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Sales scholars have long been interested in understanding goals, effort, and self-efficacy in the context of salesperson performance. This interest has led many sales scholars to examine Locke's theories related to goal setting and motivation (e.g., Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005; Locke 1968; Locke and Latham 1990). Given the wealth of information on these relationships across a variety of contexts, including sales, it is interesting to note that exceptions to long-held assumptions about the nature of these relationships have recently surfaced (e.g., Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004). These conflicting results raise questions for sales scholars interested in understanding salesperson motivation.

This study seeks to better understand these nonlinear relationships between goals and effort in the context of Locke's (1991) motivation hub. To examine the impact of goal setting and self-efficacy on a salesperson's efforts to sell new products, a well-established framework for understanding motivation was chosen. The motivation hub has several features that make it the appropriate nomological context for this study. First, both self-set goals (SSG) and self-efficacy belong to the motivation hub (Locke 1991), and these elements of the motivation hub are “the most immediate, motivational determinants of action” (Locke 2001, p. 14). Specifically, external stimuli (e.g., company directives) and internal factors (e.g., personality) influence effort and performance “at least partly” through the hub variables (Locke 2001, p. 23). An investigation of both the direct influence and the potential mediating roles of SSG and self-efficacy will provide a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms that drive selling effort.

Second, the motivation hub provides a relevant mechanism for studying the impact of setting assigned goals in a sales force management context. Most sales organizations use assigned goals (i.e., sales quotas) to motivate salespeople regardless of firm size (Douthit 1976; Dubinsky and Barry 1982; Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1977). According to a survey conducted by Hewitt Associates in 2001, more than three-quarters (77 percent) of the 224 U.S. companies that participated in the survey had sales quotas as part of their sales incentive plans (Hewitt Associates 2001). Further, researchers find that between 35.8 percent (Micheal, Rochford, and Wotruba 2003) and 48.0 percent (Wotruba and Rochford 1995) of companies modify these sales quotas when a new product is added to the product portfolio of their sales force. The motivation hub has been empirically shown to mediate the effects of assigned goals on effort (Locke and Latham 1990, p. 29). This study seeks to employ this framework to better understand the nature of the relationships between goals and effort.
In this study, we analyze a longitudinal data set to investigate the impact of goal setting on effort and performance over time. The data set consists of survey results and objective performance measures collected from 143 industrial salespeople at three points in time. The three waves of data collection occurred (1) before the new product launch, (2) three months after the launch, and (3) six months after the launch. Specifically, we collected SSG, self-efficacy, and assigned goal levels in Time 1, selling effort in Time 2, and objective new product sales in Time 3.

This unique data set enables us to investigate several important research questions. First, how do goal levels (both company assigned and self-set) impact selling effort? Are these relationships linear or nonlinear (e.g., inverted U-shape)? Second, is the influence of a salesperson’s quota related to effort directly or is its influence mediated by SSG? Third, how does goal setting impact new product sales? Answers to these questions will advance goal setting and related theories and provide meaningful guidelines to sales managers—particularly during new product launches.

BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Motivation Hub

Goal-setting theory predicts that specific and challenging goals lead to better performance as opposed to vague and nonquantitative goals (such as “do your best” goals) or no goals at all (Locke 1968; Locke and Latham 1990). Following Locke’s (1968) seminal work, research on goal setting has blossomed, and decades of joint effort have seen the motivating effect of goal setting on performance established as “one of the most robust and replicable findings in the psychological literature” (Locke et al. 1981, p. 145). Scholars in other disciplines share similar enthusiasm. For example, out of 73 management theories, goal-setting theory (Locke 1968) is ranked as the most important one by organizational behavior scholars (Miner 2003). The theory also gained popularity among sales researchers who investigated the relationship between goal setting and sales performance in a variety of contexts (e.g., Dalrymple and Cron 1998).

Similarly, social cognitive theory has established its usefulness in the literature in the past three decades (Bandura 1977a; 1977b; 1986). One of the key constructs of the theory is self-efficacy, which refers to “beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and course of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood and Bandura 1989a, p. 408). Empirical studies have found that people who have higher levels of self-efficacy tend to achieve better performance (Bandura 1991; Gist and Mitchell 1992). Specifically, researchers find that self-efficacy affects sales per-
formance not only directly but also indirectly through sales effort (Krishnan, Netemeyer, and Boles 2002), attribution (Dixon and Schertzer 2005), and salespeople’s coping style (Srivastava and Sager 1999). In addition, Locke and Latham (2002) note that self-efficacy may affect performance by enhancing goal commitment. Similar effects also have been identified in sales force research (Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005; Jarmillo and Mulki 2008).

Recognizing the importance of self-efficacy to goal-setting theory, Locke (1991) highlights self-efficacy as a key variable in the motivation hub model. The motivation hub is defined as the “center of activity” and an “enlarged mediation model” in which motivational factors (e.g., assigned goals, feedback, and monetary incentives) influence performance primarily through two hub variables—SSG and self-efficacy (Locke 2001, p. 14). As stated by Locke (1991; 2001), the motivation hub is part of a motivation sequence that flows from needs and values to rewards and satisfaction. SSG (or personal goals) and self-efficacy constitute the hub as they are closest to and most directly affect behavior and outcome. In addition, both SSG and self-efficacy are task related and situation specific (Locke 2001). Due to the pivotal role of the motivation hub in the motivation sequence, understanding the effects of SSG and self-efficacy contributes insights regarding sales force motivation and new product sales and provides implications to sales force management.

Figure 1 posits the conceptual model we developed, which was adapted from Locke and Latham (1990, p. 72, figures 3–5). One notable difference is that we add effort as an intermediary factor between the motivation hub and performance. Effort is listed as a mediator between goals and performance in the high-performance cycle based on the motivation hub (Locke and Latham 1990, p. 253). Our model depicts one antecedent variable—assigned goals (i.e., quotas)—and two outcome variables—selling effort and new product sales. At the core of the model lie the two hub variables—SSG and self-efficacy. Following goal-setting theory, we hypothesize that assigned goals influence sales effort and performance through the motivation hub. Furthermore, salespeople’s SSG are hypothesized to be affected by both their self-efficacy and assigned goals. We also propose that self-efficacy, assigned goals, SSG, and selling effort positively influence new product sales. Our particular interest in this context is, of course, the nature of the relationships between goals (both assigned goals and SSG) and effort. In the context of new product sales, we advance the following hypotheses related to the motivation hub, its antecedents (i.e., assigned goals and SSG), and its consequences (i.e., effort and performance).
Assigned Goals to Self-Efficacy

Locke (2001) lists assigned goals as one of the external incentives that influence performance through the motivation hub. According to goal-setting theory, assigned goals affect performance indirectly through their effects on SSG and self-efficacy (Locke 1991). Researchers argue for a positive relationship between assigned goals and self-efficacy based on both the Pygmalion effect (Eden 1990) and the persuasion effect (Bandura 1986). The former refers to the effect by which individuals set higher goals and achieve better performance because they are expected to do so (Eden 1990). By the same token, the latter suggests that assigned goals affect self-efficacy because assigning challenging goals is an expression of confidence that persuades the salesperson to believe in his or her abilities (Locke 2001). This suggests a positive relationship between assigned goals and self-efficacy.

Assigned Goals to Self-Set Goals

Assigned goals influence SSG because individuals use assigned goals as a piece of normative information when forming their own personal goals (Meyer and Gellatly 1988). For example, Locke et al. (1984) find that SSG are heavily influenced by previously assigned goals and argue that this may be due to the fact that individuals use assigned goals as references when determining their own goals. Not surprisingly, assigned goals and SSG are typically correlated (Locke and Latham 1990). Because it is typically impractical to set new product sales quotas based on past sales, firms usually determine quota levels based on territory potential for a new product (Johnston and Marshall 2005; Spiro, Rich, and Stanton 2007). As salespeople also possess information regarding the market potential of their own territories, their personally set goals are likely to share the same component of information (i.e., territory potential) with assigned goals. As quotas reflect territory potential and signal managers’ expectations, salespeople’s SSG are likely to be positively affected. This suggests a positive relationship between assigned goals and SSG.

Self-Efficacy to Self-Set Goals

Self-efficacy refers to individuals’ confidence in their own ability to master a task or perform well in a specific situation or set of circumstances (Bandura 1977b). The literature has been straightforward regarding the positive relationship between self-efficacy and SSG (Brown, Cron, and Slocum 1998; Locke and Latham 1990; Locke et al. 1984; Wood and Bandura 1989a, 1989b). When salespeople are confident in their own ability to successfully sell a new product, they are more likely to form cognitive representations of possible future success and therefore set higher personal goals (Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005).

These arguments have meaningful implications for sales force management. Within the context of new product launches, self-efficacy can be viewed as a salesperson’s cognitive belief that he or she is capable of successfully selling a new product to target customers, whereas SSG are specific new product sales objectives set by salespeople for a specific period of time. This suggests a positive relationship between self-efficacy and SSG. Based on the aforementioned reasoning, we test three hypotheses for the purpose of control and validation in our model:

Hypothesis 1: Assigned goals (e.g., quotas) will positively influence a salesperson’s self-efficacy in selling new products.

Hypothesis 2: Assigned goals (e.g., quotas) will positively influence a salesperson’s SSG.

Hypothesis 3: A salesperson’s self-efficacy will positively influence SSG.

Selling Effort

Self-Efficacy to Effort

Selling effort refers to “the force, energy or activity by which work is accomplished” (Brown and Peterson 1994, p. 71). Locke and Latham indicate that effort is a primary mediating mechanism “by which goals actually affect performance” (1990, p. 261). Bandura has long argued that self-efficacy is a determinant of how hard a person will work: “efficacy expectations are a major determinant of people’s choice of activities, how much effort they will expend, and of how long they will sustain effort” (1977a, p. 194). Support for this relationship is found across a range of settings (Wood and Bandura 1989b). Based on previous research, we seek to replicate these findings; therefore, we hypothesize that

Hypothesis 4: A salesperson’s self-efficacy will positively influence selling effort.

Assigned Goals to Effort

The effect of quotas (assigned goals) on effort is well documented by researchers from industrial and organizational psychology (Latham and Locke 1991; Locke 1968) and sales management (Chowdhury 1993; Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004; Wotruba 1989). Although the dominant early thinking assumes that goal level is linearly related to effort and that a higher goal level is always better in inducing effort (Latham and Locke 1991; Locke 1968), this assumption is not without challenges. For example, Atkinson (1958) finds that task difficulty is related to performance in a curvilinear relationship. Specifically, the highest level of effort occurs when the task is neither too easy nor too difficult. Similarly,
Earley, Connolly, and Ekegen (1989) argue that when people are confronted with a complex task, a very difficult goal may be less motivational than a "do your best" goal. They believe this is because an over-challenging goal can create evaluative pressure and performance anxiety, which lead people to be so anxious to succeed that they fail to discover the most effective performance strategies.

More recently, this notion has gained interest among sales researchers, and similar effects are found in this stream of research (Chowdhury 1993; Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004). Using an experimental study, Chowdhury finds that "expenditure of effort is highest when sales quotas are of intermediate levels of difficulty" (1993, p. 31). This phenomenon is accounted for by expectancy theory and the compliance effect (Chowdhury 1993). Expectancy is defined as the perceived link between increased effort and enhanced performance (Vroom 1964). According to expectancy theory, a salesperson's motivation and effort decrease as quotas increase—because higher quotas are more difficult to achieve (i.e., higher quotas lead to lower expectancy) (Vroom 1964). However, as suggested by Chowdhury (1993), quotas may simultaneously evoke a compliance effect, which represents the phenomenon by which salespeople redirect or modify their efforts to accommodate the goal assigned to them (i.e., sales quotas). Chowdhury (1993) further argues that when quotas are low, the compliance effect will dominate and, as quotas increase, salespeople's intentions to expend effort will increase. However, when quotas continue to increase, the compliance effect is overtaken by the negative effect on the level of expectancy, and salespeople's selling efforts are eventually dampened.

Following the same logic, Fang, Palmatier, and Evans (2004) test an empirical model with survey data collected from salespeople in both the United States and China. They discover that goal difficulty influences U.S. salespeople's selling effort with an inverted-U-shaped relationship (i.e., goal difficulty has a curvilinear relationship with salespeople's selling effort). In particular, salespeople were less willing to exert effort "when the goals set by sales managers were either easy or extremely difficult than when the goals were moderately difficult" (Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004, p. 197). The authors believe that when faced with easy goals, salespeople tend to have confidence they can fulfill the goals without investing a great amount of effort. In contrast, when goals are perceived to be extremely difficult, salespeople tend to have a low expectancy, which results in reduced motivation and less effort (Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004).

In the context of selling a new product, other factors may contribute to the curvilinear relationship as well. For example, researchers agree that selling a new product involves an investment of effort and resources with uncertainty (Chandy and Tellis 2000; Sorescu, Chandy, and Prabhu 2003). This uncertainty is fully recognized among individual salespeople who sell multiple products to multiple accounts, as they have to decide where to allocate their efforts (Atuahene-Gima 1997; Basu et al. 1985; Lal and Srinivasan 1993). Using four experimental studies, Ross (1991) finds that salespeople use quotas as reference points that influence their risk-taking behavior. Specifically, when salespeople perceive themselves to have a good chance of making quota, they are more willing to take risks in order to maximize their opportunity. In fact, in Ross's (1991) experiments, salespeople who felt that their chance of making quota was high chose the riskier and higher potential accounts, as these accounts represented a better chance to make quota. In contrast, when salespeople perceive themselves to have little or no chance of reaching their quota, they become more risk averse by choosing safer (lower potential) accounts. It is likely that assigned goals not only impact effort levels but also effort directions (Katerberg and Blau 1983). Compared to existing products, new products represent a riskier (and, hopefully, a higher potential) option. When salespeople perceive that they have a good chance of making their quota, they are willing to take the risk by allocating more effort toward selling the new products. However, once they believe company-assigned quotas on the new products to be too high and unattainable, they are likely to shift their efforts away from new products to safer, existing products. Although this inverted-U-shaped relationship runs counter to conventional wisdom on the assigned goals–effort relationship, we argue that given the context, we will find support for a nonlinear relationship. Therefore, we hypothesize that

Hypothesis 5: A salesperson's company-assigned goals (i.e., sales quotas) influence selling effort with an inverted U-shaped relationship.

Self-Set Goals to Effort

SSG represent personally established objectives for task accomplishment (Locke and Latham 1990). Also known as personal goals, SSG reflect the internalization of a task expectation and act as a proxy for commitment (Locke 2001). Compared to assigned goals, SSG are likely to influence salespeople's selling effort in a similar way, although some underlying mechanisms may differ. Salespeople's SSG serve two purposes in inducing selling effort. First, similar to assigned goals, SSG act as a reference and motivate salespeople to exert effort (Locke and Latham 1990). Second, when a company adds a new product to the portfolio of its sales force, salespeople who have set specific performance goals with respect to selling the new product are more likely to remain persistent on the focal product over a period of time. In an experimental context, Strickland and Galimba (2001) find that when participants are given a variety of tasks, those who set SSG switch tasks significantly less often than those who do not set personal goals. The logic may be
that SSG provide a structure that reduces both initial ambiguity and potential stress associated with a task and they help individuals focus on the task at hand. For many salespeople who carry multiple products, selling new products is a strategic choice of effort allocation between products with uncertainty (Zoltners, Sinha, and Zoltners 2001). SSG help salespeople exert initial effort and maintain persistence over time (Locke and Latham 1990). This is especially acute during new product launches, as salespeople typically suffer role ambiguity and frequently encounter customer rejections when introducing new products to target segments (Atuahene-Gima 1997).

However, the positive effect of SSG on selling effort is likely to reach a plateau when these personal goals are set overly high. SSG are, by nature, a cognitive construct that focuses on future states (Zaleski 1987). Researchers recognize that when people make predictions about future events, they have the tendency to be overly optimistic (Taylor 1991). Wicker et al. argue that “perhaps it is easy to underestimate the costs of high-effort work” and to “overestimate one’s ability to sustain those costs because they are low in cognitive availability when they are far in the future and not yet clearly and vividly imagined” (2004, p. 430). This phenomenon corresponds to the “planning fallacy”—a term coined by Kahneman and Tversky (1979)—and helps explain the difficulty in setting goals and the ill effects of setting them too high.

SSG are a salesperson’s cognitive representation of future performance. Due to the uncertainty associated with new product launches (Atuahene-Gima 1997; Chandy and Tellis 2000; Sorescu, Chandy, and Prabhu 2003), when salespeople predict their performance in selling a new product, they are likely to suffer an “illusion of future attainment” (Wicker et al. 2004, p. 430). During new product prelaunches, companies typically present the new product in its best light and provide promotional influence such as specifying rewards (Wieseke, Homburg, and Lee 2008). These positive representations of the product may lead salespeople to overestimate the potential of a new product in their territory and set sales goals that are too high (Taylor 1991). Faced with a goal that reflects this unrealistic optimism, they may redefine success in order to reduce cognitive dissonance, maintain internal consistency, and save face (Bagozzi and Dholakia 1999; Cron et al. 2005).

In the context of selling new products, salespeople who carry multiple products may shift effort from the new product (the one for which they set unrealistic goals) to other products in order to achieve redefined success. In other words, even if high SSG induce high levels of effort at the beginning of the selling process, overly optimistic goals may eventually lead to a lower overall effort level as salespeople shift their efforts to other products with more attainable performance targets.

At the same time, salespeople may underestimate the cost of their efforts—for example, the opportunity cost of other product sales foregone (Wicker et al. 2004) and the cost associated with a potential failure of a new product (Montoya-Weiss and Calantone 1994; Rangan, Meneses, and Maier 1992). Despite the resources invested by many companies, the failure rates of new products continue to run very high (Boulding, Morgan, and Staelin 1997). In fact, some researchers suggest that managers should “pull the plug” when it is necessary to stop the new product’s drain on resources (Biyalogorsky, Boulding, and Staelin 2006; Boulding, Morgan, and Staelin 1997). When managers reduce their support for a new product, salespeople may consider their efforts to sell the new product to be wasted efforts. Although there are few academic studies focusing on salespeople’s effort-allocation strategies during new product launches, it is reasonable to expect that salespeople may calculate the potential costs and benefits of their efforts (Basu et al. 1985). When salespeople realize that they have underestimated the cost of their efforts (an aspect of the notion of unrealistic optimism), they are likely to reallocate their effort to other products due to the aforementioned cognitive dissonance effect (Festinger 1957). This reallocation will result in a reduced effort when sales goals are set too high. Based on these lines of reasoning, we conclude that a medium-level SSG should induce the highest level of effort.


Mediation of Assigned Goals on Effort by Self-Set Goals

According to goal-setting theory, assigned goals reflect other people’s expectations and SSG indicate individuals’ personal commitments. Assigned goals are likely to induce effort indirectly through SSG because they depend on the extent to which individuals commit to what others ask them to accomplish (Locke and Latham 2002). In a study examining the role of goal acceptance in goal setting and task performance, Erez and Kanfer (1983) argue that the extent to which subordinates accept the organizational goals in order to form their own goals has a significant influence on individuals’ intentions and behaviors in achieving these goals. In the context of selling new products, when salespeople do not accept quotas (assigned goals), they are less likely to exert effort in order to achieve quotas. Expectancy theory suggests that when facing assigned goals, salespeople cognitively evaluate the likelihood of success before determining the level of effort they are going to exert (Vroom 1964). Assigned goals can induce effort only after salespeople form a favorable attitude toward and are committed to the assigned goals. Acceptance and commitment of assigned goals are often represented by higher SSG. This suggests that SSG are likely to mediate the impact of company-assigned goals on selling effort.

The mediating role of SSG on the assigned goals–performance relationship is also suggested by the motivation hub model.
As demonstrated in Figure 1, the motivation hub model asserts that SSG represent the most immediate determinant, which mediates the impact of other motivators (including assigned goals) on performance (Locke and Latham 1990). Meyer and Gellatly (1988) argue that individuals use the normative information conveyed in assigned goals in order to form their own SSG. Using two laboratory studies, they confirm this conjecture and find that the effects of assigned goals on performance are fully mediated by SSG. A partial mediation effect is reported by Earley and Lituchy (1991) as they find that SSG and self-efficacy substantially, but not completely, mediate the significant effects of assigned goal difficulty on performance. Similarly, Meyer, Schacht-Cole, and Gellatly (1988) find that SSG mediate the effects of assigned goals. All of these tests were conducted in laboratory settings, which enjoyed internal validity but lacked external validity.

Few field studies have directly examined the mediating effect of SSG on the assigned goals–effort relationship; however, related empirical findings suggest the potential mediation effects of SSG. For example, Wotruba (1989) argues that if a salesperson does not believe that a goal is important, then the impact of that goal on effort is expected to be less than that of a salesperson who believes the goal to be important to performance. In addition, Mento, Cartledge, and Locke (1980) find that self-assigned personal goals (i.e., SSG) are better predictors of performance than assigned goals from superiors. Similarly, using a sample of 88 salespeople, Hollenbeck and Williams (1987) find that salespeople attribute greater importance to SSG than assigned goals. This empirical evidence directly supports the notion that SSG are likely to have a stronger impact on selling effort than assigned goals, and implies that salespeople’s SSG may mediate the impact of company-assigned goals on their effort. We seek a direct test of this mediation in a field study to provide evidence of external validity in the assigned goals–SSG–effort mediation. Based on the aforementioned arguments, we posit:

**Hypothesis 7:** A salesperson’s SSG will fully mediate company-assigned goals impact on effort such that company-assigned goals will not influence selling effort when a salesperson’s SSG are controlled.

**Performance**

Many studies have validated the positive effects of self-efficacy (Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp 2005; Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005), SSG levels (Brown, Cron, and Slocum 1998; Callahan et al. 2003; Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004; Locke and Latham 1990; Mento, Steel, and Karren 1987), and selling effort (Brown and Peterson 1994; Christen, Iyer, and Soberman 2006) on sales performance. During new product launches, salespeople who are more confident in their ability to sell new products successfully, who set higher personal sales goals, and who exert more effort are likely to achieve better new product sales. In addition, because assigned goals (such as sales quotas) partially reflect territory potential (Johnston and Marshall 2005; Spiro, Rich, and Stanton 2007), we hypothesize that company-assigned goals will also directly affect sales performance. Therefore,

**Hypothesis 8:** A salesperson’s (a) self-efficacy, (b) SSG, (c) selling effort, and (d) company-assigned goals are positively related to new product sales.

**METHOD**

**Data Collection**

The sample frame consists of 802 salespeople working in both the United States and Canada for a large, global corporation that develops, manufactures, and markets products for professional customers in the construction and building maintenance industries. We examine a new product launched in 2005, as this situation is conducive to understanding goal setting. It should be noted that this new product was similar in several ways to the other products the focal company sells in terms of target market, sales cycle, and pricing. The salespeople who sold this product worked independently in their own assigned territories, carried multiple products, and were all responsible for the new product launch. In accordance with the company’s standard practices, the new product was demonstrated to the sales force during an internal meeting prior to launch. Technical features, marketing strategies, and supporting resources were also presented to the sales force in a series of prelaunch sales meetings. No product-specific bonus was directly linked to the sale of the new product. Rather, the new product became part of the regular portfolio of products for the sales force and therefore was a part of the standard compensation plan. The standard compensation plan included volume quotas for sales of all products collectively and incentives for exceeding quota. Based on territory potential and historical sales data, the company assigned each salesperson a specific unit volume goal (i.e., quota) for this new product. Despite the lack of direct incentives, salespeople were aware that the performance ranking of this new product would be publicized regularly through internal communications in sales meetings.

We administered data collection in three waves. Specifically, in Time 1, we collected data using questionnaires posted on the company’s intranet. Just before the new product was released to the market, one of the sales executives sent the salespeople an e-mail to encourage participation in the survey. As a part of the questionnaire, we collected a measure of self-efficacy and asked salespeople to carefully estimate their personal goal for unit sales of the new product (SSG). During Time 1, we
also gathered company records regarding individual quotas (assigned goals) for sales of the new product. In Time 2, which occurred three months after the new product launch, we collected self-reported selling effort from each salesperson using the same Web site. In Time 3, six months after the launch, we collected objective performance data (unit sales of the new product) from company records. Data regarding assigned goals, SSG, and objective performance measures were all based on the same time period for proper comparison. In total, 439 salespeople (54.7 percent response rate) completed the Time 1 survey and 152 salespeople (19.0 percent response rate) completed the Time 2 survey. After linking these two sets of responses to Time 3 data (unit sales), we generated 143 usable responses (17.9 percent response rate). Most of the salespeople participating in the study were male (93.3 percent), and the average age was 40.5 years. The average sales experience was approximately 15 years, and organizational tenure was nearly 10 years.

To address response bias, we conducted a comparison of known values for the population analysis (Armstrong and Overton 1977). At the end of the project, 777 salespeople remained in their current positions from the original sample frame of 802 salespeople. We compared this group of 777 salespeople to our sample across a range of measures. Specifically, we compared the quotas and new product sales of the 439 salespeople who completed our Time 1 survey with the company averages of the 777 salespeople. Tests of equality showed that neither new product performance \( Z = -0.718; \) n.s. [not significant] nor selling quota \( Z = 1.447; \) n.s. of salespeople in our sample differed significantly from the company’s averages. In addition, we tested equality of new product performance \( Z = -1.246; \) n.s. and selling quota \( Z = 0.387; \) n.s. between the 439 salespeople and the 143 salespeople in our final sample and found no differences. Further, we compared our final sample \( n = 143 \) with the company averages \( n = 777 \) and found no significant difference for new product performance \( Z = 0.792; \) n.s. and selling quota \( Z = 0.389; \) n.s.). These results indicate that nonresponse is not a significant threat to the validity of our study.

### Measures

We examined five constructs in this study—assigned goals (i.e., quotas), SSG, self-efficacy, selling effort, and new product sales. Both assigned goals levels (i.e., quotas) and new product sales were obtained through company records and were measured in units. Salespeople’s self-efficacy, SSG, and selling effort are self-reported measures and are described below. Descriptive statistics and construct intercorrelations are reported in Table 1.

#### Assigned Goals (i.e., Quotas)

We measured salespeople’s assigned goals (i.e., quotas) as the number of units each salesperson was expected to sell. These goals were assigned to salespeople by management based on their territory potential prior to the new product launch. Assigned goals were gathered from company records. The average number of units assigned is 20.92 per salesperson, and the standard deviation is 17.95 units.

#### Self-Set Goals

Prior to the new product launch, each salesperson was asked to indicate the number of units they targeted for themselves to sell as their sales goal (Brown, Cron, and Slocum 1998). The average number of units each salesperson indicated that they could sell is 13.39, and the standard deviation is 11.96 units.

#### Self-Efficacy

To measure self-efficacy, we asked salespeople to indicate their confidence in their ability to perform “as well as, or better than” other salespeople in the company in terms of sales of the new product. Following the recommendation of Bandura (1997) and the example of Brown, Jones, and Leigh (2005), we used magnitude and confidence scores to measure self-efficacy. The magnitude measure asked salespeople to indicate the propor-

---

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Assigned Goals</th>
<th>Self-Set Goals</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Goals</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Set Goals</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01. \)
Selling Effort

We measured salespeople’s effort to sell the new product with three self-reported items adapted from Brown and Peterson (1994). Three months after the new product was launched, we asked the study participants how much effort (overall, number of hours worked, and total number of calls made) they exerted selling the new product compared to other products they sell. These items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = “far less than other products” and 7 = “far exceeded other products.” The internal consistencies of selling effort are satisfactory (coefficient alpha = 0.918).

Performance

Performance was measured with the actual number of units each salesperson sold six months after the new product launch. We collected the data according to the company’s sales records. The average number of units sold is 5.65, and the standard deviation is 7.27 units.

RESULTS

Hypotheses Testing

We tested the hypotheses using seemingly unrelated regressions (SURs). Given the longitudinal nature of the data and the theoretical relationships among the variables of interest, we used SUR because dependent variables from one equation become independent variables in subsequent analyses (Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005; Johnston 1984). These types of relationships among regression equations violate the assumptions of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression by potentially introducing heteroskedasticity and correlated residuals. One of the strengths of the SUR method is that it addresses these potential violations of OLS regression assumptions (Johnston 1984; Zellner 1962). We note that even though the errors are likely to be correlated across the equations, this does not mean the Gauss–Markov assumptions have necessarily been violated. However, by using the SUR model to estimate the equations simultaneously, we can improve efficiency. An efficient estimator is desirable as it is the minimum variance unbiased estimator, and thus all standard errors are better estimated than using OLS regression. The model we tested consists of the following four equations:

\[
SE = \alpha_1 + \beta_{11} AG + \epsilon_1
\]

\[
SSG = \alpha_2 + \beta_{21} SE + \beta_{22} AG + \epsilon_2
\]

\[
Effort = \alpha_3 + \beta_{31} SE + \beta_{32} AG + \beta_{33} AG^2 + \beta_{34} SSG + \beta_{35} SSG^2 + \epsilon_3
\]

\[
Performance = \alpha_4 + \beta_{41} SE + \beta_{42} AG + \beta_{43} SSG + \beta_{44} Effort + \epsilon_4
\]

In the equations above, the following abbreviations are used: SE = self-efficacy, AG = assigned goal, SSG = self-set goal, effort = sales effort, and performance = new product sales. The quadratic terms of assigned goals and SSG are added to test the nonlinear relationships between goal levels and selling effort (Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004; Ping 1995). To test H7, we replace Equation (3) with the following equation and rerun the SUR analysis.

\[
Effort = \alpha_{3a} + \beta_{31a} SE + \beta_{32a} AG + \beta_{33a} AG^2 + \epsilon_{3a}
\]

Results

The SUR results are reported in Table 2. As expected, assigned goals have a positive effect on salespeople’s self-efficacy ($\beta_{11} = 0.32, p < 0.01$). Further, salespeople’s self-efficacy ($\beta_{21} = 0.19, p < 0.05$) and company-assigned goals ($\beta_{22} = 0.38, p < 0.01$) positively affect SSG. These results support H1 through 3 and validate our model as they are consistent with prior theoretic predictions. We find, as expected in H4, that the relationship between self-efficacy and selling effort is positive and statistically significant in Equations (3) ($\beta_{31} = 0.25, p < 0.01$) and (3a) ($\beta_{31a} = 0.20, p < 0.05$). Contrary to recent empirical evidence (Chowdhury 1993; Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004), we find that H5, which posits company-assigned goals influence salespeople’s selling effort in a nonlinear way, is not supported. Although we find a significant linear relationship between assigned goal levels and selling effort ($\beta_{32} = 0.22, p < 0.05$), the expected negative relationship between the squared term of assigned goals and selling effort is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($\beta_{32a} = -0.15, p < 0.10$); both of these betas should be significant to identify a nonlinear relationship. In contrast, H6 is supported as we find that both the linear SSG term ($\beta_{34} = 0.46, p < 0.01$) and the quadratic SSG term ($\beta_{34} = -0.30, p < 0.05$) are significant and have the expected signs. Therefore, we find support that SSG levels have an inverted-U-shaped relationship with selling effort. Figure 2 depicts the plot of the effects of SSG on selling...
effort. The relationship demonstrates an inverted-U-shaped curve. The effects of SSG on selling effort are positive until it reaches an optimal point, after which it becomes negative.

We followed the approach suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) to test the mediation effect of salespeople’s SSG (H7). First, we show that the independent variable (AG) affects the mediator (SSG). Second, we demonstrate that the independent variable (AG) affects the dependent variable (effort). Third, we show that the relationship between the independent variable (AG) and the dependent variable (effort) becomes nonsignificant after the mediator (SSG) is controlled. Comparing the results of Equation (3) to those of Equation (3a), we discover that adding salespeople’s SSG and the corresponding quadratic term cause the relationships between assigned goals ($\beta_{22} = 0.11, \text{n.s.}$) and selling effort, along with assigned goals’ quadratic term ($\beta_{32} = -0.12, \text{n.s.}$) and selling effort to become nonsignificant. Table 2 also shows that adding the two terms to the equation increases $R^2$ by 6.52 percent (from 12.1 percent to 18.6 percent). The incremental $F$ is significant ($\Delta F = 8.80, p < 0.001$). These results support H7.

H8 suggests that salespeople’s self-efficacy, SSG, effort, and assigned goals all have positive relationships with new product sales. As expected, the coefficients of assigned goals ($\beta_{42} = 0.24, p < 0.01$), SSG ($\beta_{43} = 0.34, p < 0.01$), and effort ($\beta_{44} = 0.20, p < 0.05$) are all positive and significant. However, the relationship between self-efficacy and new product sales is not significant ($\beta_{41} = 0.043, \text{n.s.}$). Thus, H8b through 8d are supported, but H8a is not supported.
DISCUSSION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Implications for Theory

This paper advances the motivation hub model by examining the effects of assigned goals, self-efficacy, and SSG on both selling effort and new product sales. Based on our analysis of longitudinal, multisource data from an actual work setting, we contribute to the literature in several ways. We start our discussion of contributions by examining results that challenge conventional wisdom with respect to goal theories, as we found support for a curvilinear (as opposed to linear) relationship between SSG and effort but failed to replicate the same relationship between assigned goals and effort.

First, we provide evidence of an inverted U-shaped relationship between SSG and effort—to our knowledge, this is the first such published evidence. Our findings suggest that salespeople exert the highest levels of effort when SSG are neither too low nor too high. This finding conflicts with conventional wisdom that suggests the relationship between SSG and effort is positive and linear (e.g., Brown, Jones, and Leigh 2005; Locke and Latham 1990). Other studies have found evidence of a nonlinear relationship between assigned goals and selling effort and offered a straightforward explanation based on salesperson’s expectancies (Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004). When a salesperson perceives a goal to be easy, then they perceive little effort is required to achieve the goal. Alternatively, when the perception is that the task is difficult, then low expectancies drive down motivation to exert effort on the task. We see parallels in our findings with SSG and justified our hypothesis with similar arguments.

We also examined another explanation for this result which involves the uncertainty of selling a new product. We suggest that a salesperson’s SSG are subject to a possible “illusion of future attainment” (Wicker et al. 2004, p. 430) given the uncertainty of selling new products. Because SSG are salespeople’s cognitive representations of a future performance associated with uncertainty, the possibility that they may be overly optimistic is real. Researchers have demonstrated that when individuals realize their optimism is unrealistic and their goals unattainable, they have the tendency to redefine success and to shift their efforts to another area (Wicker et al. 2004).

Second, we fail to find evidence of the inverted U-shaped relationship between assigned goals and selling effort similar to Chowdhury (1993) and Fang, Palmatier, and Evans (2004). Although we find evidence of the positive, linear relationship between assigned goals and effort, we do not have evidence of a significant quadratic term. It is worth noting that our evidence is directionally consistent with our hypothesis in that the beta associated with the quadratic term is negative, but it failed to demonstrate statistical significance beyond the 0.10 level. Unfortunately, our results provide little clarity in an already unclear relationship between assigned goals and effort. Given these mixed results, more research is clearly needed to fully understand this important relationship.

Third, we also discover a nonsignificant relationship between self-efficacy and performance, which is somewhat surprising. Both self-efficacy and SSG are defined as part of the motivation hub. Goal-setting theory posits that SSG only partially mediate the impact of self-efficacy on performance. Therefore, self-efficacy should have a direct, positive effect on performance (Locke 1991; 2001). Our data suggest that the effects of self-efficacy on new product sales are fully mediated by SSG, further emphasizing the importance of SSG on new product sales. To fully understand this finding, we performed a post hoc analysis to determine the relationships between self-efficacy, SSG, effort, and performance. We find that the relationship between self-efficacy and performance in a model without SSG or effort is only significant at the $p = 0.10$ level. However, the self-efficacy–performance relationship failed to reach even this level of significance with the presence of SSG in the model. When effort is included without SSG, effort does not explain significantly more variance than self-efficacy alone and it does not mediate the self-efficacy–performance relationship.

To explain these findings, we revisit the potential impact of uncertainty on the model. These results may be related to the fact that selling a new product involves more uncertainty for salespeople than that faced in their daily routines. According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy is based on an individual’s overall assessment of his or her performance capabilities. These capabilities may include past performance, aptitude, resourcefulness, coping strategies, and so forth (Bandura 1986; Locke and Latham 1990; Mone and Baker 1992). As a result of the risky, uncertain nature of selling a new product, salespeople may have to discount the perceived effectiveness of their own performance capabilities. The effect of self-efficacy on performance, thus, has to rely more on the pervasive self-regulatory goal processes (Mone and Baker 1992). This rationale advocates the full mediation effect, which we find (as opposed to a partial mediation effect) during the process of selling new products.

Fourth, our study finds that SSG fully mediate the assigned goals–effort relationship and the self-efficacy–performance relationship. We now explore the implications of both results. Results suggest that the impact of assigned goals on selling effort is fully mediated by SSG. This finding was one we expected—as it is one of the underlying predictions that constitute the motivation hub model. However, this effect has rarely been examined in the literature, especially in actual working contexts. Relative to assigned goals, SSG have received little attention in the literature (Moussa 2000). Most goal-setting studies only involve goals that were assigned externally by experimenters, supervisors, or organizations (Chowdhury 1993; Fang, Palmatier, and Evans 2004; Mento, Steel, and...
Karren 1987). Unlike these studies, we distinguish between goals assigned by the company and salespeople's SSG and include both in our model. By examining company-assigned goals and salespeople's SSG simultaneously, we advance the theoretical understanding of the mechanisms that drive salespeople's selling effort.

Fifth, using multisource, longitudinal data, we find support that assigned goals, SSG, and selling effort all positively influence new product sales. These direct influences on performance are consistent with established models as cited in our support for the hypotheses. This confirms that our model is consistent with previous theoretical predictions on several fronts with the exceptions carefully noted above. These results also show that effort does not fully mediate the effects of the motivation hub on performance. Certainly, other factors (e.g., assigned goals and SSG) also play an important direct role.

Sixth, we test these hypotheses in a new product launch context that extends our understanding of sales-related factors that influence the success of new product launches. Specifically, we find that goal levels, particularly SSG levels, are critical to maximizing salesperson effort in the uncertain environment of new product sales.

Finally, it is important to point out the dynamic nature of this model. It takes time before salespeople realize whether their goals have been set at an appropriate level. Only after salespeople have exerted effort can they evaluate the market response. Thus, the effects can only be assessed with a longitudinal study design. In our study, we measure salespeople’s effort three months after measuring their SSG. Therefore, the effort level is an accumulated measurement, and we address a primary shortcoming of using a cross-sectional design within which the curvilinear relationship between SSG and effort is less likely to be detected.

Managerial Implications

The results of this study provide valuable managerial implications to sales managers, marketing managers, and other stakeholders. Using a new product launch as the context to test our hypotheses, we uncover evidence suggesting that managers need to recognize SSG exhibit an inverted-U-shaped relationship with selling effort. This result indicates that internal marketing should not end when a product is launched into the market. On the contrary, managers should maintain sufficient internal communication and provide frequent feedback to salespeople, especially during the first several months of the campaign. We posit that salespeople may lessen their efforts and shift the focus of their activities if their initial efforts fail to achieve the expected progress. Continual support, assistance, and feedback from managers may help resolve this cognitive dissonance (Earley et al. 1990) without loss of sales effort. In addition, as the inverted-U-shaped relationship implies, salespeople who set the highest goals are the most vulnerable to suffer from overoptimism syndrome. Sales managers need to pay special attention to this group of salespeople. However, the curve also implies that the salespeople who set lower goals may not be sufficiently motivated and enthusiastic. Compared to the salespeople who set goals that are too high, the larger challenge may be for sales managers to motivate the lower-goal group. Obviously, customized management based on an in-depth understanding of individual salespeople’s situations should contribute positively to better new product sales.

We also find that salespeople’s SSG fully mediate the effects of assigned goals on selling effort. As SSG reflect salespeople’s commitment to assigned goals, marketing and sales managers need to spend time and effort persuading salespeople that it is in their best interest to sell the new product. It is more important for salespeople to internalize the message associated with the product in order to form their own personal goals than to toss down a seemingly meaningless quota to them. One strategy suggested by Wieseke, Homburg, and Lee (2008) is to focus internal communications regarding new products on positive product attributes. Specifically, managers should explicitly show how product attributes will translate into better sales performance.

Although we do not find a direct impact of self-efficacy on performance, self-efficacy enhances new product sales indirectly. Self-efficacy constitutes an important motivational element as its consequences, effort, and SSG, are positive and significantly related to performance. According to Locke and Latham (2002), managers can raise salespeople’s self-efficacy by (1) providing adequate training, (2) being role models, and (3) expressing confidence in their salespeople. All of these are important to sales management—and are especially critical during new product launches.

Limitations and Future Research

By combining self-reported data and objective data, this study addresses the potential limitation of single-source bias, which is typical to many similar studies. In addition, we employ a longitudinal study design by collecting data at three points in time. Compared to a cross-sectional design, we are in a better position to assess the sequential effects of motivation hub variables on effort and new product sales. However, we acknowledge that our research domain is limited to one specific organization. Readers should be cautioned on the representativeness of the sample and generalizability of the results. The stability of our results needs to be examined in a variety of contexts across various industries.

Moreover, we suggest that these results be examined with a sample of less-experienced salespeople to determine the impact of experience on the SSG–effort relationship. We would expect there to be an increase in accuracy typically associated
with a salesperson's SSG as sales experience increases (Brown, Cron, and Slocum 1998; Wotruba 1989), suggesting that younger salespeople would be less capable in their abilities to predict future performance and therefore may actually demonstrate a more severe inverted-U-shaped curve than our sample demonstrated. In fact, the "illusion of future attainment" may actually be more of a problem with younger salespeople (Wicker et al. 2004). This suggests that our data provide a tougher test of the theory, but that our finding may be more important when managers are dealing with younger, less-experienced sales forces.

Future research should examine the effects of other external factors within the motivation hub model. According to Locke and Latham (2002), these factors are at both the individual and organizational levels. In the context of salespeople selling new products, the former may include salespeople's goal orientation, need for achievement, and personality constructs. At the organizational level, one may investigate research questions that are more relevant to marketing and sales management. For example, how do compensation, job design, feedback, and leadership influence selling effort and performance? And how are these effects mediated by the motivation hub variables? Answers to these questions may lead to better guidance for managers in their endeavor to optimize management strategies and increase sales performance.

Finally, it is interesting to note exceptions to a long-held relationship between two constructs such as SSG and effort; however, we must seek additional empirical evidence to determine the nature of this relationship. In addition, further work should be done to better understand the assigned goals–effort relationship. Particularly, different field contexts and controlled laboratory studies would be useful in confirming these findings. It is our hope that this study will encourage additional research in the area of goals and motivation.
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