suitable research method (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 139). It constitutes a comprehensive plan of how one could answer a research question (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 136) and as source for how to collect and examine data (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 40).

Exploratory methods are used to clarify the fundamental cause of a problem in order to create an in depth understanding for the specific research question (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 139). This could be done through a scrutiny of open questions asked at interviews with experts or in focus groups (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). This research method is described to be flexible and adaptable to change, thus new findings that change the direction of may occur throughout the research (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). A descriptive method is concerned with description of particular persons, events or conditions and is often mixed with explanatory studies to extend the research (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). Prior to data collection a descriptive methods requires a clear overview of the phenomena one intend to collect data from (Saunders et al., 2009, p.140). However, this method is rarely proposed due to that there is a risk that it becomes too descriptive, i.e. they are likely to lack data evaluation and reflections (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). This method should rather be thought of as a means to an end and is likely to be a forerunner to an explanatory study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). Explanatory methods require higher skills than those of accurate description and enable researchers to determine a situation or problem by examining the relationships between variables (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 140). This is done by collection of quantitative data, collected by a survey, and the use statistical tests provide a clear view of the variables relationships (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 141). Since the purpose of this study is to investigate the motivational situation in Company X through the relationships between different variables the explanatory approach will be suitable for us. We also consider us to partly carry out a descriptive method whereas we in depth describe the particular situation for Company X. One could argue that an exploratory method could be conducted in our context, however our primarily aim is to find what factors that have an impact and not an in depth investigation of underlying reasons why they occur. As objectivists and positivists we consider the reality external to social actors, thus we find this research method most appropriate to constitute new knowledge and insights to the field of motivation.
4.2 Data Collection Method

The type of data collected for a study should be carefully considered because it could imply what analysis a researcher will be able to conduct (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 335). Similarly, Saunders et al. (2009, p. 362) suggest that all methods evaluated to obtain one that is appropriate for the research question and the study’s purpose. Primary and secondary data are the most frequently used data collection methods. Collecting primary data means to collect new data for the specific purpose of a study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 256). Primary data enable us to investigate whether the proposed relationships between variables in our conceptual model aligns with the hypothesized effects. As we want to assess the effects of motivation in a particular organization, we also consider it important to get present and valid information from them specifically. In our opinion, primary data serves as a better indicator of what the effects are in our specific case. Therefore, it would be adequate for us to collect the information primary data could provide. However, the possibility to obtain primary data is highly dependent on the accessibility of the population (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 169). Our close cooperation and communication with Company X provided a good access to our population. Thus, Saunders et al. (2009, p. 222) notes that the issue of primary data could be that the response rate can fluctuate substantially between researches but that one could alleviate this by using appropriate techniques.

Using secondary data implies a risk that it does not meet the needs for the intended study and therefore creates an obstacle to fully address a study’s objectives (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 270). Thus, we claim that it is not always clear how secondary data has been retrieved and processed. This is the reason why we wanted to collect primary data in the first instance. Hence, previous studies are always more or less limited and secondary data used in one context may be inappropriate to apply to another. To sum up, we regarded primary data as most appropriate for our study in regard to our research purpose and to test the hypothesized effects of variables.

However, it has also been assessed that secondary data can be a useful source to analyze and answer a research question (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 320; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 256) and that many studies have used a combination of primary and secondary data (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 258). Therefore, we have also decided to comprehend secondary data for the performance variable in our conceptual model. Secondary data is defined as previously collected data that is integrated in a new context and reanalyzed (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 256). Though, one needs to take into consideration that it could be problematic to use data if it is not presently collected (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 270). Hackman and Oldham (1980) and other previous studies, e.g. Martinaityte & Sacramento (2013), also used secondary data to measure the performance variable. Additionally, Sohi (1996) stated that self-reported measurements of performance would be inappropriate since it can lead to biased results. We had convenient access to sufficient performance data through non-written documentary data received from historical reports of Company X, regarding the salespeople’s performance in previous years. Documentary data is often used in combination with primary data (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 258). Further, we argue that Company X’s secondary data of performance serves as a complementary variable that would make it possible for us to assess “real” outcomes. Hence, we will be able to examine what variables that have a considerable effect on performance in different teams and not only analyze what people claim to be the reason why they perform well. By using this secondary data in our analysis, we
argue that we will gain advanced knowledge of how different variables relates to Company X salespeople’s performance.

However, big sets of data may be complex to manage and could require a great amount of time and effort to analyze and interpret (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 320; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 268). Collecting secondary data could be time consuming and costly if it is difficult to access (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 270). However, secondary data collected within organizations could be convenient because they are often decent comprehensions and therefore would provide data with relatively high quality for the context (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 268) and it also saves time (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 313; Saunders, 2009, p. 268). Secondary data could also provide an opportunity to put findings into a more general context if compared with primary collected data (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 269) and lead to unexpected findings, which could provide useful insights for a study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 270). Therefore, we considered it interesting and valuable to advance our analysis from our primary data with secondary data, representing the performance of salespeople at Company X, to see if our variables had any unsuspected effects on salespeople’s performance.

4.3 Questionnaire Design

Primary data can be collected in several ways, for example by observation, semi-structured interviews, structured interviews, in-depth interviews and group interviews. Observation essentially involves “systematic observation, recording, description, analysis and interpretation of people’s behavior” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 288). This data collection method has been relatively neglected but could contribute with rich data (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 288). Observations are suitable if you want to study what people do (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 288) but as we will study what people are affect by, we consider this method as inappropriate. Interviews can provide valid and reliable data but what type of interview you adopt needs to align with your research purpose and question (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 318). Structured interviews use standardized questionnaires with identical sets of questions asked to respondents, i.e. interviewer-administered questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 318). An interviewer reads the same sets of questions to all respondents and then record their answers, this interview method collect quantifiable data and suits a quantitative research (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 318). Thus, there is no social interaction between respondents and interviewers and questions are read in the exactly as they are written and use the same tone to all respondents (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 318). Semi-structured and in-depth interviews are unstandardized and often used in qualitative studies (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). When performing a semi-structured interview the interviewer has list of topics and questions to consider but all interviews may vary (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). In-depth or unstructured interviews are informal and provide the interviewer with an opportunity to explore a certain topic in a more general manner (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). Thus, no predetermined questions are needed but should, however, have a clear idea of certain notions you want to explore (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). Semi-structured or in-depth interviews could also be used within smaller groups, where participants elaborate and discuss topics facilitated by an interviewer. Since, the latter two interview methods were appropriate for qualitative research and we conduct a quantitative one, we did not consider these options. However, we could potentially have used structured interviews for our research, but questionnaires are an efficient way to collect data from larger samples (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 361). Since we had the ability
to reach the census of a relatively large population, we considered questionnaires to be a more efficient research method that would facilitate our analysis to a greater extent. Therefore, we used a self-completion questionnaire for our research, which is a widely used quantitative data collection technique (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 361). Respondents get a questionnaire with the exact same sets of questions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 361) and fill in the answers themselves (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 231).

When constituting a questionnaire, one must initially consider in what form they should be asked (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 374). Many questionnaires use both open and closed questions where the former refers to questions that respondents can answer in their own way and the latter provides respondents with alternatives and the instruction to choose one (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 374). Open questions are more widely used in semi-structured and in-depth interviews, thus they are useful when one conducts exploratory studies (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 375). Further, open questions are useful if one want to have detailed answers, get respondents principally thoughts or when it is difficult to determine what type of response you will get (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 375). Closed questions have several advantages and from the respondents point of view they are easier to complete and process (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250). In particular it is convenient for respondents because they do not have to write extensively answers (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250). Open questions may also be less important for some research purposes (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 249) and closed question are more appropriate for the purpose of our study. Our questionnaire is constituted by mandatory closed questions, except for two of demographic questions. Disadvantages with closed questions could be that respondents do not find an answer applicable to them (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250, 253) but closed questions are often perceived clear since answers are given (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250). We use a scale for each question so respondents had a greater possibility to find an applicable answer than if they were completely given. Closed questions also facilitate the administration and analysis of a quantitative study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250). Our questionnaire will be distributed at a morning meeting with a premise of that it has to be simple, understandable and easy to fill in. Thus, we found closed questions appropriate for our research purpose and for the convenience of respondents to fill in the questionnaire.

It could also be very beneficial to use closed questions from researchers’ viewpoint. They provide an opportunity for the researcher to compare answers with each other, facilitates the analysis of relationships between variables and reduces the possibility of misinterpreted questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250). However, individuals do interpret questions differently and lack the opportunity to give spontaneous answers, which are two other disadvantages of closed questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 250, 253). We are aware of these disadvantages and have considered our closed questions very carefully. We argue that misinterpretations may be difficult to avoid due to that people simply think differently. Thus, we did our best to ask questions in a way that would facilitate an understanding among participants.

In order to create a sufficient questionnaire one must carefully consider the sets of questions asked to make sure it captures what you attempt to measure (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 361). This will be crucial to gather the data required to answer a research question (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 361). Therefore, it is recommended to consider the purpose of the research when constituting the questionnaire. It is also important because it could affect the response rate as well as reliability and validity of the research
(Saunders et al., 2009, p. 362). With support from Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 263) there
are some questions created by us (Appendix 1, question 1 to 5) but note that they asked
solely to describe our sample and will therefore only be analyzed in descriptive
statistics. Question 2 (age) and 5 (team number) was optional; with respect to our
respondents and our promise to keep them anonymous, we decided to make those
questions optional. Hence, in some teams members of a certain age are very few and
one could therefore potentially lead back to a certain person. Thus, we neither will
elaborate on both of these demographic questions in combination with each other at any
time.

Scales from former research will constitute a foundation for the analysis of our
conceptual model and the variables’ effects. During our scrutiny of previous theories
and findings, we also evaluated their constructs asked to respondents in their research.
We wanted to assess relevant theories to answer our research question and find scales
that would lead us to retrieve appropriate data. In order to do so, we used scales that
have been tested by previous research. By using the exact same questions tested in other
research, one can enhance the reliability of ones own (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 263).
Additionally it also provides an opportunity to compare new findings with previous
research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 263). For each variable we adopted a scales from a
previous author. To measure job characteristics, critical psychological states and
intrinsic motivation we used items 6 to 27. As it follows the original questionnaire by
Hackman and Oldham (1980, p. 276-302), the questions regarding different scales are
asked in a random order. In total 22 of 83 items were used from their scales. In our
survey question 6 and 9 corresponds to Skill Variety, question 7 and 12 represent task
identity and question 10 and 15 measure task significance. Question 8 and 13 denote
feedback from the job itself whereas question 11 and 14 represent autonomy. To
measure the degree of coaching in Company X, we used Oneymah’s (2009) scale that in
turn was inspired by Oliver and Anderson’s (1994) scale of the “extent of supervision”.
We used all five items in this scale and they correspond to questions 28 to 32 in
Appendix 1. In 1991 Jaworski and Kohli developed a new scale that was measuring four
types of feedback and this scale is also applied in our questionnaire (Appendix 1,
questions 33 to 50). All these variables will further explain how Company X’s
salespeople perceive critical psychological states.

Variables that measure the critical psychological states were also taken from Hackman
and Oldham’s (1980) scales. Experienced meaningfulness was represented by question
18 and 21; experienced responsibility was measured by questions 16, 22, 25 and 27
whereas knowledge of results was considered by question 19 and 24. Further we also
wanted to assess how the job characteristics variables were affecting the salespeople’s
perceived role within the company. Therefore we integrated two scales representing role
conflict and role ambiguity respectively. It has been mentioned in previous research that
Rizzo, House and Lirtzman’s (1970) scales of role conflict and role ambiguity do not
adequately measure role stress dimensions (Teas, 1983, p. 90). Alternatives scales such
as Walker, Churchill and Ford’s (1977) could be rather feasible to measure role stress
(Teas, 1983, p. 90). However, that scale was adjusted for an industrial setting and
therefore we found it inappropriate for our study. The scale developed by Rizzo et al.
(1970) was also used by several other researchers e.g. Coelho, et al. 2011; Jaworski &
several aspects that were incompatible with our purpose. Therefore, we decided to use
Sohi’s (1996) adapted scale that aligned more with our study. There were five items of
role conflict corresponding to items 51 to 55 and five items explaining role ambiguity that respectively corresponds to items 56 to 60 (Appendix 1).

Hackman and Oldham (1980) were also developed a scale to measure intrinsic motivation, this variable is represented by item 20 and 23 (Appendix 1). Whereas the outcome variable of customer orientation has its origin in Saxe and Weitz (1982) Selling Orientation - Customer Orientation scale (SOCO scale). However, Thomas et al. (2001, p. 68) found that salespeople’s orientation can be measured with only ten of the original twenty-four items. Therefore they reduced the scale and argued that the reduction in number of items did not affect the obtained information. They mean that their ten items scale to some extent is even more reliable and valid, mainly due to that having less items has a potential to reduced response fatigue and bias due to compliance (Thomas et al., 2001, p. 68). Further, they argued that this was true in different settings and whether the research was conducted on sales representatives, sales managers or customers (Thomas et al., 2001, p. 68). As this reduction contributed to a less extensive SOCO scale, it is more applicable to multiple items scale where the scale could be integrated and examined with other variables (Thomas et al., 2001, p. 68). Thankor and Joshi (2005) followed Thomas et al.’s (2001) example and reduced the scale further. However, they used five items that were adapted from Saxe and Weitz’s (1982) original questions regarding customer orientation and these are the ones used in our questionnaire (Appendix 1, question 61 to 65). Hence, Thomas et al.’s arguments that a scale with less questions could measure the same content and still be valid constituted the foundational argument for us to not choose the original, extensive SOCO scale. Thus, we decided to use the tested reliable scale by Thankor and Joshi (2005).

The selected items from Job Characteristics, Critical Psychological States, Intrinsic Motivation and Coaching were all measured with a seven point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” and “completely disagree” to “completely agree”. Whereas constructs from Feedback, Role Stress and Customer Orientation were measured by a five point Likert scale all ranging from “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree”. Schwepker (2003, p. 153) concludes that a reduction of the categories available in a response scale (i.e. seven-point scale to a six-point scale) does affect the scales reliability. Hence, modifications of scales do not have any considerable effect on the actual measurement of the variable. Therefore we adjusted the scale of all items from seven and five point scales into a six point Likert scale. This scale was chosen for all items to make a more coherent questionnaire and to not obtain mediocre answers. Hence, we did not want to have a neutral answer and a six point Likert scale encourage the participant to choose an answer leaning towards the higher or lower scores.

All constructs were originally in English, and since our respondents were Swedish-speaking we considered it important to translate our questions to Swedish. We argue that translated questions increase the probability of obtaining a high response rate and to avoid misinterpretations due to potential lack of linguistic skills. We translated the questions ourselves and were very careful when we doing this. We wanted to diminish the risk of misinterpretations due to that they increase the probability of biased or irrelevant results. In order to increase the salespeople’s understanding for our translations, we deliberated with our mentor at Company X about whether the translations were adequately or not. Hence, our mentor carefully went through our translations and commented on whether the content and meaning of our questions were maintained. The questions were also distributed to two objective persons that gave their
opinions of our translations and content of the questionnaire. After we received feedback of the questions we made some minor changes in terms of changing words to synonyms or put words in a logical order. Thus, we were cautious to not change the original meaning of the questions and therefore several times translated them back to English.

4.4 Performance Measures

Our performance variable will be measured by secondary data from Company X. Performance is a determination and evaluation of how efficient a behavior is in terms of how well it aligns with goals and objectives of an organization (Churchill et al., 1992). Sohi (1996, p.52) concludes that the perception of how to best measure performance deviates between authors and has been a subject for debate. Some authors mean that self-reported measures of performance would be inappropriate since it leads to bias (Sohi, 1996, p. 52). Contrary to this other authors states that self-reported measures are appropriate due to that there is no motive to suspect that a potential bias has a systematical variation among employees, specifically salespeople (Sohi, 1996, p. 52). We regarded it as insufficient to obtain self-evaluated measures of performance. Partly due to that we simply argue that the salespeople do not have the information and self-distance needed to evaluate their performance within the organization.

Hackman and Oldham (1980) and other previous studies, e.g. Martinaityte & Sacramento (2013) also used secondary data to measure the performance variable. We had convenient access to sufficient performance data regarding the salespeople's performance in the last year through historical reports of Company X. More specifically, the data provided by Company X contains quantitative information regarding sales ratios and also a value adding services ratio. Value adding services contains: number of customers agreeing on getting electronic invoices, number of customers agreeing on getting information by email instead of mail, number of customers wanting to leave but are convinced to stay, number of heating devices sold, number of customers agreeing on being contacted when their electricity contract expires. Dividing all of these numbers by numbers of calls gives us the value adding services ratio, which is a measurement of how much extra the employees does in one call. The sales ratio refers to number of contracts sold to new customers divided by number of calls received. Company X emphasizes the importance of satisfied customer and according to Company X is the most important performance measurement for them customer satisfaction index. Though, since all teams are performing above the company’s goal on this matter, we, together with Company X agreed on excluding this measurement, in favor for the value adding services measurement, which we argue is related to customer orientation.

Another reason why we found it appropriate to use the data Company X already gathered was the many favorable features of secondary data and its potential to advance the current study. Additionally the data was cohesive and useful, therefore we argue that it is relevant to use secondary data provided by Company X.

4.5 Sampling Technique

In order to execute our study we are required to gather data from the population we are investigating. A population is a particular group of individuals or objects that are a
susceptible for questions or observations that could be comprehended into data structures and information (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 63). Our target population consists of individuals working at Company X’s Customer Service Department. Their primary duty is to provide efficient and helpful services to all Company X customers on the Swedish electricity market. This population was chosen primarily due to Company X’s request and their concern of their performance. Hence, as we are writing on commission for Company X, we regarded it as natural to integrate them in the process of deciding our population. We also considered this group as relevant since they work in a business to customer setting and have a daily, direct contact with customers. Further, we regard this population as suitable due to their complex work tasks. From previous findings and our own experience, we also knew that this group would be appropriate to represent the perception of incompatible demands, which is a relevant aspect of our study. Lastly, as we will to provide some managerial implications for what effects certain variables have on Company X’s salespeople, we found it natural to carry out our study on this particular group.

The possibility to attain and gather data from an entire population is defined as a census (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 210). Studying a census means that researchers aim to gather data or information from the whole target population (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 63). However, studying a census is in many cases impossible. Generally, this type of data collection is challenging for a researcher, mainly due to time constraints, financial resources or access constraints (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 210). Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 175) also enhance the difficulties of collecting data from all members of the population. However, these types of constraints are critical factors in any type of research design (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 449) and since we had the opportunity to reach all members in our population we found it appropriate to try.

Further, quantitative research constantly requires researchers to scale down the population and use samples (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 175) in particular when it is difficult to retrieve primary data from the entire target population (Shiu et al., 2009, p.449). Sampling means to define a smaller number of the whole population that will represent the larger defined population (Shiu et al., 2009, p.448) and is convenient when the data collection from an entire population becomes impractical (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 216-217). Since we had access to a whole population sampling was not needed for our study. Thus, information comprehended from samples can also be useful to draw conclusions for the whole population (Shiu et al., 2009, p.448). Hence, it is concerned to be generalizable to the specific context a quantitative study has been conducted in (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 163). The primary aim is to conclude that the sample is representative for the entire population and not just for the single sample researched (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 164). Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 164) describes generalization as a way for researchers to develop “principals about human behavior that can be used to predict what people will do in certain situations”. This means that through assessing a sample of the target population (salespeople at the Customer Service) we can generalize our findings regarding Company X salespeople to other salespeople in the same department and even to other companies with similar work settings and markets. We were able to send our survey to the entire population, the census. Therefore, when we interpret the result we will evaluate whether respondents who agreed to participate in our survey are representative of the full census.
Though, we want to highlight that other sampling techniques also may have been appropriate for our study. In order to select a sample there are two different sampling approaches: *probability* and *non-probability sampling* (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 176; Shiu et al., 2009, p. 64). *Probability samples* entails that the sample has been randomly selected and that every member in a population has an equal chance of being included in the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 179; Shiu et al., 2009, p. 64). This sampling approach is mainly used when researchers want to assess the generalizability of their population (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 179). On the contrary a *non-probability sample* signify that a sample is not randomly selected (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190; Shiu et al., 2009, p. 64).

One example of probability sampling, and one of the most basic sampling techniques, is the *simple random sample* (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 179). This sample technique means that researchers assign numbers to all members in the population and then use a table of random numbers to determine which individuals that will constitute the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 180). *Systematic sample* is another example of probability sample, which implies that the researcher selects units directly from the population (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 180). Hence, a researcher defines a sequence of numbers e.g. 16,36,56,76 etc. that will determine who will be included in the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 180). None of these probability-sampling methods were appropriate since we had the opportunity to investigate a whole census. We want to gather as many responses as possible to generalize our findings, thus these sampling techniques were not related to our context. A third type of probability sampling is the *stratified random sampling*. This sampling technique entails that the population is separated into different categories (i.e. departments, country) and then the sample is randomly selected from each category (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 181). In our case this would for example mean that we first divided our population into their work teams and then randomly selected participants from each team. We are aware of that these sampling techniques could have been appropriate to use as well. However, we had a unique chance to reach the whole census and decided that it was what we wanted to aim for. The fourth probability sample regards the *multi-stage cluster sampling* approach that concerns qualitative researchers with the intention to interview their sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 181). It signifies that interviewers are required to cluster their population into groupings (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 182). For example, if one aims to research the 20 largest Service companies in Sweden one could randomly sample the ten largest ones, thus yielding ten clusters and then randomly select a number of participants. However, this sampling technique is not appropriate for our current research.

There are also three types of *non-probability sampling* approaches available and one of them is the *convenience sampling* (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190). In this approach the sample is selected by the convenience of researchers (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 480), which means that participants are selected due to their availability and accessibility for researchers (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190). Imagine that you have a group of people that appear interesting in terms of ethical considerations. This group was chosen particularly for its easy access and there is a good chance to obtain a high response rate (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190). One must note that this type of sampling approach does not determine what population the sample is representative for (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190). This sampling approach often facilitates the data collection but is often subject to biases (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 241) and induces an impossibility to generalize results (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 190). A convenience sample could have been used but
we did not consider this sample approach due to that we needed a representative population to be able to generalize our findings.

Snowball sampling means that researchers create an initial contact with a smaller group of participants, relevant for the study, and establish new contacts through them (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 192). This is also a non-probability sample, which we found inappropriate for our study because we only considered a group of individuals gathered in the same organization. Quota sampling is the last option of sampling which aims to constitute a sample by different categories, such as, gender, age, ethnicity etc. (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 193). In contrast to the probability sample of stratified random sampling this sampling approach does not determine participants randomly (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 193). Further, when researchers have decided on which categories to research they determine what number of participants that should be interviewed in each category (i.e. quotas) (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 193). Then the interviewer has the opportunity to choose which individuals to include in the research as long as the quotas are obtained (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 193). We drew the conclusion that this sampling approach was not suitable for our study.

Further, a sample selected from a population could be either homogeneous or heterogeneous (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 189). A heterogeneous sample is likely to be varied and contrary a relatively homogenous sample constitutes less variation (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 189). Previous research on the JCM model (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Renn & Vandenberg, 1995; Tiegs, et al., 1992) has tested it on heterogeneous samples. Our questionnaire intends to investigate how the salespeople at Company X perceive the organizations ability to motivate them. Further, their foundational work tasks are very similar so the sample is relatively homogenous. Therefore we also expect our findings to be less variable than if it had been a heterogeneous sample. Further, a homogenous sample also implies that it does not have to be as big as a heterogeneous sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 189). However, our intentions are to receive an answer from the whole population, i.e census. In order to attain a high response rate we were working in close relationship to Company X, which distributed our questionnaire at a morning meeting. This allowed all participants to answer the questionnaire at their working hours and hopefully increased the motivation to participate. We decided to distributed the questionnaire one date and that was the only time anyone was given the opportunity to answer. Hence, there was no reminder to fill in the questionnaire but it was planned that if the response rate was low that the procedure would be replicated.

To summarize, our intentions were include as many members as possible from a census and Company X’s customer service population was easy to access. Further, the potential participants were available electronically; therefore we neither had any direct difficulties with the accessibility or financial resources. Thus, we still had the time restrictions to consider. Positive aspects of collecting data from a census increased our probability to attain all members of our population.

4.6 Data Collection

Our questionnaire was distributed by email during one day, the 15th of April 2014 to all salespeople selling to private customers at Company X. All employees were given time to answer the survey during their team’s morning meeting. We used an online-based self-completion questionnaire, which means that an URL link was sent to all
salespeople's email so the survey was easily accessible for the employees. Thus, it is more cost efficient and time saving than postal questionnaires that is another type of self-completion questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 364). However, these types of questionnaires have some disadvantages as well. One would be that it is hard to support the respondents and answer any questions regarding the questionnaire (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 233). In our case this was solved so that we were at Company X’s office during the morning meeting when the questionnaire was distributed.

Saunders et al., (2009, p. 395) enhances the importance to gain access to the sample in order to obtain a high response rate. One must determine a good source to collect data from (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 395) and since we are writing on commission for Company X it was natural to engage them when we developed a strategy to gain access. Most challenging could be to gain physical access due to that people may be reluctant to engage in additional activities due to time limits or scarce resources (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 395). When we gathered our data this problem was solved due to that participant got to complete the questionnaire at their working hours, which may have led to a greater motivation to participate in our study. However, it was still optional to answer the questionnaire, nobody was forced to answer. The mailing list included all 187 salespeople working at Company X's Customer Service Department. Salespeople working with businesses were excluded from the survey due to that our research is limited to salespeople working with consumers.

As the software Company X uses themselves for surveys were too complex and difficult to use we decided to use another software. Instead we had the opportunity to use software provided from another organization where one of the authors work. Our questionnaire was conducted in Webropol, an international tool provided by Webropol Oy, founded in 2002 (Webropol, 2014). Webropol is a web-based tool to easily conduct survey and analyze the answers which we got access to through credentials. We have designed and customized our survey in this tool and then published the survey through a URL link that was sent by email to all participants. The respondents received the link to their work email and opened the link to answer the questionnaire.

In order to obtain representative data and decrease biases of the analysis it is substantial to attain a high response rate (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 188; Saunders et al., 2009, 219). Our mentor at Company X informed us that there are 187 salespeople working at their Customer Service Department selling to consumers but out of those 187 people 31 are unable to attend because they are on leave of absence, on maternity or sick leave, therefore the number of potential respondents was reduced to 156. We received 130 completed questionnaires out of 156 potential answers. 26 individuals that for some reason chose to not participate have also opened the survey. To increase the response rate we made sure that it was clarified that all participants will remain anonymous. When respondents sent their answers, their questionnaires were automatically named by a number, which makes us unable to assess who the respondents are.

In order to calculate our total response rate we calculate the completed responses divided by the total number of potential participants. This means that we have an overall response rate of $\frac{130}{187} \approx 69.5\%$. Webropol provides us with the information that 130 salespeople answered and that of them opened the questionnaire without responding, which means that 31 persons never opened the questionnaire at all. Sometimes researchers are unable to contact respondents and according to Saunders et al., (2009, p.
these respondents are simply unreachable. Therefore these respondents should not be represented in the data either. In order to calculate our active response rate we need to exclude these individuals and calculate the amount of completed answers divided by the total sample with an exclusion of ineligible and unreachable salespeople. The active response rate is therefore \( \frac{130}{187-31} \approx 83\% \). We consider this response rate to be high and sufficient for a study.

4.7 Data analysis

4.7.1 Statistical Analysis

In this section we intend to describe how we will measure and analyze the collected data to find which variables have a positive impact on Intrinsic Motivation and Customer Orientation. We are going to use the statistical analysis program SPSS to analyze our collected data. If answers are manually entered in the statistical program human errors can be eliminated (Saunders et al., 2009, p.425). Since our questionnaire was distributed digitally we did not have to enter the answers manually and therefore we eliminated human errors. Some questions in our survey were reversed (Appendix 2) so these questions had to be re-coded before analyzing our data to avoid misinterpretations. For example the question about intrinsic motivation: “I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.” is not reversed while “My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job.” are reversed. If the respondent answered for example 6 on the first question it would imply high level of intrinsic motivation, but to answer the same thing on the second question the respondent should mark 1. Hence, to be able to analyze them together we needed to re-code the second question so that high level of intrinsic motivation always correspond to a high number.

4.7.2 Cronbach’s Alpha

When using scale questions it is important to test internal reliability by using Cronbach’s Alpha (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 158-159). Cronbach’s Alpha analyzes the consistency of responses to items in each construct to see if the items in the construct measure the same thing, i.e. what they intend to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159; Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 374). For example the construct we call Role Conflict contain five items that intend to measure the same variable i.e. Role Conflict. The result of the test will be between 0 and 1, where 1 means that the reliability is high (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159). For the construct to be considered reliable Cronbach’s Alpha need to be at least above 0.7 but preferably above 0.8 (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159; Saunders, et al., 2012, p. 430).

4.7.3 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics can be used to acquire numerical information about respondents that can be described and compared (Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 502). We retrieved descriptive statistics on our data from SPSS, which means that we can see frequencies, mean and standard deviation of all our constructs.

The frequency distribution shows how many respondents that chose each alternative (Shiu, et al., 2009, p.515). The mean is a measure of central tendency and represents the average value when all items are added up and divided by number of items (Bryman
Further, the standard deviation is a measurement for the variance around the mean, which means that it can show if the respondents' answers were similar or widely spread (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 515), i.e. high standard deviation means that the responses varied a lot (Saunders et al., 2009, p.447; 601). The final descriptive statistic we used was Pearson correlation, which shows how constructs are related to each other (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 347; Saunders et al., 2009, p.597). The result will be between 1 and -1 where results between -1 and 0 shows that it is a negative correlation between two variables, and a result above 0 means that it is a positive correlation (Saunders et al., 2009, p.521; Shiu et al., 2009, p. 515). In our questionnaire we had only two optionally questions, the rest were mandatory, therefore we believe that all answers will be usable in our analyses. We will show our data for each construct, graphically in tables and bar charts. Bar charts are an effective way to illustrate the results clearly (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 524).

4.7.4 Cross-tabulation
To better understand how the teams at Company X are compounded we used a technique called cross-tabulation. Cross-tabulation makes it possible to categorize respondents and treat two or more variables simultaneously (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 512). Thus, we used cross-tabulation to see what competences existed in the different teams we investigated (team number and competence), how much experience members of the teams have (tenure and team number) and how long it generally takes to generate basic skills to advanced skills (tenure and competence). Shiu et al. (2009, p. 512) state that demographics are typical variables that researchers start the cross-tabulation with. This technique is said to be good to use when the researcher wants to study relationships between variables (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 512). The purpose of this analysis technique was to determine if the responses to a certain variable differ (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 512), for example if competence differs because of the tenure.

4.7.5 Regression Analysis
In order to test our conceptual model we used bivariate regression analyses. In order to perform a bivariate regression analysis, at least 20 survey responses are needed (Hair et al., 2006, p.197) and we have 130 respondents, which means that this method can be used. Shiu et al., (2009, p. 564) describes it as “a statistical technique that analyzes the predictive, linear relationship between two variables by estimating coefficients for a straight line equations”. The equation is the basis for a straight line: \( Y = a + bX + e \) (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 564). Here “\( Y \)” represents the dependent variable, “\( a \)” is the intercept, “\( b \)” indicates the slope, “\( X \)” is the independent variable and “\( e \)” is the standard error (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 565). By doing a regression analysis we can see how much the dependent variable correlates with the independent variable (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 524), hence predict and measure changes in the dependent variable by looking at the correlation. Regression will be used in our thesis to predict and measure how our independent variables (\( X \)) affect our dependent variables (\( Y \)), i.e. intrinsic motivation and customer orientation.

From the equation above we can see that the bivariate regression analysis only allow one independent variable. When we have more than one variable, we will also use multiple regression analyses, which is the same as bivariate regression analysis with the exception that more than two independent variables are believed to influence the dependent variable (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 583). For multiple regression analyses at least
50 responses are needed (Hair, et al., 2006, p.197), thus our 130 responses are more than sufficient for this technique therefore we can use this kind of analysis. For example, multiple regression analysis allowed us to examine to what extent job characteristics affect the outcomes. Multiple regression also performs separate regressions for each of the independent variables included, hence it is possible to see the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 583) and which of the independent variables that has the strongest influence on the dependent variable. When performing multiple regressions, we used intrinsic motivation and customer orientation as the dependent variables and job design, critical psychological states, supervisory behavior and roles stress as independent variables. Those were used to measure what effects the independent variables had on the dependent variables. It is also important to look at the significance level of the regression model since it measures the probability that these relationships occurred by chance (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 353; Moore, et al., 1996, p. 384). We have chosen a significance level of 0.1 so if the value is lower than that it means that the relationship most likely did not occur by chance. The strength of the relationship in the regression is measured by R-square, which always is between 0 and 1, and it should be as high as possible (Saunders et al., 2019, p.465). For example if the value R-square is 0,5, it means that 50% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable(s) (Saunders et al., 2019, p.465). Though, when extra explanatory variables are added to the model R-square increases, therefore it is better to look at R-square adjusted instead when doing multiple regression analysis (Moore, et al., 1996, p.646).

We also included a multicollinearity diagnostics when performing the regressions, to measure the correlation level between the independent variables in the regression model (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 591). The values for tolerance and the variance inflation factor (VIF) measures collinearity, where the tolerance result will be between 0 and 1 and should be over 0,1 but preferably as high as possible, and the VIF result, on the other hand, should be as low as possible and not above 5 (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 591). High multicollinearity between independent variables means that they are highly correlated and it is not possible to see how and to what extent the independent variables influence the dependent variable (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 590). Also the Beta value of each independent coefficient sufficient for us because it shows which independent variable that has the strongest impact on the dependent variable (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 584).

4.7.6 Independent Two-sample T-test
We also received secondary data on performance measurements from Company X, which we used to analyze the relationship between the different variables on team level with the performance on team level. We divided the teams into two group based on performance, i.e. high and low performance to compare the group means by performing a two-sample t-test. To decide where to draw the limit between high and low performance we first looked at Company X performance goals. Since no group manage to reach the goals we decided together with Company X to draw the limit after the third best performing team in each measurement. Further, we grouped all teams with only low performance together and called that group the low performance group, while the rest of the teams form the high performance group. The high performance group consists of team number: 6, 13, 3, 1 and 10 (team 6 has the highest performance). Hence, the low performance group consists of team: 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14. The test will show whether or not it is a significant difference between the two groups
(Moore, et al., 1996, p. 450). This test makes us able to determine if our measured variables differ between high- and low performing groups. If we find there is a significant difference between the two groups we will compare their means. The high performance group’s mean will be the determinant of how the variable affects performance. For example, if the high-performing group has a higher mean than the low-performing group on a variable with a significant difference, we can conclude that the variable has a positive effect on performance. However, if a low performance group has a higher mean it would mean have negative effect on performance.

4.8 Ethical Considerations
Saunders et al. (2009, p. 168) enhances that ethical concerns and practices have received greater attention during the past decade than previously. In order to decrease an unethical conduct it is of importance to constitute a study in an ethical fashion (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 122). Therefore we have tried to deliberate on this issue throughout our research process. Diener and Crandal (1978, p. 7) have determined four ethical considerations of major importance; deception, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and harm to participants. These are important to consider when conducting a study. Most important is to not defraud participants (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). Deception means that researchers are required to honestly clarify the study's aim and not pretend it is for anything other than communicated (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). Similarly Ejlertsson (2005, pp. 29-30) enhances the importance of providing respondents with cohesive information about the questionnaire and its purpose. Further, the lack of informed consent concerns the importance of providing participants with the correct information regarding the study so they can evaluate their decision to take part or not (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 134; Diener & Crandal, 1978, p. 34). With these ethical considerations in mind we distributed our questionnaire by email and informed participants of our purpose and intentions with our study. As we want to conduct a study with high quality we consider it of significant importance to execute it in an ethical manner. Further, we regard ourselves of having the primary responsibility to accomplish this. Therefore we also felt that it was important to provide our participants with detailed information of how and why we are executed the study. This information was available to all participants in connection to the URL link with our questionnaire. We intended to have an open and honest communication with our participants and we believe that our information letter to them contributed to that. To us it was also important to clarify the value of the individuals participating and therefore also expressed our appreciation to them in the information letter.

Harm to participants mainly concerns physical harm such as stress, harm participants self-esteem or future career prospects (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). It is important that researchers think of all possible precautions that participants are not directly affected or harmed by the result of their participation (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). We were carefully to think through how we treated the data collection, our respondents answer and specifically the way we revealed our findings in our analysis in order to not cause any harm for our participants. Further, Ejlertsson (2005, pp. 29-30) explains that all participants should also be able to choose whether they want be anonymous or not. Participants in our study were also promised to remain anonymous and the Webropol software enabled us to be unaware of whom the respondents were. Invasion of privacy mainly concerns that participant’s confidentiality and anonymity is obtained (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). We will assure we do not invade in the privacy of our participants.
One way to avoid it would be to analyzing results on a group level and not on an individual level. Further, the team numbers were recoded to make sure that the teams also were kept anonymous. Hence, we will not present an individual’s opinions regarding items we rather focus on what the general answer among genders, teams or age groups were. This in order to not expose a certain individuals feelings or behavior. However, it has been argued that web-based questionnaires distributed by email somehow harm the “lack of informed consent” due to that mostly no previous relationships are established (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 187). Thus, participants’ willingness to answer was the choice of each respondent. One may question whether it really was due to that we distributed the questionnaire during a controlled morning meeting. In order to diminish the potential perception of forced participation we clarified in our information letter that it was optional. These issues also made us decide to be present during the meeting in order to make sure no one was suggested to unwillingly participate. From a broader perspective it was more beneficial for us to distribute the study electronically due to time constraints. As well as the anonymous, optional questionnaire was the most ethical approach to collect our data. In summary, we regarded all these ethical considerations and their correlated effort as necessary to minimize the harm to our participants and to increase the trustworthiness of our study.

4.9 Writing on Commission

Writing on commission can sometimes be difficult because it is complicated to balance the academic agenda with the organization’s interests. To maintain this balance we have been in contact with our contact person at Company X, and we have constantly had an open dialogue with them and our supervisor at the university Dr. Galina Biedenbach. But because Company X gave us the opportunity to choose freely how to set our purpose in our study it was possible to make both theoretical and practical contribution. Company X has provided us with all information we need about the organization, including data on performance, and also they distributed our survey and set aside time for their employees to answer it. Dr. Biedenbach has supported us, supervised the writing process and given us feedback about our thesis. During these 20 weeks we have tried to find a solution to a current problem theoretically and develop practical recommendations for Company X. This has been challenging, educating and very rewarding to write on commission and have the opportunity to apply theories in a real business setting.
5. Empirical Findings and Analysis

This chapter presents findings and results from our survey. In order to provide a cohesive overview of results from collected primary data, we include graphs and descriptive statistic. The chapter includes the results multiple regression analysis. Furthermore, the secondary data from Company X and the primary data are used for comparing differences between low- and high performance groups across the key variables examined in this study.

5.1 Demographics

To get a better view of the respondents and to be able to compare different groups, we asked the respondents to answer a number of demographic questions, i.e. gender, age, tenure, work competence and team number (Appendix I). Out of respect for the respondents’ privacy it was optional to answer the question about age and tenure. However, only 4 people chose not to answer these questions about tenure and no one skipped the question about age. The fact that not that many respondents chose not to answer the optional questions gives us a coherent and justified overview of our sample.

Company X distributed the survey to all employees working with consumers at their customer service department. A total of 187 people received the survey and 130 people answered our survey, which gives us a response rate of 69,5 %. 40 % of the respondents were men and 60% were women and that matches the distribution of men and women at the company proportionally.

The majority of the respondents (63 %) were between 20-29 years old. Also the majority (64 %) of the respondents answered that they have worked for the company three years or less (1-3 years: 34% and less than one year: 30 %).
Figure 5. Response rate Age and Tenure

On average 60-70 % of each team’s members have responded to our survey. There were two exceptions: team 1 – 100 % and team 2 – 38 %. Response rates of all the teams are listed in Table 4. Notice that team numbers were recoded to ensure the teams’ anonymity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team number</th>
<th>Response rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Response rates by teams.

To get a better understanding of how the teams are composed, we combined the data from our demographic questions concerning team number and tenure, team number and competence. It showed that Team 5 has the highest concentration of newly hired employees. Further Team 5 is, together with Team 12; the team containing most employees with, what Company X defines as, basic skills.
Further, we divided the teams into a high performance group and low performance group. The teams were divided based on their performance on sales ratio and value adding service ratio. This information was obtained from the secondary data provided to us by Company X. From table 5 we can see that the teams in the high performing group mainly consisted of employees with advanced skills (87%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance groups</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced skills</td>
<td>Basic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performance</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low performance</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Competence distributed by Performance group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Performance groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High performance</td>
<td>Low performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Performance distributed by Tenure.

The high performing teams also have more experience than the low performing teams. Combining data on competence and tenure we can also conclude that most of the employees have advanced skills, the majority of employees with basic skills have worked for the company less than one year (table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced skills</td>
<td>Basic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Competence distributed by Tenure.

5.2 Cronbach’s Alpha

A Cronbach’s Alpha test measures the reliability of constructs, i.e. tests if all questions in the construct measures the same thing (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p.164; Saunders et al., 2009, p.374). It is necessary to perform this kind of test and make sure that the constructs are reliable before doing regression analysis (Saunders et al., 2009, p.374). If the constructs are not reliable we cannot be sure of what they measure (Bryman & Bell,
2007, p.164), hence we cannot know exactly what relationship the regression analysis explains.

Cronbach’s alpha should be higher than 0.7 to be considered reliable (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p.164). Our Cronbach’s Alpha test revealed that seven constructs out of the seventeen we used were not reliable; all of them came from Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Characteristics Model. The constructs: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, job feedback and knowledge of results were calculated by two questions. In order to increase the reliability of our constructs, we chose to keep the question closest to the original definition of the variables (Appendix 2). Hence, by using the question closest to the definition, we are more certain that we will analyze the information in alignment with the variables’ original meaning. The same was done for the construct of Experienced Responsibility. Thus, this construct consisted of four questions. We needed to also refine this variable to create a variable close to its original meaning. In order to do so, we started to remove items suggested by SPSS. Hence, by looking at the information provided from SPSS, we could obtain what value the variable would get if certain items were removed. Therefore, we removed questions one by one to see if we could obtain the suggested value of Cronbach’s Alpha. In the end, we chose that specific question to represent the variable, which also made us able to use it (Appendix 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Output Feedback</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Output Feedback</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
<td>One item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for All constructs.

After measuring the reliability of the constructs, we calculated the variables for constructs containing more than one item. By adding all items in each construct and dividing them by the total number of items in the construct, we got the average value of the construct. This was done for all our seventeen variables; skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, job feedback, positive behavioral feedback, negative behavioral feedback, positive output feedback, negative output feedback, coaching.
experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, knowledge of results, role conflict, role ambiguity, intrinsic motivation and customer orientation. After that, we retrieved descriptive statistics for all variables. Descriptive statistics include the mean, standard deviation and Pearson correlation.

5.3 Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviation of each variable are depicted in table 9. The mean is the average of all values (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 185) and the standard deviation is a measure of the spread around mean (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 345). Regarding the means, they were mainly around 4, the lowest mean was that of role conflict (3.06) and the highest was customer orientation (5.15). In our questionnaire we chose to use a scale with no middle point. This means that a mean value of four and higher is correspond to a positive evaluation of a construct whereas three and lower correspond to a negative evaluation. Generally we can conclude that autonomy (3.68), job feedback (3.92), negative output feedback (3.65) and role conflict (3.06) are perceived in a negative way and the rest are perceived in a positive way. Since the mean of some variables are negative and the highest mean is just above 5 we argue that it is room for improvement of the perception of certain constructs.

As mentioned before the standard deviation shows how the answers are distributed around the mean (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 447; 601). From Table 9 we can see that the values range from 0.63 for experienced responsibility to 1.05 for negative output feedback. From the low values of our variables’ standard deviations, we can determine that the answers did not differ that much from one another, on our six-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job feedback</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive behavioral feedback</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavioral feedback</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive output feedback</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative output feedback</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced meaningfulness</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced responsibility</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of results</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Descriptive statistics – Mean and Standard deviation
Table 10 shows a Pearson correlation test between all constructs. 72 out of the 136 correlations in the test were significant at p<0.10. All of the constructs were positively related to each other except role conflict, which is negatively related to most constructs. The strongest significant negative correlation was between role conflict and task identity (-0.37) and role conflict and experienced meaningfulness (-0.37) the weakest negative correlation was between role conflict and job feedback (-0.15). Worth mentioning is that autonomy (-0.35) and coaching (-0.27) also had relatively strong negative correlation with role conflict. Furthermore, role conflict (reversed) is the only construct negatively related to intrinsic motivation (-0.21) and customer orientation (-0.18). Since a high mean is positive also for role conflict and role ambiguity (meaning less stress), in this case for example, it means that if the mean increases, i.e. the employees feel less role conflict; they will feel less intrinsic motivation. Most researchers have looked at role conflict as a de-motivator, meaning that more role conflict has negative effects on outcomes.

The variables having significant positive relationship with intrinsic motivation are experienced responsibility (0.49), customer orientation (0.4), experienced meaningfulness (0.36), task significance (0.30), and skill variety (0.16). Further, experienced meaningfulness (0.39), customer orientation (0.35), skill variety (0.34), task significance (0.25) and autonomy (0.24) have the strongest positive relationship with experienced responsibility. Hence, customer orientation, task significance, skill variety and experienced meaningfulness have positive relationship with intrinsic motivation and experienced responsibility. Experienced meaningfulness also has positive significant relationship with customer orientation (0.36), though the strongest were between customer orientation and role ambiguity (0.60) and intrinsic motivation (0.40). In turn task significance (0.35) has the strongest positive relationship with experienced meaningfulness, followed by skill variety (0.31).

The strongest positive relationship was between positive output feedback and positive behavioral feedback (0.81) and the weakest was between positive behavioral feedback and task identity (0.14). For the rest of the results see Table 10.
Correlation is significant at 0.1 level (2-tailed).

Table 10. Pearson correlation table

5.4 Multiple Regression Analysis

5.4.1 Effect of Predictors on Intrinsic Motivation (Regression 1)

To measure the effect of job design (job characteristics and critical psychological states), sales managers’ behavior and role stress on the dependent variable intrinsic motivation we conducted a multiple regression analysis (Table 10). When we tested the main model, we found that task significance, experienced responsibility and role conflict were significant at p<0,10. The adjusted R-square of the model is 0,27, which means that the model explains 27 % of the variation in intrinsic motivation. This means that there are other factors, not measured in the model, which explain the rest of the variance (73 %) in the dependent variable (Moore, et al., 1996, p. 646; Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 465).

From regression analysis (Table 11) we can see that multicollinearity was not a problem with this model, since tolerance levels were above 0,1 and VIF-values were under 5, i.e. the independent variables were not too highly correlated (Shiu, et al., 2009, p. 591). The tolerance level was 0,69 and VIF was 1,44 for task significance, 0,66 (tolerance level) and 1,51 (VIF) for experienced responsibility, and 0,60 (tolerance level) and 1,66 (VIF) for role conflict. Hence, we can estimate independent regression coefficients for the independent variables. Our main model shows that both task significance (Beta 0,21) and experienced responsibility (Beta 0,41) have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. Experienced responsibility has almost twice as strong effect on intrinsic motivation as task significance. Role conflict (reversed) on the other hand has a negative effect on intrinsic motivation with a Beta value of -0,18. Considering the reversed coded values of role conflict, this effect means that if employees feel more role conflict they will also
feel more intrinsic motivation. Hence, we can conclude that some role conflict is positive for employees’ intrinsic motivation.

### Table 1. Coefficients – Regression 1 Main model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-1.336</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-1.404</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavioral</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavioral</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Output Feedback</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>4.388</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-1.351</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict (R)</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-1.818</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Intrinsic Motivation

Furthermore, we determined the best-fitting model by doing a stepwise regression analysis. From our results, we can see that the best-fitting model explains most variance in the dependent variable (intrinsic motivation) when it consists of the independent variables: *experienced meaningfulness* and *experienced responsibility*. The model’s adjusted R-square value is 0.26, which means that the model explains 26% of the variance in intrinsic motivation. The model is significant at a 0.01 significance level (p<0.00) (*Table 12*), which indicates that there is strong evidence that independent variables have an effect on the dependent variable (Moore, et al., 1996, p. 646). That the model is significant means that the independent variables effect on the dependent variable did not occur by chance (Moore et al., 1996, p. 646). We can conclude that multicollinearity was not a problem with this model, since the VIF was 1.177 and tolerance was 0.85.

### Table 12. Coefficients – Regression 1, best-fitting model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>7.631</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Responsibility (Constant)</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>6.314</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>5.564</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>4.992</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Intrinsic Motivation
Our model (Table 12) shows that both of the independent variables have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. Further, it also shows that experienced responsibility has the strongest influence on intrinsic motivation with a Beta value of 0.41. Experienced meaningfulness only has about half the effect on intrinsic motivation with a Beta of 0.199.

Regression 1 provided empirical evidence regarding our proposed hypotheses:

H1: Job characteristics such as: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy and e) job feedback have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H3: Critical psychological states such as: a) experienced meaningfulness, b) experienced responsibility and c) knowledge of results have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H5: Feedback such as: a) positive behavioral feedback, b) negative behavioral feedback c) positive output feedback and d) negative output feedback have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H7: Coaching has a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

H9: Role stress such as: a) role ambiguity and b) role conflict have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

Based on our findings, we can conclude that: the main model supported H1c and H3a, and we found that role conflict has a negative effect on intrinsic motivation, which contradicts H9b. Further, the best-fitting model supported H3a and H3b.

5.4.2 Effects of Predictors on Customer Orientation (Regression 2)

Secondly we measured the impact of job design (job characteristics, critical psychological states), sales managers’ behavior and role stress on customer orientation using a multiple regression analysis. First we tested our main model and found that: negative behavioral feedback, negative output feedback, coaching, experienced responsibility and role ambiguity are significant at a 0.01 significance level (p<0.01) (Table 13). Together the variables in our main model explains 40.5% of the variance in the dependent variable: customer orientation, since adjusted R-square for the model is 0.405. Multicollinearity was not a problem in our main model since tolerance levels and VIF-values for all significant variables were within the acceptable limit.

We can conclude that negative behavioral feedback (Beta -0.23) and coaching (-0.18) have a negative effect on customer orientation, while negative output feedback (0.26), experienced responsibility (0.15) and role ambiguity (0.51) have a positive effect on customer orientation. These results show that if negative behavioral feedback or coaching is increased, it will affect customer orientation in a negative way, i.e. customer orientation will decrease. Negative behavioral feedback has the strongest negative effect of the two variables. However, if negative output feedback, experienced responsibility or role ambiguity increases it will have a positive effect on customer orientation, i.e. customer orientation will increase.
Furthermore, we conducted a stepwise regression analysis to find the best-fitting model. This regression showed that the best-fitting model consisted of the independent variables role ambiguity and experienced responsibility. The adjusted R-squared for this model was 0.392 (Table 14), which means that role ambiguity and experienced responsibility together explain 39.2% of the variance in customer orientation (Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 489). Thus slightly higher than the model we tested in regression 1, but still 39.2% is regarded as a relatively low number (Moore, et al., 1996, p.646).

Table 13. Coefficients – Regression 2, main model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.485</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>-1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Output Feedback</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Output Feedback</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict (R)</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>5.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Coefficients – Regression 2, best-fitting model

Further, the model is significant at a 0.01 level (Table 14), which indicates that there is strong evidence of that: role ambiguity and experienced responsibility have an effect on customer orientation. This means that the independent variables effect on the dependent variable did not occur by chance (Moore et al., 1996, p. 646).

Nor in this case was multicollinearity a problem since VIF was 1.065 and tolerance was 0.939 (Table 14). This means that independent variables were not highly correlated and
it was possible to estimate the independent regression coefficient for the variables (Shiu et al., 2009, p. 591). The standardized coefficients, Beta in this model show that each of the independent variables had a positive effect on customer orientation. Role ambiguity had the strongest effect with a Beta-value of 0,55. In this model experienced responsibility had a Beta-value of 0,21.

Also in this case, the two models have almost the same R-square (0,405 and 0,392) but also here the best-fitting model only includes two variables (role ambiguity and experienced responsibility), varies our original model, includes five variables (negative behavioral feedback, coaching, negative output feedback, experienced responsibility and role ambiguity). We argue that the best fitting-model could be used as well as the original model because the R-square values are close to each other. Hence, negative behavioral feedback, coaching and negative output feedback do not add much explanation to the model.

From Pearson correlation table (Table 10) we can conclude that negative behavioral feedback has the second strongest relationship with role ambiguity (0,38). Negative output feedback has a relative strong positive relationship with role ambiguity (0,32). Furthermore, it is also a strong positive relationship between negative behavioral feedback and negative output feedback (0,73), and between negative behavioral feedback and coaching (0,47). These relationships explain why these variables do not add much to the model and therefore they can be excluded.

Regression 2 provided empirical evidence regarding our purposed hypotheses:

H2: Job characteristics such as: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy and e) job feedback have a positive effect on customer orientation.

H4: Critical psychological states such as: a) experienced meaningfulness, b) experienced responsibility and c) knowledge of results have a positive effect on customer orientation.

H6: Feedback such as: a) positive behavioral feedback, b) negative behavioral feedback c) positive output feedback and d) negative output feedback have a positive effect on customer orientation.

H8: Coaching has a positive effect on customer orientation.

H10: Role stress such as: a) role ambiguity and b) role conflict have a positive effect on customer orientation.

The results of our second regression analysis provided empirical evidence that the main model supports hypotheses: H6d, H4b and H10a, and that negative behavioral feedback and coaching have a negative effect on customer orientation, which contradicts H6b and H8. Further, in the best-fitting model hypotheses: H4b and H10a are supported.

5.4.3 Effect of Intrinsic Motivation on Customer Orientation (Regression 3)

We also conducted a bivariate regression analysis with intrinsic motivation as independent variable and customer orientation as dependent variable to see if intrinsic motivation affects customer orientation in some way. We found that intrinsic motivation accounted for 15,3% of the variance in customer orientation, i.e. R-squared was 0,153
(Appendix 2). This model was highly significant at a 0.01 level (Table 15) hence; there is low probability that the independent variable’s impact on the dependent variable occurred by chance (Moore, et al., 1996, p. 646). The Beta 0.400 in Table 15 shows that intrinsic motivation has is a positive effect between on customer orientation. This means that if intrinsic motivation increases by one unit, customer orientation would increase 0.400 units (Saunders, et al., 2009, p.463).

Table 15. Coefficients – Regression 3

The results of regression 3 provided empirical evidence that the hypothesis H12 is supported.

H12: Intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on customer orientation.

5.5 Differences Between High Performance Groups and Low Performance Groups (two sample t-test)

In addition to our regressions, we also conducted a two-sample t-test to find out whether there were differences between high performance groups and low performance groups on our variables. We divided our respondents into two groups: high performance (group 1) and low performance (group 2) by comparing their performance on the two different variables that Company X consider the most important ones. The first grouping variable was sales ratio and the second grouping variable was added value service ratio.

From the t-test we can see that the high performance group, in general, had higher means than the low performance group. They only had lower means on the variables: skill variety and role conflict. However, only three variables showed a significant difference at a 0.1-level, namely: positive behavioral feedback with a t-value of 2.341, coaching with a t-value of 1.937 and role ambiguity with t-value 2.263 (Table 16). The high performance group’s mean on positive behavioral feedback was 4.44 and the low performance group’s mean was 4.38, thus the difference was 0.06. The mean was also higher for the high performance group on coaching, i.e. 4.27 compared to 3.94, which means that the difference was 0.33. The difference between the groups on role ambiguity was 0.30, and also here was the high performance group’s mean higher (5.07) than the low performance group’s mean (4.77). The results of the t-test are presented in Table 16.
Our two-sample t-test provided empirical evidence regarding our purposed hypothesis: 

**H11**: There is a difference between high performing groups and low performing groups on factors such as: a) skill variety, b) task identity, c) task significance, d) autonomy, e) job feedback, f) experienced meaningfulness, g) experienced responsibility h) knowledge of results, i) positive behavioral feedback, j) negative behavioral feedback k) positive output feedback, l) negative output feedback, m) coaching, n) role ambiguity, o) role conflict, p) intrinsic motivation and q) customer orientation.

The results provided empirical evidence that the hypothesis H11i, H11m and H11n are supported.

**H11i**: There is a difference between high performance groups and low performance groups on positive behavioral feedback.

**H11m**: There is a difference between high performance groups and low performance groups on coaching.

**H11n**: There is a difference between high performance groups and low performance groups on role ambiguity.

---

### Table 16. Summary of Group statistics and t-value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High performance</th>
<th>Low performance</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>4,42</td>
<td>4,53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>3,93</td>
<td>3,71</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>4,67</td>
<td>4,60</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3,51</td>
<td>3,29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job feedback</td>
<td>4,02</td>
<td>3,87</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive behavioral feedback</td>
<td>4,44</td>
<td>4,38</td>
<td>2,341*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavioral feedback</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>4,21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive output feedback</td>
<td>4,82</td>
<td>4,43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative output feedback</td>
<td>3,74</td>
<td>3,61</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>4,27</td>
<td>3,94</td>
<td>1,937*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced meaningfulness</td>
<td>4,40</td>
<td>4,38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced responsibility</td>
<td>4,73</td>
<td>4,73</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of results</td>
<td>4,47</td>
<td>4,45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict (R)</td>
<td>3,02</td>
<td>3,09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>5,07</td>
<td>4,77</td>
<td>2,263*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4,52</td>
<td>4,41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>5,21</td>
<td>5,11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at a 0,1-level, NS = non significant
6. Discussion

6.1 Regression 1 - Predictors and intrinsic motivation

From analyzing the first regression where we tested the impact of job design, sales managers’ behavior and role stress on intrinsic motivation we conclude that some variables had a positive effect on intrinsic motivation.

The factors in our main model that show a significant effect on intrinsic motivation were: task significance (0.21) and experienced responsibility (0.41) and role conflict (-0.18). Task significance is defined as the degree to which the job has impact on the physical or psychological well-being of other people (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.79; Pierce et al., 2009, p. 487). We argue that the reason behind why task significance affect intrinsic motivation in the context of salespeople at Company X is that electricity cost stands for a significant part of the consumers’ economy (Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 36, 46). We argue that people’s economy have a significant impact on their lives and therefore salespeople at Company X experience their task as having a significant effect on people’s lives. Regarding the effect role conflict has on intrinsic motivation, we argue that the reason why salespeople at Company X experience role conflict can be many e.g. some employees might find customer orientation incompatible with being effective, also many of the salespeople at Company X think about selling in terms of sales-orientation, which can create a role conflict since the salespeople perceive the company’s and customers’ demands as incompatible. The fact that role conflict has a negative effect on intrinsic motivation and has negative relationships with all variables in the correlation table, we argue can be explained by the boundary-spanning role they possess. Hence, salespeople at Company X are not negatively affected by role conflict because they have learned to cope with it and it is just one part of their role and some salespeople even thrive in these kind of selling environments due to the challenge it implies (Sohi, 1996, p.55). What is surprising is that all types of feedback and training (job feedback, positive/negative behavioral feedback, positive/negative and coaching) have a negative relationship with role conflict. Hence, if feedback or coaching increases, salespeople will experience more role conflict. Most theories (e.g. Sohi, 1996; Walker, et al., 1975) argue that feedback and training decrease role conflict since the communication between employee and sales manager clarify the demands and help the employee better cope with the role conflict. Since we found the opposite relationship we argue that salespeople at Company X might experience demands from the company, coming from sales managers as incompatible with demands from e.g. customers or other parts of the organization.

The factors that in the best-fitting model had a significant effect on intrinsic motivation were: experienced responsibility (0.41) and experienced meaningfulness (0.20) (Table 12). Even though the other factors might affect intrinsic motivation when tested in the main model or in Person correlation, they were not relevant for the model when we tested the best-fitting model. Our results partly support Hackman and Oldham’s research (1980) where they argue that experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility and knowledge of results together increase intrinsic motivation. Our results from the stepwise regression show that only experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility had significant positive effects on intrinsic motivation.

The two models have almost the same R-square (main model: 0,27 and best fitting model: 0,26) but the best-fitting model only include two variables (experienced
meaningfulness and experienced responsibility), unlike our main model, which include three variables (task significance, role conflict and experienced responsibility). We argue that the best fitting-model could be used as well as the original model because the R-square values are close to each other. Hence, experienced meaningfulness could replace role conflict and task significance without having a significant effect on how much the model explains in the dependent variable. From Pearson correlation table (Table 9) we can conclude that task significance (0.35) and role conflict (0.37) have the strongest relationship with experienced meaningfulness. These relationships are why role conflict and task significance can be replaced with experienced meaningfulness without affecting the models strength.

Further, from the Pearson correlation table (Table 10) we can also see that skill variety (0.31) has a relatively strong relationship with experienced meaningfulness and these variables also have a positive relationship with intrinsic motivation. Even if job characteristics do not have a significant direct effect on intrinsic motivation when the effect on intrinsic motivation are tested in the main or best-fitting model, the variance in intrinsic motivation explained by them might be indirectly explained by experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility. These results partly support Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) theory where they argue that job characteristics have an indirect effect on motivation through critical psychological states. According to Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) theory, we would expect to find that skill variety, task significance, and task identity affect experienced meaningfulness. Hence, our findings partly support this part of their theory as well, since we can see that there is a relationship between skill variety (0.31), task significance (0.35) and experienced meaningfulness. Hackman and Oldham (1980, p.73, 78) argue the reason why experienced meaningfulness has a positive effect on salespeople’s intrinsic motivation is that it means that they do something that challenge them and stretches their abilities, and at the same time it is valuable to them and they can feel proud of their work. The more skills they have to use the more meaningful it is perceived (Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p.78). Regarding Company X, we argue that the salespeople operate in a selling environment that is highly complex and it is also constantly changing due to new market models and regulations (Swedish energy market inspectorate, 2013). Also most of the employees at Company X have developed their skills so that they now have what they call advanced skills. We argue that this, constantly changing market in combination with fierce competition (Company X, 2014; Swedish Consumer Agency, 2013, p. 36) and the opportunity to develop their skills are what makes salespeople experience their job as meaningful. We argue the positive effect experienced meaningfulness has on intrinsic motivation at Company X show support for Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 773) who argue that the high intrinsic motivation implies that the salesperson values things such as personal achievement and success as well as selling because it is challenging and can give a feeling of performing a useful service.

Our findings also supports Fried and Ferris’ (1987, p. 306) and Renn and Vandenberg’s (1992, p.290) findings that critical psychological states have a stronger effect on intrinsic motivation than job characteristics and that experienced responsibility and experienced meaningfulness shows noticeably effect on intrinsic motivation than any other variable from the JCM. As mentioned earlier, previous research has shown that experienced meaningfulness is a key mediator of all the five job characteristics in the JCM on intrinsic motivation (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658) and therefore some researchers have chosen to measure only the effect of experienced meaningfulness on outcomes.
(e.g. Thankor & Joshi, 2005). Fried and Ferris (1987, p.306) and Renn and Vandenberg (1992, p. 290) state that experienced responsibility has strongest effect on intrinsic motivation, which our findings also support. We found that experienced responsibility has the strongest influence on intrinsic motivation with a Beta value of 0.41. This result means that the more personal responsibility the employees’ feel they have, the more intrinsic motivation they will experience. Experienced meaningfulness only has a Beta of 0.20. Therefore we cannot agree on experienced meaningfulness being the most influential and important factor, and we argue that neither experienced meaningfulness nor experienced responsibility can be excluded from the model. Hackman and Oldham (1980, p.72) explains that experienced responsibility is about feeling personally proud, and employees who experience responsibility believe that they are personally responsible for the quality of their work. In the context of selling services we argue that since it is the same person selling and performing the service it implies that the employees receive instant feedback on customer satisfaction and this instant feedback makes the link between action and outcome clearer. We argue that salespeople working for relatively large organizations might not be able to see how their work affects the organizations performance at large, since they may perceive themselves as one among many others contributing to the result. Hence, salespeople working for large organizations might feel less responsible for quality and performance and therefore be feel less experienced motivation. Furthermore, from Pearson correlation table we can see that there are a positive relationship between skill variety (0,34), experienced meaningfulness (0.39) and experienced responsibility. We argue that salespeople at Company X who have advanced skills and work in a complex environment know more and therefore they take more responsibility for their work. Hence, they know what effects their work has on other people.

Most of the studies have been done on heterogeneous groups with employees from different departments (Renn & Vandenberg, 1995), different companies and different industries (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Tiegs, et al., 1992). Our survey was conducted in one single organization and in one department, i.e. a homogeneous group. The same factors still had the strongest influence on intrinsic motivation. Also none of the researchers mentioned above manage to explain more of the variance in intrinsic motivation than we did. Renn & Vandenberg’s (1995, p. 291) model explained 22% and it is pretty close to our 26%. Since we have not seen a higher number than that from research done using the JCM model and including other variables, we conclude that an R-square adjusted of 0,26 is a relatively high number in this context.

6.2 Regression 2 - Predictors and Customer Orientation

Our results from the second regression, which measured the impact of job design, sales managers’ behavior and role stress on customer orientation in our main model, show that the significant variables were: negative behavioral feedback (Beta -0,23), negative output feedback (Beta 0,26), coaching (Beta -0,18), experienced responsibility (Beta 0,15) and role ambiguity (Beta 0,51). Together those variables accounted for 40,5% of the variance in the dependent variable: customer orientation. Negative feedback only gives information about which behaviors not to use, not which behavior to use instead (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, p. 197), therefore we argue that this type of feedback does not help salespeople to be more customer oriented. From this result we can conclude that the more negative behavioral feedback the salespeople receive the less customer-oriented they will be. We argue that this effect can imply that the salespeople at
Company X receive negative behavioral feedback on customer-oriented behavior, or that they perceive customer-oriented behavior as unwanted behavior due to the negative behavior feedback they receive. Furthermore, our results show that coaching has a negative effect on customer orientation. We argue that since coaching aim at developing salespeople’s skills, it means that the ones providing coaching at Company X do not do in in a way that increases customer orientation. We mean that this effect could indicate that the organization has not provided their sales managers with the right directives or tools to develop salespeople’s customer orientation behavior. Also, managing salespeople in organizations with a customer-oriented strategy is a complex challenge (Fine, 2007, p. 185). Further, Company X only recently changed their reward system and how salespeople’s performance is evaluated; i.e. their sales strategy from focusing on quantity to quality and customer orientation (Company X, 2014). Zoltners et al. (2012, p.176) emphasize how hard it can be to change organization’s sales strategy from a quantitative to qualitative, customer focused since it is often deeply rooted in the organizational culture. We argue that this might be the case for Company X since coaching and negative behavioral feedback has a negative effect on salespeople’s customer orientation rather improving it. We argue that sales managers and the organization might not yet have fully adopted customer orientation. Furthermore, the selling environment in the electricity market is constantly changing and customers demand more from salespeople, which we argue puts extra pressure on sales managers to provide sufficient, up to date with customers’ demand, negative behavior feedback and coaching.

Further, regarding Company X negative output feedback can for example be negative results on customer satisfaction index. Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p. 198) found that negative output feedback remind salespeople of the results they are expected to attain and by that it can improve performance. In the context of Company X this could mean that if they perform poorly on, for example, customer satisfaction index they will receive negative feedback on that output, which helps them improve their customer oriented selling.

Both when testing our main model and the best-fitting model, the results showed that role ambiguity and experienced responsibility had a positive significant effect on customer orientation. Role ambiguity with Beta 0,55 in the best-fitting model and 0,51 in the main model; and experienced responsibility with Beta 0,21 in the best-fitting model and 0,15 in the main model. Employees experience responsibility if they feel personally proud and if they believe that the quality of work depend on their effort rather than external factors (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.72). As mentioned before, customer orientation is about satisfying customers’ needs, hence acting customer-oriented leads to more satisfied customers. We mean that salespeople who do not take responsibility for their actions, e.g. do not feel that it is their fault that their customers are dissatisfied, will not care about acting customer-oriented.

Thankor and Joshi (2005) examined customer orientation from the perspective of JCM in an industrial sales context. They only tested experienced meaningfulness, not experienced responsibility and found that experienced meaningfulness had an effect on customer orientation. Further, Hackman and Oldham (1980, p.78) argue that, the more liability a worker feels for their interactions with customers and dealing with their needs and problems it will find the work more meaningful (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.78). Our results do not support those findings since experienced meaningfulness is excluded.
in our best-fitting model. Though, from the Pearson correlation table (Table 10) we can see that experienced meaningfulness had a relationship (0.36) with customer orientation. Also we can see that experienced meaningfulness has a relative strong positive correlation with experienced responsibility (0.39). Hence, also in this case we can make the assumption that the variance in customer orientation explained by experienced meaningfulness might be indirectly explained by experienced responsibility, which would then explain why they do not add anything to the model.

Our findings partly support Flaherty et al.’s (1999, p.12) result, since we found that role ambiguity has a positive effect on customer orientation. They found a positive effect of role ambiguity on customer orientation, as well as a positive effect of role conflict on customer orientation. We argue that the reason why role ambiguity has significant positive effect on salespeople’s customer orientation at Company X can be explained by the changes the organization is going through, i.e. changing focus towards a more customer-oriented organization. We mean that we found this effect because it is important for salespeople at Company X to know what the new guidelines and policies are in order to become more customer-oriented. When the correlation was tested we also found a significant relationship between role conflict and customer orientation (Table 13), with one important difference, we found a negative relationship while Flaherty et al.’s (1999, p.12) found a positive effect. Hence, our result shows that if employees feel more role conflict customer orientation will increase. Flaherty et al.’s (1999) questionnaires were distributed to a sample of salespeople from various firms. Their sample included both salespeople selling services and goods, as well as business-to-business salespeople and business-to-consumer salespeople. We argue that since our research, unlike Flaherty et al.’s (1999) research, was done on a homogenous group working in a complex service setting, this can be part of the explanation why our results differed. Some researchers (e.g. Brown & Peterson, 1993, p. 75) argue that some role conflict is positive for performance because it makes salespeople more alert since it is more challenging. We argue that this might be the case in the context salespeople at Company X operates in, but maybe not in other selling contexts. For example are salespeople operating on the electricity market restricted by regulations, which can imply increase role conflict since they for example are not allowed to sell on all customers but their performance measurements (sales ratio) tells otherwise. However, salespeople on the electricity market are used to these regulations and have learned how to cope with them, thus, they might be able to tolerate higher levels of role conflict before it becomes negative. Brown and Peterson (1993, p. 75) support this argument since they found that the effect role stress has on work outcomes generally vary a lot, and that work context might help explaining these variations.

When analyzing this model we saw that the adjusted R-square for the best-fitting model was 0.39 (Table 14), which means that role ambiguity and experienced responsibility together explains 39 % of the variance in customer orientation (Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 489). Hence, we expect that there are other variables, not tested in our research that would explain the remaining 60 %. Flaherty et al.’s (1999, p.11) model only explained 17% of the variation in customer-oriented selling, which means that we managed to explain more than twice as much with our model.

The two models we have tested have almost the same R-square (0.405 main model and 0.392 best-fitting model) but also here the best-fitting model only includes two variables (role ambiguity and experienced responsibility), varies our main model,
includes five variables (negative behavioral feedback, coaching, negative output feedback, experienced responsibility and role ambiguity). We argue that the best fitting-model could be used as well as the original model because the R-square values are close to each other. Hence, negative behavioral feedback, coaching and negative output feedback do not add much explanation to the model. From Pearson correlation table we can conclude that negative behavioral feedback has the second strongest relationship with role ambiguity (0.38). Negative output feedback has a relatively strong positive relationship with role ambiguity (0.32). Furthermore, it is also a strong positive relationship between negative behavioral feedback and negative output feedback (0.73), and between negative behavioral feedback and coaching (0.47). These relationships might explain why these variables do not add much to the model and thus, why they are excluded in the best-fitting model. Hence, it means that negative behavioral feedback; coaching and negative outcome feedback might affect customer orientation indirectly through role ambiguity. We argue that the best fitting-model could be used as well as the original model because the R-square values are close to each other.

6.3 Regression 3 - Effect of Intrinsic Motivation on Customer Orientation

Some researchers suggest that intrinsic motivation can be seen as a critical psychological state rather than as an outcome variable (Wall, et al., 1978, p.195). From our regression analysis, we conclude that intrinsic motivation has a significant positive effect on customer orientation with a Beta value of 0.400 (Table 15). Our results thereby support Mullin and Pullins’ (2009, p. 774) findings that intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on customer orientation. Thankor and Joshi (2005, p. 590) argue that customer-oriented selling demands more of the salespeople and therefore they need to be intrinsically motivated to make the extra effort customer-oriented selling demands. During the last year, Company X has changed their focus to be more customer-oriented this implies that the demands on salespeople at Company X have increased. The salespeople at Company X should for example make sure they understand the customer’s needs, present all options in a way that is easy for customers to understand and negotiate a win-win situation with the customer in every call (Company X, 2014). Several other researchers support that intrinsic motivation has an effect on e.g. win-win negotiation tactics, adaptive selling approaches, enhancement of flexibility and customer-orientation (e.g. Hennessey, 2000; Hodgins et al., 1996, Pullins, 1996; Pullins, 2001; Ryan et al., 1983; Weitz et al., 1986).

We found that intrinsic motivation accounted for 15.3% of the variance customer orientation, i.e. R-square was 0.153. Hence, we can conclude that there are other variables not tested in our model, accounting for the rest of the variance. 15.3% might be seen as a low number. Compared to previous studies done on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation, e.g. Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 774) we argue that our explanation rate is moderate since they explained 18.7% with their model, which included six variables.

Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 772) conducted their study on salespeople in different firms and industries, but all respondents were business-to-business salespeople, while we conducted our study on a homogeneous group, containing salespeople from the same company, selling to consumers. Therefore, the results can imply that the industry and if
it is tested on business-to-business or business-to-consumer salespeople do not affect the result.

6.4 Low Performance Group vs. High Performance Group

From the results of the t-test (Table 16) we can conclude that three of our variables differed significantly between the high and low performance group, and that the high performance group’s means were higher on all the significant variables. We found that the variable, coaching differed the most between the two groups. Our result support Corcoran et al.’s (1995, p. 115) findings, that coaching is one of the most significant opportunities available to an organization to influence the performance of salespeople. Coaching is defined as “using skills, experience, and direction to help someone improve their performance” (Carter, 2006, p. 113). Therefore we argue that more and coaching of higher quality lead to higher performance. In the context of selling at Company X, it would mean that someone especially skilled at customer-oriented selling helped developing these skills in salespeople to increase the sales ratio and value adding service ratio. Hence, it is important for companies to coach their employees in order to improve performance. Since it is ultimately the sales manager that is responsible for developing his/her team’s skills, we argue that it is important that they are given the time to do so. Coaching should be provided continuously and involve goal setting, and training to improve behaviors (Ford et al., 2011, p. 158). Effective sales organizations use their managers as a “coach and communicator” rather “than a commander and scorekeeper” (Carter, 2006, p. 114). Sales managers should act as role models for their salespeople and there through enhance appropriate behaviors (Rich, 1998, p. 115). This is certainly important since work habits; positive attitudes and goals tend to be imitated by their salespeople (Rich, 1998, p. 115).

Further, it was a significant difference between groups on role ambiguity. Since the high performance group’s mean is higher, it means that if the employees feel less role ambiguity they are more likely to perform better. Many researchers have come to the same conclusion as we did, i.e. that role ambiguity would lead to a lower performance (e.g. Brown & Peterson, 1993, p. 72; Rizzo, et al., 1970, p. 151; Tubre & Collins, 2000, p. 164; Walker, et al., 1977, p.160). Walker et al. (1977, p.160) argue that experiencing role ambiguity may lead a salesman to misjudge the linkages between the effort he expends on the job, the level of performance he will achieve, and the rewards he is likely to attain as a result of that performance (Walker, et al., 1977, p.160). According to Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p.192), the explanation behind why salespeople experiencing less role ambiguity perform better is that they are clear about what they are expected to accomplish can focus their efforts on the appropriate objectives. We argue that salespeople at Company X know that they should be customer-oriented because they clearly perceive themselves as customer-oriented since the mean value in every team were high and because all teams perform above company’s goal on customer satisfaction index. However, Company X has a problem with the sales ratio and value adding services ratio since none of the teams manage to reach the company’s goal. The three best teams on these measurements constitute the high performance group. We therefore argue that it is important for the company to provide clear guidelines and policies on how to combine the customer orientation with increased selling to improve performance.
We also found a significant difference between the two groups on positive behavioral feedback. Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p.192) suggest that feedback could be used to remind salespeople of what the right behaviors are and through that improve performance. We argue that this implies that the employees who receive more positive feedback on how work, e.g. feedback on the sales technique they use and how they communicate with customers etcetera, know which behaviors are good to use and therefore they can perform better. Further, Harmon et al. (2002, p. 51) suggest that feedback could be used to acknowledge effective selling techniques and satisfying outcomes. If a sales manager provides the feedback in direct relation to a specific issue, it is more likely that the feedback will come across sufficiently (Harmon et al., 2002, p. 51). Rich (1998, p. 57) explains that a salesperson's behavior is more likely to be repeated if the sales manager gives praise and recognition. Therefore we argue that it is important that sales managers are present in their teams, and taking the time to give mainly negative output feedback and positive behavioral feedback continuously since these types of feedback has an effect on customer orientation and performance.

One of our performance measurements was a value adding service ratio, which can be related to customer orientation since this ratio measurement is to make sure that all of the customer’s need are met, to make the customer more satisfied. The reason behind why only positive behavioral feedback out of all of the feedback constructs shows a significant difference between the two groups might be that the company emphasizes the importance of customer orientation, and therefore the managers put extra effort on commenting on correct behavior, and thereby increasing the performance on value adding services. However, they do not yet reach sales objectives on this measurement, hence it is still room for improvement.

Many researchers argue that role ambiguity; positive behavioral feedback and coaching are related and this relationship is also seen in our Pearson correlation table (Table 10). The correlation table shows a very strong positive relationship between positive behavioral feedback and coaching (0.7). Furthermore it shows that there is a significant, relatively high positive correlation between positive behavioral feedback and role ambiguity (0.37), and that it is a moderate positive correlation between coaching and role ambiguity (0.25). Jaworski and Kohli (1991, p.197) found that positive behavioral feedback was contributing to performance through the role clarity of a salesperson as well as it could have a direct effect on performance. Further, they (1991, p.197) found that negative feedback did not have a direct effect on performance, which our results support.

Dubinsky and Mattson (1979, p. 84) and Walker, et al. (1975, p. 38; 1977, p. 161) found that more experienced salespeople perceived less role ambiguity and therefore they suggest that the amount and nature of sales training may influence a salesperson's perceptions of, and ability to cope with, role ambiguity. In turn, coaching is closely related to feedback, e.g. Carter (2006, p. 113) and Ford et al. (2011, p. 157) state that coaching mainly consists of providing salespeople with feedback in order to encourage their appropriate behavior and to give suggestions for improvement. Jolson et al. (1993, p.) argue on the other hand, that coaching is a technique for teaching and a way to mediate information and methods to create an ability to complete a task. We agree with Carter (2006) that it is a difference between coaching and feedback. Feedback encourages appropriate behavior, but we argue that suggestions for improvement are coaching. Therefore, we argue that it is important for companies to consider both in
order to decrease role ambiguity and improve performance. From these arguments, we conclude that it is important that the company provides clear goals, guidelines, and information to their employees on what they have to do, as well as the tools for how to do it.

6.5 Revised Conceptual Model

Based on our analysis and discussion of our results, we can evaluate and revise our proposed conceptual model, which was developed in the theoretical chapter. When testing we did not find support for all predicted effects between constructs. When testing our main model with intrinsic motivation as dependent variable, we found that task significance; role conflict and experienced responsibility had an effect on intrinsic motivation. However, when we tested the best-fitting model we found that experienced responsibility was still significant but that the two other factors could be replaced by experienced meaningfulness.

Furthermore, our results from testing the effects of the main model on customer orientation showed that negative behavioral feedback, negative output feedback; coaching, experienced responsibility and role ambiguity had a significant effect. The best-fitting model only included the variables: experienced responsibility and role ambiguity. In this case, we could conclude that negative behavioral feedback; negative output feedback and coaching do not add much explanation of the variance in customer orientation. Therefore, to simplify the model without losing the strength in the model, we decided that these variables could be excluded from the model.

None of the job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and job feedback) had a significant direct effect on our dependent variables of intrinsic motivation and customer orientation if we look at the best-fitting models in Regression 1 and 2. The second group of variables, critical psychological states, and their effects were partly supported as out of the three psychological states tested in our model, experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility were found to have a positive significant effect on intrinsic motivation (Regression 1). Experienced responsibility was also found to have a positive significant effect on customer orientation (Regression 2). Further, we did not find support for the third group of factors: sales managers’ behavior (positive/negative behavioral feedback, positive/negative output feedback and coaching) and their impact on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation when testing the best-fitting model. Those factors did not show any significant direct effect on the dependent variables (intrinsic motivation and customer orientation) in the best-fitting model (Regression 1 & 2). In the final group of variables, role ambiguity was found to have significant positive effect on customer orientation, thus the effects of role stress were only partly supported (Regression 1 & 2). Lastly we found support for the positive effect of intrinsic motivation on customer orientation.

In addition to our regressions, we conducted a t-test with grouping variables: high and low performance to test whether there are differences between performance groups on our variables. We found support for difference between the two groups on three closely related variables, namely: coaching, positive behavioral feedback and role ambiguity. Figure 6 shows our final conceptual model, which provides the key results of our study.
Figure 6. Revised Conceptual model based on Regression analysis and best-fitting model.

* Variables that show significant difference between high and low performance group.

Figure 7. Revised Conceptual model based on Findings from t-test.
7. Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter aims to answer our research question and present the theoretical contributions that this study makes to the field of research. We also make practical recommendations to Company X on how they can use our findings in the future to increase their employees’ intrinsic motivation, customer orientation and consequently, to improve performance.

7.1 General Conclusions

The main purpose of this study was to examine the effects of job design and sales managers’ behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople. Furthermore, we aim to examine if any of the factors included in our model have an effect on performance of Company X’s salespeople. This study was conducted in a business to consumer context on the Swedish electricity market. Our model was inspired by Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) model of work design but we made a theoretical contribution by developing and testing an extended model. On our primary data collected from salespeople in Company X Customer Service was processed in a statistical analysis. We tested the effects of job design and sales manager’s behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation. To further extend our research we conducted a two-sample t-test to analyze and establish differences between high- and low performance groups on all of the variables included in our model. Thus, we complemented our analysis of primary data with secondary data retrieved from Company X. After conducting this study, we are now able to answer our research questions:

*What impacts do job design and sales managers’ behaviors have on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople? What kind of difference exists between high- and low performance sales teams considering these factors?*

Our study shows that two constructs originating from the category of critical psychological states have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. More specifically: experienced responsibility and experienced meaningfulness have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. However, it was experienced responsibility in combination with role ambiguity that represented the best fitting model when we tested effects on customer orientation. These findings indicate that it is important for salespeople to feel that they are responsible for the quality of their work and know what is expected from them. Also, in our bivariate regression analysis, we found that intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on customer orientation. Since job characteristics and sales managers’ behavior did not have significant effect on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation in the best fitting, we can conclude that they do not have a direct effect on the dependent variables.

Secondly we tested which motivational factors affect salespeople's performance. The t-test showed that coaching, positive behavioral feedback and role ambiguity differed significantly between high-, and low performance groups. Hence, according to the results high performance group receives more coaching and positive behavioral feedback and experiences less role ambiguity. Overall our study shows the importance of considering encouraging coaching and positive behavioral feedback in order to make salespeople perform better.
7.2 Theoretical Contributions

Our study makes relevant theoretical contribution to research on motivation. Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Characteristics model has been widely used to define the motivating potential of a job and its design (Devaro et al., 2007, p. 986; Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p.585; Wagner et al., 2008, p. 6364). Most of the prior research we read on work design only tested certain parts of it. Thus, the whole model is infrequently tested that it creates a research gap (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). Thus, we argue that since we tested the main part of the model and developed the moderator of context satisfaction into variables of sales managers’ behavior we were able to make a contribution to the theory.

Others have modified and extended the model as well but nobody has, to our knowledge, combined the variables we use in our combination. Some may have used different variables for job design or outcomes. For example, Johlke and Iyer (2013, p. 59) tested if autonomy, job feedback and skill variety lead to different levels of ambiguity and if they had any effects on the outcomes: job satisfaction, customer orientation and sales performance. Our results partly support Johlke and Iyer (2013) since we found that high performance group experience less role ambiguity, i.e. that decreased amount of role ambiguity has a positive effect on performance.

Prior research mostly used job characteristics to find what outcomes they affect and excluded the critical psychological states (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). We considered this rather rare since Hackman and Oldham (1976, p. 255) describe them to be a core in their model. The precondition holds that job characteristics are the source for individuals to experience the psychological states (Johns et al., 1992, p. 658). Our findings support these statements since our research showed that none of the job characteristics had a significant direct effect on intrinsic motivation or customer orientation in our best-fitting model. They seem to rather affect them through the critical psychological states like in the original model from Hackman and Oldham (1980).

Lopez et al. (2006, p. 389) assessed that more research has to be drawn on motivation especially with respect to the changing selling environment. They enhance that there is little guidance for sales management to understand what the most important factors for motivation are among their salespeople. Hackman and Oldham (1980) suggested that skill variety, task identity and task significance have a positive effect on experienced meaningfulness. Our findings partly support their suggestion since our results show that skill variety and task significance have the strongest relationship with experienced meaningfulness. Our results also support Stajkovic and Luthans (2001, p. 587) who suggested that one key aspect that could have a significant impact on motivation is task complexity. Hence, since skill variety and task significance have an indirect effect on experienced meaningfulness it implicates that organizations need to consider how tasks are formed if they want salespeople’s to experience them as meaningful. Our findings also revealed another aspect for organizations to consider: sales managers. From our results we can conclude that they are an important source for salespeople’s customer orientation and performance, i.e. sales ratios and value adding services ratios, through their ability to reduce role ambiguity, and providing feedback and coaching. We also found that it is important that sales managers have the knowledge and skills to give negative behavioral feedback and coaching since it can have a negative effect on customer orientation.
Research has also paid close attention to the critical psychological states (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590). Experienced meaningfulness was found to be a critical psychological state with relevance for salespeople’s customer orientation (Thankor & Joshi, 2005, p. 590). Thus, the most significant factor for customer-oriented behavior appeared to be that people experience their job as meaningful. However, we did not find any support for this, instead our research shows that experienced responsibility and role ambiguity have a significant positive effect on customer orientation when we tested the best-fitting model. Due to these deviating but significant findings of critical psychological states we argue that they should not be excluded from models that aims to test the effects of job design on certain outcomes.

Prior research on role stress has provided deviating results (Sohi, 1996, p.55) and our literature review revealed that role stress is mostly treated as having a demotivating effect on outcomes. However, study by Coelho et al. (2011) studied the job complexity i.e. job characteristics, role ambiguity, role conflict and internal motivation, and its effect on supervisors, co-workers and customers’ creativity. Thus, role conflict and role ambiguity have been tested in the JCM before but they did not combine variables as we do. More research on role stress is required and it is specifically recommended to determine the motivating potential of role conflict, role ambiguity and job characteristics to understand the relationship between theory and practice (Singh, 1998, p.84). Our findings show that if employees experience less role ambiguity they will perform better and be more customer-oriented. We did not find any significant effect between role conflict and any of our dependent variables in the best-fitting models. However, when we tested the main model we could see that role conflict had a negative effect on intrinsic motivation. This implies that less role conflict decreases the intrinsic motivation among salespeople’. Comparing the means between the high-, and low performance groups we also saw that the high performance group had a lower mean on role conflict even if the difference between groups were not significant. These findings could suggest that some role conflict might have positive effects on intrinsic motivation and performance.

Prior research determined the need to assess how intrinsic motivation influence sellers and their customer relationships (Pullins, 2001, p. 405). Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 774) found that that salespeople’s intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on customer orientation. We tested whether intrinsic motivation had a positive effect on customer orientation and found support for Mullin and Pullins’ (2009) findings. Thus, intrinsic motivation increases a salesperson's customer orientation.

When it comes to contextual contributions Singh, (1998, p. 80) suggests future studies to involve sampling boundary-spanning roles, relevant to marketing. It was specifically suggested to conduct studies on customer service representatives and salespeople since it is a rare combination in studies. Thus, we argue that our research contributes with an extra dimension to research simply due to that we have studied customer service salespeople. Previous research have also emphasized the importance of conducting research in markets undergoing rapid changes since it implies that selling becomes more complex (Jones et al., 2005, p. 106). A study by Jones et al. (2005) states that sales management and effective selling represents a research field that has stagnated. They meant that it has significant influence on companies’ market success and has potential for extensive future research. We conducted our study in the Swedish electricity market, which is highly complex and constantly changing due to new market models and
governmental directives. Our findings show that in the complex electricity market, it is important for organizations to make sure employees experience responsibility and meaningfulness of their job in order to increase intrinsic motivation. Further, it is important for salespeople in this context to experience responsibility, role ambiguity and intrinsic motivation to increase customer-oriented behavior. Other variables of job design and sales managers’ behavior had insignificant effects on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation. However, sales managers’ behavior had an impact on performance through: coaching, positive behavioral feedback and role ambiguity. Thus, we have provided theoretical contributions both in the field of selling and sales management, motivation and to research of this industry and similar ones.

7.3 Practical Implications and Recommendations for Company X
One aim of this study was to provide sales managers with results that could help them motivate their employees, make them customer-oriented and increase salespeople’s performance. It is important that sales managers use the right tools to motivate their employees so that the employees use customer-oriented sales techniques.

Our study shows that management need to make sure that the work is designed in a way so that the employees experiences responsibility and meaningfulness in order to increase intrinsic motivation among the employees. Factors that have a strong positive relationship with experienced meaningfulness are skill variety and task significance, therefore companies should design work in such way that employees perceive their job as diverse and significant. Managers could for example provide opportunities for salespeople to develop their skills so that they can work with a greater variety of tasks and take on more challenging tasks. It is also sufficient for the company to provide salespeople with information about how work performance affects people (customers as well as colleagues) and the organization from a broader perspective so that the salespeople understand the value of their work. Regarding Company X they could create understanding for the difficulties companies operating in the electricity market face and highlight the impact salespeople’s performance can have on financial performance, customer satisfaction and image. By increasing these factors the employees will not only feel intrinsic motivation, they will also act more customer-oriented since experienced responsibility and intrinsic motivation also have a positive effect on customer orientation. Thus, it is extremely important that salespeople know that they are the company’s most important link to their customers and also profits.

The other factor that affects customer orientation is role ambiguity; therefore it is important that organizations provide clear objectives and guidelines to employees so they know what is expected of them. Previous research suggests coaching and feedback to decrease levels of role ambiguity. Our results from the main model show differently; coaching and negative behavioral feedback can have a negative effect on customer orientation. To start with, organizations should make sure that goals and objectives are aligned with the company’s customer orientation strategy so that guidelines and policies are clear. Customer orientation is a relatively new core value at Company X, therefore it might take some time to change the company culture and we argue that it makes it even more important that directives are clear. Further, Company X should make sure that all sales managers understand, adopt and have the ability to give feedback and coaching that are aligned with the company’s guidelines to ensure customer-oriented selling. We argue that it is especially important for companies operating in rapid changing markets
like the electricity industry to continually train sales managers and salespeople in order to improve customer orientation since customers’ demands changes as well.

Role ambiguity was not only important for customer orientation but also for sales performance. Hence, if employees experience less role ambiguity, they will not only increase customer satisfaction by being customer-oriented but they will also sell more contracts to new customers and sell more value adding services, which means that they will do more for the customer in every call. Other factors that increase the performance is positive behavioral feedback and coaching, which emphasize the importance of a present, experienced and committed sales manager who can give positive feedback and good advice on how to improve skills.

As mentioned earlier, we also found that there is a positive effect of intrinsic motivation on customer orientation. This means that both customer-oriented selling and intrinsic motivation are important factors for organizations to consider since they do not only improve the organizational performance and image through more satisfied and loyal customers intrinsic motivation is also beneficial for the employees. We argue that by increasing intrinsic motivation and customer orientation the company can create a virtuous cycle with many benefits.
8. Truth Criteria

In this chapter we discuss the reliability, generalizability, validity and replication of our study. We reflect on the consistency of our measures and how our findings could be generalized to different settings. Further, we describe to what extent our concepts measured what we intended to and possibilities for other researchers to replicate our study.

8.1 Reliability

It is vital to consider the independence and consistency of measures when conducting a study, i.e. evaluating the reliability (Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 78; Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 162). In our opinion, it is specifically important that studies have high reliability due to that it can increase the ability to be reused and applied to other settings. In order to be able to foster future research, our intention was to constitute a comprehensive and reliable research. The reliability of a study corresponds to the use of data collection method and analysis and their ability to constitute consistent results (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 156). Bjereld (2009, p. 115) on the other hand describes reliability to be dependent on how constructs are measured. Considering these reliability definitions we can conclude that they concern the importance of having consistent constructs and measurement of them.

There are three factors to consider when evaluating the reliability of a quantitative data: stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159). The more stable measures are the more reliable constructs (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159). Stability corresponds to how stable the measures are over time (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159; Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 79). Stability could be tested by replicated studies and one could either replicate the whole research or parts of it to measure constructs’ consistency (Bjereld et al., 2009, p. 115). All our constructs have been measured previously which implies that we have the ability to compare our findings with other researchers. This enables us to get an indication of our measures’ previous stability and consistency. As we did not have the time or resources to create our own measures and scales, we found it appropriate to use already tested items and constructs in order to keep a high reliability of our study. Thus, we want to enhance that sales people's attitudes, beliefs, perceptions and preferences influence our findings and it can be hard to expect our identified relationships to endure over time. Thus, above mentioned notions are subject to change over time and therefore it can be difficult for us to obtain and prevent any fluctuations in them. We argue that our measures are relatively stable due to that all of them have been tested to a relatively present and to a great extent.

Internal reliability is the second factor to consider. It corresponds to whether or not the items (questions) that constitutes a construct equally represent the measure. Internal reliability is commonly measured by the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 374). Cronbach’s Alpha analyzes the consistency of responses to items in each construct to see if the items in the construct measure the same thing, i.e. what they intend to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159; Saunders, et al., 2009, p. 374). A Cronbach’s Alpha test for a construct should attain a level of 0.8 in order to be considered as reliable (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159) however a value of at least 0.7 can be acceptable (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.159; Saunders, et al., 2012, p. 430). When we
performed our Cronbach’s Alpha test on all our constructs we got a variation of values. *Skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, job feedback, experienced responsibility and knowledge of results* all obtained a value below 0.6. This means that the items in these constructs did not measure the same thing. However, we modified these construct to only one item closest to their definition in order to measure what we intended to. We found this a bit surprising since these constructs all were adopted from the original source of Hackman and Oldham (1980). These constructs have also been widely tested and their results seem to have been somewhat consistent and stable over time. Further, the items of *experienced meaningfulness* and *intrinsic motivation* had a higher internal reliability and had the values 0.78 and 0.70 respectively. Thus, they were somewhat lower than the accepted value but still considerably higher than some of the other constructs and therefore we consider these constructs as relatively reliable.

Remaining constructs of our study - *positive behavioral feedback, negative behavioral feedbacks, positive output feedback, negative output feedback, coaching, role conflict, role ambiguity and customer orientation* - all attained a value above 0.8 and are therefore considerably reliable.

Decisions can be inconsistent between researchers if there are several ones, which could cause an increased subjectivity (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159). This subjectivity is what the last factor of inter-observer consistency concerns. It is also explained to be an error/bias caused by researchers and/or the inter-rater reliability of other authors, (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 157; Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 78). In order to diminish the subjectivity of our study, we deliberated on problems, choices, and decisions together. Concerns regarding our theories, questionnaire and chosen constructs are some of the joint decisions we had to make. In order to decrease the interrater reliability of other authors we used already established items representing a construct. We thought these previously tested constructs would provide good indicators for measures and interpretations of results. Our findings are based on statistical tests performed in SPSS. This together with our open-minded attitude contributes to a decreased subjectivity. We have done everything in our power to be as objective as possible in order to increase the reliability of our results. We consider our subjectivity to be relatively low and thus we induced very little influence on our research.

### 8.2 Generalizability

The primary intention with *generalizability* is that researchers aim to develop law-like implications of human behavior that can be used to predict what other people would do in similar situations (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.164). In our study the whole population constituted our sample, i.e. we studied the census. Thus, our findings will be representable for the whole population. Thereof the findings including the sample of salespeople at Company X Customer Service provided valuable insights for drawing conclusions regarding all salespeople in this company.

60 % of our respondents were women and 40 % were men (*Appendix 2*). Since, this proportion of women and men aligns with the overall proportions of the genders in Company X, it indicates that our findings are generalizable for the organization. Similarly, most of our respondents were in the age between 20-29 and 30-39, which also corresponds to the general age distribution in Company X. Thus, this also gives us an argument to conclude that our findings can be generalizable for our census. We argue that our findings were sufficient to determine the overall perception of job
characteristics, supervisors behavior and roles stress among Company X customer service.

Further, we can suggest that our findings are relatively generalizable to other business to consumer work settings where salespeople have a similar responsibility to generate sales. We also suggest that our findings could be generalized to other companies of similar size in the same market. Thus, salespeople working in those organization most likely experiences the same complexity as salespeople at Company X, because they work in a changing environment with demand from different role sets and has similar work tasks. Further, it could potentially be generalized to other sectors with similar markets and services, e.g. insurance -, telephone and district heating, because these markets are characterized by intense competition and offers complex services that are often distributed by salespeople. Further, Company X (2014) describes the electricity contracts to be very similar to the bank loans, i.e. mortgages. Our contact person means that both of these services operate in markets with high competition. Further, there are high requirements to meet customers’ demands and provide the trust to manage customers’ money in sufficient ways. Therefore, this is an additional context where the results and recommendations of this study can be valid.

8.3 Validity

In contrast to reliability, which evaluates the measures of constructs, validity corresponds to what actually is measured (Bjereld et al., 2009, p. 115; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 156). As previously mention there is an interrelation between the notions of reliability and validity. It is explained by that measures can be reliable without being valid but valid measures may not always be reliable (Bjereld et al., 2009, p. 116). Thus, our measures of positive behavioral feedback, negative behavioral feedback, positive output feedback, negative output feedback, coaching, role conflict, role ambiguity and customer orientation appeared to be reliable due to their strong values in our Cronbach’s alpha test but they do not necessarily measure the notions in the way we intended to. If this was the case they would be considered as reliable but not valid.

If a construct is inconsistent over time the construct most likely does not measure the intended construct, i.e. validity requires the constructs to be reliable (Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 81). Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 159) explains that there are certain factors to consider when evaluating the validity of a research: measurement validity, internal validity, external validity and ecological validity. Measurement validity primarily applies to quantitative research and considers the validity of constructs (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42). Hence, it considers if the comprehension of concepts measures what they intended to (Bjereld et al., 2009, p. 112; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159), i.e. if concepts appropriately measured the concepts (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 157). Thus, it refers to whether a measure of a concept really reflects what it is supposed to. In respect to reliability a concept cannot be considered valid in case they are fluctuating and unstable (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42).

Internal validity is mainly related to if two or more constructs have a causal relationship that holds true (Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 164; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42). One could as the question: “how confident can we be that the independent variables really is at least in part responsible for the variation in that has been identified in the dependent variable?” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42). Thus, one can look at the independent
variables effect on dependent variables to evaluate the validity of a construct (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42; Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 164). In order to evaluate our internal validity we refer to our regression analyses where we can see that our independent variables - skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, job feedback, experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, knowledge of results, positive behavioral feedback, negative behavioral feedback, positive output feedback, negative output feedback, coaching, role conflict and role ambiguity - explained 26 % of the variation in our dependent variable; intrinsic motivation. The same independent variables explained 39,2 % of the variance in the dependent variable customer orientation. According to Saunders et al. (2009, p. 489) these number can be considered as low. However, in comparison with other studies testing the same model and similar variables we can conclude that our percentages are relatively high. Our third regression tested intrinsic motivation effect on customer orientation and we can see that it explain 15,3 % of the variance in customer orientation. Mullin and Pullins (2009, p. 774) tested the same relationship and found a slightly higher relationship between the two variables, however they tested six significant independent variables in their model whereas we only test one. Further, Saunders et al. (2009, p. 461) also argues that it could be challenging to obtain the whole variance of dependent variables. We therefore draw the conclusion that our percentage represents a relatively high variance of these variables. Saunders et al. (2009, p.268) describes secondary data to potentially, be of high quality. Since we received comprehensive secondary data from Company X we also consider this data as valid. These aspects are the foundational arguments for that we consider our study holds internally valid to a relatively high extent. Thus, there may be other independent variables that could be used to describe a larger percentage of the variation in our dependent variables.

Evaluating external validity is related to the possibility of generalize findings to other research contexts (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 43; Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 163). In order to generalize findings to the whole target population it is important to find a representative sample (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 367). However, as we described in our methodological chapter we conducted our study on the whole target population, which means that we aimed to reach the whole census. Thus we did not need to find a representative sample, instead the participants from our target population served as representatives for the whole population. Therefore, we argue that our study has a high external validity and that our findings can be generalized to the whole population. Lastly researchers need to consider the ecological validity of a study. This notion refers to if the findings are applicable to individual’s daily lives - their natural social settings (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 43). Further, Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 43) describes that this notion is concerned with that research sometimes generate findings that could be technically valid but inapplicable to individuals daily lives. This implies that the unnatural factor of answering a questionnaire can induce limited ecological validity (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 43). Company X distributes questionnaires relatively often to evaluate their salespeople's perceptions regarding organizational aspects. Therefore we argue that our questionnaire did not induce any unnatural factors that limited our responses. Furthermore, we carried out our study in regard to a practical problem and therefore argue that our findings are applicable to their natural social setting.
8.4 Replication

Replication is another criterion to consider when evaluating research. This notion is very close to reliability and considers whether or not it is possible for other researchers to replicate a study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 41). There may be different reasons for why other researchers chose to replicate or re-evaluate a study. One example would be when the domain of question is relevant but the results are deviating from other findings or that the research process may be suitable for another context (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 41). In order to replicate a study one prerequisite is that researchers describe their procedures in detail (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 41). If not, it could lead to contingent questions regarding the research process or impossibility to replicate a study (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 41; Graziano & Raulin, 2010, p. 40). We have done our utmost to explain all steps and details regarding our research process in order for others to be able to replicate our procedure. Specifically, we wanted to emphasize all the details of our research method and therefore provide extensive explanations of our methodological choices. Furthermore, we described how and why certain concepts were chosen, how our questionnaire was designed and what population we have studied to provide future researchers with a foundational approach to assess the same variables in another context or simply replicate it in a similar setting. We argue that our research is possible to replicate to a large extent even if not identically.
9. Criticism

In this chapter we critically discuss our literature review and practical data collection method. It provides valuable insights for researchers that would like to replicate our study. We evaluate our results and acknowledge potential factors that could have affected our research that give implications to future research in this field.

9.1 Criticism of Literature

Using secondary references instead of deriving the original source induce a risk that the core meaning is changed (Johansson-Lindfors, 1993, p. 117-118). Thus, we want to emphasize that we have tried to decrease any potential misinterpretations by using primary sources. One may question why we have chosen to use so many older sources, but when we tried to avoid secondary sources it many times lead us back to classical studies. We wanted to assess comprehensive and consistent information from original sources to create an adequate foundation for our theoretical framework and conceptual model. Further, we also considered it important to describe classical views that had significant impact and implications for more recent findings. Thus, the combination of classical and more recent studies gave us a very adequate overview of how the research in the fields have developed and enabled us to create a greater understanding for our topic. Therefore we argue that it is important to present the classical studies together with more recent ones. We therefore claim that the use of primary sources of literature increases the trustworthiness of our study, therefore we have chosen to use them rather than choosing secondary sources that could lead to misinterpretations. Further, to avoid changing the core meaning of the original source or passing on inaccurate information to readers we held the use of secondary sources to a minimum. When we derived the original source we often read several sources before we found the original one. This further gave us an opportunity to assess how other researchers interpreted the original meaning and enabled us to obtain original definitions of our key constructs. If sources were interpreting it similarly with the original source we have used them to support the original source.

When we conducted our theoretical framework, we used different types of sources. Scientific articles and books on our relevant topics have primarily been used. Saunders et al. (2009, p. 256) enhance that findings may not always be applicable in a certain research area and that it is important to consider and evaluate sources before using them. When choosing our sources we evaluated the purposes of the studies and who the authors were. Previous research studying a similar setting or conducted by well-known authors within a field gave indications that the source was relevant and appropriate to use in our literature review.

Further, we have primarily considered literature written in English. Even though we are not native English speaking students, we considered it to generate fewer misinterpretations if the sources do not need to be translated. We claim that it could be difficult to carry on the content of the information when it is translated and more difficult to replicate if the reader cannot relate to the language. It simply may be difficult for an independent reader to follow us back to the original source because it requires bilingual skills. However, our scientific sources were mainly chosen due to their contribution of the field. To understand the electricity market, we used institutional sources and material from websites of the three largest companies in the market. We regard our institutional reports to be reliable due to that these public institutions inspect the Swedish electricity market to ensure consumer rights. Company X provided us with
internal document that provided a deeper understanding for the organization. We are aware of that these documents may emphasize an ideal and opportunistic view of the Company. There is also a risk that information retrieved from personal communications appears subjective. Thus, we treated these types of information with criticism and objectivity.

9.2 Criticism of Practical Method
Initially, we deliberated with Company X on which variables that potentially could have an impact on their salespeople’s intrinsic motivation and customer orientation, we started to review previous research and findings. When examining prior literature we also determined different factors affecting these variables. All constructs selected outside of the original Job Characteristics Model by Hackman and Oldham (1980) were directly found reliable.

Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) original questionnaire contained five sections of questions. The first and second section regard core job characteristics and was divided into one general section where you were supposed to describe your job as objectively as you can and another with more specific questions where you were also supposed to be objective (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p.277). There were no restrictions or suggestions that these different sections had to be asked together. To be able to analyze the items properly in the statistical program SPSS we were concerned with that all items in a construct measured the same thing. Since, the first section regarding core job characteristics was more general and had another scale than the other section it could have limited our analysis of those questions. Further, in the book of Work redesign (1980, p.275), there were neither any instructions nor suggestions of that they had to be used in combination. After deliberation with our supervisor, we, therefore, concluded that we probably could use only one section in order to measure the core job characteristic constructs. In section three the respondents were supposed to indicate how they personally felt about their job. More specifically these questions regarded critical psychological states and intrinsic motivation.

Section five of the Job Characteristics survey also deviated from the other sections since it mainly asked questions of how individuals thought their colleagues felt about their jobs. The instructions in section five specifically states that respondents can answer these questions differently from how they have answered previously where they were supposed to only answer for themselves. This section was excluded due to the probability of a decreased internal reliability of the constructs. Section four was also excluded due to that it measured the moderator of contextual satisfaction. Since, we wanted to study the impact of supervisor behaviors more closely we decided to exclude this moderator. It was instead substituted by the variables feedback and coaching that was treated as characteristics of the job that could have an effect on outcomes. Section six measured the moderator of growth need strength, which we decided to exclude. In conclusion we want to enhance that our specific choices regarding our constructs from Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) original research may have implied that our constructs appeared to be less reliable when several items were included. In order to facilitate future research we therefore suggest that one may use other constructs for these variables.
Further, we want to highlight the potential misinterpretations of our questionnaire due to language barriers. Deficient translation, lack of academic language skills and knowledge of theoretical concepts may be reasons for why respondents potentially misinterpret items (Shiu et al., 2009, pp. 399-400). In order to diminish misinterpretations we tried to use appropriate translations from English into Swedish. In order to confirm that they were sufficient and understandable we pre-tested them on number of managers that gave us feedback and suggestions for changes. However, we always went back to the original item before we made any changes in order to not distort from the original meaning of items. The questionnaire was also tested on two external persons and neither of them had any relation to Company X. Their feedback enabled us to also get an independent opinion that was used to improve our questionnaire and reduce the risk for misunderstandings.

Overall our data collection went well. We reached a high response rate and reduced manual errors through our online questionnaire. In regard to our constructs, some adjustments were made and we were able to obtain useful data that further provided some relevant results.
10. Limitations and Future Research

This chapter describes the limitations of our studies. Further, we elaborate on potential ideas and suggestions for future research considering intrinsic motivation and customer orientation in a business to consumer setting.

Most studies are subject to limitations and our research was limited to a salesforce, in the Swedish electricity market, i.e. Company X customer service. Thus, our study was limited to salespeople working in a business to customer setting, for a specific company and in a certain industry. It is therefore limited to people working under certain conditions, i.e. our setting was primarily considered with demands to sell more, be customer oriented and efficient in order to increase sales. Even though our findings were generalizable for our census, the generalizability to other markets may be limited, although the results can be applicable on other context such as, other business-to-consumer work settings, resembling companies in the same market, and other industries operating in similar markets or selling similar services e.g. insurance -, telephone and district heating services. However, limitations also provide opportunities for future research. The proposed theoretical framework and determined effects between constructs could be tested in different industries and markets in order to generate more general results. Further, the salespeople were located in Sweden, which induced a geographical limitation to our study. We refer to that the specific culture, including - attitudes, values and beliefs - can have impacts on what is perceived to be motivating. Therefore, it could be suggested to conduct a cross-cultural analysis in order to determine any deviating effects of motivation in business to consumer settings between countries and continents.

Further, we limited our survey to a specific type of salespeople - frontline salespeople. Though all our participants worked in a customer service, one could assume that the same research and potentially the same findings could also correspond to a telemarketing work setting. Therefore future research potentially could replicate the study across various types of selling jobs and industries. Another limitation would be that we only adopted the perception of motivation from salespeople’s perspective. We suggest that there may be deviating perceptions of salespeople's motivation among sales managers. As well as customers may perceive the salespeople’s customer oriented selling techniques differently. In order to determine similar and different views and opinions among these groups, it could be sufficient to compare the results from a multi-perspective analysis. It could be an interesting approach since it comprehends a broader view and perception of this topic. Additionally it could constitute an opportunity for Company X to decrease potential misalignment between the customer’s expectations and salespeople's approaches.

Further, our results showed that if the managerial behaviors, coaching and negative behavioral feedback increase; it has a negative effect on customer orientation. These results indicate that sales managers may not have the right abilities to effectively support salespeople with the right aids to develop their customer-oriented sales behavior. Therefore, we also suggest that it can be sufficient to carry out the study on sales managers’ in order to determine how they perceive customer-orientation.

From the results of our regressions we can conclude that we did not find support for all our effects. Further, we tested the effect of intrinsic motivation on customer orientation and our findings supported previous findings. We suggest future research to test the
opposite effect, hence, if customer orientation effects intrinsic motivation. We also suggest future research to test the effect of intrinsic motivation together with the significant variables from the best-fitting model on customer orientation to conclude if intrinsic motivation adds any explanation to the variance in customer orientation. The same could be done with intrinsic motivation, hence, test the effects of significant variables from our best-fitted model together with customer orientation on intrinsic motivation to see if that model would explain more of the variance in intrinsic motivation. In conclusion we want to enhance that the constructs included in our model never have been tested in this specific combination previously. Thus, we have created an original model that could be modified and researched further in order to determine the most efficient combination of variables to determine what salespeople are motivated by. Though, we one last time will argue that it is important for each specific organization to determine what their salespeople are motivated by. Thus, our model provides a foundation to build other studies on and we would recommend others to test and try to confirm part of our findings in similar business to consumer settings. We therefore claim that our proposed framework and selected constructs can motivate future researchers to replicate and validate our conceptual model and facilitate future research.
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Hi!
In the link below you find an attached questionnaire regarding your job. Our names are Elina and Sara and we are at the moment completing our master studies in Business Administration. We have specified in Marketing and Management respectively and are now writing our thesis on behalf of Company X. We think it is important that everyone feel comfortable and motivated at his or her job and with his or her tasks. Therefore the main purpose of our thesis is to examine the effects of job design and sales managers’ behavior on intrinsic motivation and customer orientation of salespeople in your department. Furthermore, we aim to examine if any of the factors above have an effect on your performance.

Shortly, it means that we aim to investigate to what extent characteristics of your job facilitate your motivation and customer orientation. We are very grateful if you would like to participate and we want to enhance that all responses are anonymous!

Please make sure you press “submit” when you completed the survey.

Below you find the link to our survey: https://www.webropolsurveys.com

Thank you!
Sincerely, Elina Hedelius and Sara Nilsson

Hej!
På länken nedan hittar du en bifogad enkät om ditt jobb. Vi heter Elina och Sara och håller just nu på att avsluta våra mastersprogram i företagsekonomi. Vi har fördjupat oss i marknadsföring respektive management och skriver nu vårt examensarbete på uppdrag av företag X. Vi tycker att det är viktigt att alla känner sig bekväma och motiverade på sitt jobb och med sina uppgifter. Därför är det huvudsakliga syftet med vår uppsats är att undersöka effekterna av ett jobbs design och hur försäljningschefers beteende påverkar motivation och kundorientering av säljare på din avdelning. Vidare vill vi undersöka om någon av faktorerna ovan har en effekt på din prestation.

I korthet innebär den att vi strävar efter att undersöka i vilken utsträckning egenskaperna i ditt jobb förbättrar din motivation och kundorientering. Vi är mycket tacksamma om du vill delta och vi vill belysa att alla svar är anonyma!

Se gärna till att du sänder in enkäten när du fyllt I den.

Nedan hittar du länken till vår undersökning: https://www.webropolsurveys.com

Tack!
Med vänliga hälsningar, Elina Hedelius och Sara Nilsson
Section 6: Demographic Questions

1. Sex:
   - male
   - female

2. Age:
   - under 20
   - 20-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 or over

3. How long have you been employed at Company X?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1-3
   - 4-6
   - 7-10
   - more than 10 years.

4. What competence do you have?
   - Only basic skills (Internal training provided by Company X to everyone): (YES)(NO)
   - Basic skills and developed skills (Internal training provided by request from employee alternatively as a suggestion from management): (YES)(NO)

5. My team number: …….
Section 1
Listed below are a number of statements, which could be used to describe a job. You are to indicate whether the statement is an accurate or an inaccurate description of your job. Please try to be as objective as you can in describing how accurate each statement describes your job.

How much do you agree with the statement?
1 = Disagree strongly
2 = Disagree
3 = Disagree slightly
4 = Agree slightly
5 = Agree
6 = Agree strongly

6. The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

7. The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

8. Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

9. The job is quite simple and repetitive.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

10. This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

11. The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

Del 1

Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

7. Mitt jobb är strukturerat så att jag inte har möjlighet att utföra hela arbetet från början till slut. (R)
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

8. Jag kan avgöra hur väl jag presterar enbart genom att genomföra arbetsuppgifterna.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

9. Mitt jobb är ganska enkelt och upprepade. (R)
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

10. Mitt jobb är utformat så att många människor kan påverkas av hur väl det utförs.
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

11. Mitt jobb ger mig ingen möjlighet att ta egna initiativ eller att använda mitt omdöme när det kommer till att utföra arbetet. (R)
1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The job provides me a chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.</td>
<td>Mitt jobb ger mig möjlighet att avsluta det arbete jag påbörjat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.</td>
<td>Mitt jobb ger mycket få leddräner om huruvida jag presterar bra. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td>Mitt jobb ger mig möjlighet att utföra arbetet fritt och självständigt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.</td>
<td>Sett ur ett bredare perspektiv är mitt jobb i sig inte särskilt viktig eller betydan. (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 2
You are to indicate your own personal feelings about your job.
How much do you agree with the statement?
1= Disagree strongly
2= Disagree
3= Disagree slightly
4= Agree slightly
5= Agree
6= Agree strongly

16. It’s hard, on this job, for me to care very much about whether or not the work gets done right.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

17. My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

18. Most of the things I have to do on this job seem useless or trivial.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

19. I usually know whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

20. I feel great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

21. The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

22. I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

23. I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

Del 2
Här anger du vad du personligen tycker om ditt jobb.

Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

16. Jag har svårt att bry mig särskilt mycket om huruvida arbetsuppgifterna i mitt jobb utförs på rätt sätt eller ej. (R)
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

17. Jag blir mer nöjd med mig själv när jag presterar bra på jobbet.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

18. De flesta saker jag måste göra på jobbet upplever jag som värdelösa eller simpla. (R)
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

19. Oftast vet jag om min arbetsinsats på det här jobbet är tillfredsställande eller ej.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

20. Jag känner stor personlig tillfredsställelse när jag gör det här jobbet bra.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

23. Jag mår dåligt och blir olycklig när jag upptäcker att jag har utfört arbetet dåligt.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
24. I often have trouble figuring out whether I’m doing well or poorly on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

25. I feel I should personally take credit or blame for the results of my work on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

26. My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

27. Whether or not this job gets done right is clearly my responsibility.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

24. Det är ofta svårt för mig att lista ut om jag gör bra eller dåligt ifrån mig på jobbet.
   (R) 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

26. I allmänhet påverkas inte mina känslor särskilt mycket av hur väl jag presterar på jobbet. (R)
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

27. Huruvida det här jobbet blir gjort på rätt sätt eller inte är helt klart mitt ansvar.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
Section 3: My supervisor

Coaching
How much do you agree with the statement?
1= Disagree strongly
2= Disagree
3= Disagree slightly
4= Agree slightly
5= Agree
6= Agree strongly

28. I receive a lot of coaching from my boss or those I report to.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

29. Management provides a lot of on-the-job suggestions and tips on ways they think I can improve my selling skills and abilities.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

30. There are senior salespeople designated by management who offer me a lot of coaching.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

31. Management makes sure I know how to carry out my assigned tasks.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

32. Management gives me training intended to improve my productivity.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

Del 3: Min chef

Coaching
Nedan listas ett antal påståenden som skulle kunna användas för att beskriva coaching. Vänligen ange om du håller med påståendena eller ej.
Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

28. Jag får en hel del coaching från min chef eller de som jag rapporterar till.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

29. Min chef bidrar med en hel del jobbrelaterade förslag och tips på hur de tror att jag kan förbättra mina färdigheter och bli en skickligare försäljare.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

30. Cheferna har utsett säljare med stor erfarenhet som kan erbjuda mig en hel del coaching.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

31. Min chef ser till att jag vet hur jag skall utföra de uppgifter jag blir tilldelad.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

32. Min chef ger mig utbildning som syftar till att förbättra min produktivitet.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
Section 3: Feedback
How much do you agree with the statement?
1= Disagree strongly
2= Disagree
3= Disagree slightly
4= Agree slightly
5= Agree
6= Agree strongly

33. My manager makes it a point of telling me when he thinks I manage my time well.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 – 3 \rightarrow \text{4} \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

34. My manager commends me when he thinks I'm using the "right" selling techniques.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 – 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

35. My manager tells me when I deal with customers appropriately.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

36. My manager expresses his approval when he sees me going about my job as he expects.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

37. When my manager thinks I have done something wrong, he lets me know about it.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

38. My manager makes it a point to tell me when he thinks I am not using the right selling techniques.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

39. When I deal with customers in a way my manager disapproves, he lets me know.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

Del 3: Feedback
Nedan listas ett antal påståenden som skulle kunna användas för att beskriva feedback från din chef. Vänligen ange om du håller med påståendet eller ej. Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

33. Min chef talar alltid om för mig när denne tycker att jag använder min tid väl.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

34. Min chef berömmer mig när denne tycker att jag använder rätt försäljningstekniker.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

35. Min chef talar om för mig när jag behandlar kunderna på lämpligt sätt.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

36. När min chef tycker att jag lever upp till förväntningarna säger denne det till mig.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

37. När min chef tycker att jag har gjort något fel låter denne mig få veta det.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

38. Min chef talar alltid om för mig när denne tycker att jag inte använder rätt försäljningstekniker.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]

39. När jag behandlar kunder på ett sätt som min chef ogillar låter denne mig få veta det.
   \[ \text{1} – 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \]
40. My manager would let me know if I didn't present a new product/service properly.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

41. When my manager doesn't find me working the way he expects he tells me about it.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

42. When my manager thinks my performance is good, he provides me with positive feedback.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

43. My manager lets me know when he thinks I am producing good results.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

44. When I sell an impressive number of cars, my manager makes it a point of mentioning it to me.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

45. My manager gives me a "pat on the back" when he thinks I made a good gross profit.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

46. When my manager is satisfied with my sales output, he comments about it.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

47. My manager tells me when he is upset with my performance.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

48. When my sales are low, my manager brings it to my attention.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

49. My manager is prompt in letting me know when my output is below his expectations.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

40. Min chef skulle låta mig veta om jag inte presenterar en ny produkt/tjänst på rätt sätt.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

41. När min chef tycker att jag inte lever upp till förväntningarna säger denne det till mig.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

42. När min chef tycker att min prestation är bra ger han/hon mig positiv feedback.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

43. Min chef talar om för mig när han/hon tycker att jag levererar goda resultat.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

44. När jag säljer mycket får jag alltid veta det av min chef.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

45. Min chef ger mig en "klapp på axeln" när han/hon tycker att jag gjort ett bra jobb.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

46. När min chef är nöjd med min försäljning säger han/hon det.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

47. Min chef säger till mig när han/hon är upprörd över min prestation.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

48. När min försäljning är låg uppmärksammar min chef mig på det.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

49. Min chef dröjer inte med att låta mig veta när min produktion är under hans/hennes förväntningar.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
50. When I fail to meet his sales expectations, my manager indicates his dissatisfaction.

50. När jag misslyckas med att uppfylla min chefs försäljningsförvänt-ningar visar han/hon sitt missnöje.
### Section 4: My Role in the company
How much do you agree with the statement?

1= Disagree strongly
2= Disagree
3= Disagree slightly
4= Agree slightly
5= Agree
6= Agree strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. I work under incompatible policies and guidelines. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I have to work under vague directives and orders. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I have to do things that should be done differently. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I have to work on unnecessary things. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I am certain about how much authority I have in my selling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I know what my responsibilities are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Del 4: Min roll i företaget
Nedan listas ett antal påståenden som skulle kunna användas för att beskriva hur tydlig din roll i företaget är. Vänligen ange om du håller med påståendet eller ej.

Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?

1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Jag arbetar under riktlinjer och policyers som är inkompatibla med varandra. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Två eller fler personer ställer krav på mig som är inkompatibla med varandra. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Jag tvingas arbeta under otydliga direktiv. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Jag måste göra saker som bör göras annorlunda. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Jag måste arbeta med onödiga uppgifter. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Jag är säker på hur mycket auktoritet jag har.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Jag vet vad mitt ansvar är.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Jag vet precis vad som förväntas av mig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. My goals and objectives have been clearly defined.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

60. I am certain about what has to be done.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
Section 5: Consumer orientation

How much do you agree with the statement?
1= Disagree strongly
2= Disagree
3= Disagree slightly
4= Agree slightly
5= Agree
6= Agree strongly

61. I try to determine how I can best help the customer solve his/her problem.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

62. I always present the customer with a realistic picture of what my firm’s products can do.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

63. I spend much of my time listening to the customer talk about his/her needs.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

64. I wait until I fully understand the customer’s needs before making my sales presentation.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

65. I am always candid in discussions with my customers.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

Del 5: Kundorientering

Nedan listas ett antal påståenden som skulle kunna användas för att beskriva hur du arbetar med kunden. Vänligen ange om du håller med påståendet eller ej.

Hur väl instämmer du med påståendena?
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer inte
3 = Instämmer mestadels inte
4 = Instämmer delvis
5 = Instämmer
6 = Instämmer helt

   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

63. Jag lägger mycket av min tid på att lyssna till kunden och prata om vad han/hon har för behov.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

64. Jag väntar tills jag har full förståelse för kundens behov innan jag påbörjar min försäljningspresentation.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

65. Jag är alltid uppriktig i diskussioner med mina kunder.
   1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
### CHRONBACH’S ALPHA

#### Skill variety
*Table 8 – Reliability and item statistics for skill variety*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill variety</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job is quite simple and repetitive. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Task identity
*Table 9 – Reliability and item statistics for task identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job provides me a chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin. (Removed this item)</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task significance

**Table 10 – Reliability and item statistics for task significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done.</td>
<td>4.492</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things. (Reversed) (Removed this item)</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Autonomy

**Table 11 – Reliability and item statistics for autonomy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work. (Reversed) (Removed this item)</td>
<td>3.369</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job gives me a considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Job feedback

*Table 12 – Reliability and item statistics for job feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job feedback</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well. (Reversed) (Removed this item)</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive behavioral feedback

*Table 13 – Reliability and item statistics for positive behavioral feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive behavioral feedback</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes it a point of telling me when he/she thinks I manage my time well.</td>
<td>13,785</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager commends me when he/she thinks I am using the right selling techniques.</td>
<td>13,023</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells me when I deal with customer appropriately.</td>
<td>13,023</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager expresses his/her approval when he sees me go about my job as he/she expects.</td>
<td>13,015</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Negative behavioral feedback**

*Table 14 – Reliability and item statistics for negative behavioral feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-TOTAL Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavioral feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my manager thinks I have done something wrong, he/she lets me know about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes it a point to tell me when he/she thinks I am not using the right selling techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I deal with customers in a way my manager disapproves, he/she lets me know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager would let me know if I did not present a new product/service properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my manager does not find me working the way he/she expects me he/she tells me about it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive output feedback**

*Table 15 – Reliability and item statistics for positive outcome feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-TOTAL Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive output feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my manager thinks my performance is good, he/she provides me with positive feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager lets me know when he/she thinks I am producing good results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I sell an impressive number of contracts, my manager makes it a point of telling me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives me a pat on the back when he/she thinks I made a good gross profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my manager is satisfied with my sales output, he/she comments about it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Negative output feedback

*Table 16 – Reliability and item statistics for negative outcome feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative output feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells me when he is upset with my performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my sales are low, my manager brings it to my attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is prompt in letting me know when my output is below his/her expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I fail to meet his sales expectations, my manager indicates his dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coaching

*Table 17 – Reliability and item statistics for coaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive a lot of coaching from my boss or those I report to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management provides a lot of on-the-job suggestions and tips on ways they think I can improve my selling skills and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are senior salespeople designated by management who offer me a lot of coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management makes sure I know how to carry out my assigned tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management gives me training intended to improve my productivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Experienced meaningfulness

**Table 18 – Reliability and item statistics for experienced meaningfulness**

#### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.786</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced meaningfulness</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the things I have to do on this job seem useless or trivial. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experienced responsibility

**Table 19 – Reliability and item statistics for experienced responsibility**

#### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.467</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced responsibility</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is hard, on this job, for me to care very much about whether or not the work gets done right. (Reversed) (Removed this item)</td>
<td>13,377</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job. (Removed this item)</td>
<td>13,885</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I should personally take credit or blame for the results of my work on this job.</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not this job gets done right is clearly my responsibility. (Removed this item)</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Knowledge of results

**Table 20 – Reliability and item statistics for knowledge of results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>,494</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
<th>Knowledge of results</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I usually know whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job.</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>,329</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I often have trouble figuring out whether I am doing well or poorly on this job. (Reversed) (Removed this Item)</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>,329</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Role conflict

**Table 21 – Reliability and item statistics for role conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>,809</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
<th>Role conflict</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I work under incompatible policies and guidelines. (Reversed)</td>
<td>11,746</td>
<td>14,796</td>
<td>,519</td>
<td>,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I receive incompatible requests from two or more people. (Reversed)</td>
<td>12,085</td>
<td>13,597</td>
<td>,650</td>
<td>,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to work under vague directives and orders. (Reversed)</td>
<td>12,508</td>
<td>15,663</td>
<td>,579</td>
<td>,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to do things that should be done differently. (Reversed)</td>
<td>12,246</td>
<td>14,761</td>
<td>,683</td>
<td>,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to work on unnecessary things. (Reversed)</td>
<td>12,708</td>
<td>15,898</td>
<td>,572</td>
<td>,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role ambiguity

Table 22 – Reliability and item statistics for role ambiguity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
<th>Role ambiguity</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am certain about how much authority I have in my selling.</td>
<td>19,508</td>
<td>10,562</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are.</td>
<td>19,392</td>
<td>10,318</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My goals and objectives have been clearly defined.</td>
<td>19,531</td>
<td>10,003</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am certain about what has to be done.</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intrinsic motivation

Table 23 – Reliability and item statistics for intrinsic motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
<th>Intrinsic motivation</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.</td>
<td>12,469</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.</td>
<td>13,015</td>
<td>7,070</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.</td>
<td>13,969</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job. (Reversed)</td>
<td>13,923</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer orientation

Table 24 – Reliability and item statistics for customer orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.854</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavioral Feedback</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Outcome Feedback</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Outcome Feedback</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Responsibility</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>