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Abstract
The concept of goal orientations and their effects on workplace behavior has been traditionally examined in a domestic context and often within the same organization. This article addresses the shortage of empirical research in this area by exploring whether goal and achievement motivation theory holds in an international Middle Eastern context. Based on data from 225 international sales agents (ISAs) located in the UAE our findings extend the extant literature by providing fresh insights in an inter-firm and international context. Using structural equation modeling, the findings confirm ten hypotheses and we specifically discover that both Positive and Negative Feedback lead to greater Learning and Performance Orientation that in turn influence ISAs located in the Middle East to Work Harder and Smarter, which ultimately leverages Performance outcomes. Several managerial implications for HRM practice are extracted from the study and directions for future research.
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Introduction

With companies under increased pressures to align their international human resource management (IHRM) practices with national culture differences and preferences (Sparrow 1999; Mendenhall and Oddou 2000; Bloom, Milkovich and Mitra 2003; Afiouni et al. 2013), this manuscript is primarily targeted at managers who in their roles continually strive to avoid the pains of ‘passive representation’ in highly competitive international markets with trade intermediaries (Gilliland 2001; Chelariu et al. 2006). In particular, the type of intermediary known as international sales agents (ISAs) is classified as a workforce who belongs to independent businesses. Typically ISAs do not hold title for the products they represent and usually avoid taking physical possession (Rosenbloom 2008). They represent a quasi-integrated mode because manufacturers typically spin off selling related functions to these intermediaries who earn a sales commission (Jackson and D’Amico 1989). They are however, capable of undertaking an array of tasks for the companies they represent and for marketing their products.

The ISA role is often critical as they take responsibility for contacting buyers and obtaining sales in foreign markets. Often undervalued, ISAs frequently have the potential to achieve export success as due to their experience and in-market knowledge, they have familiarity with foreign market conditions and the ability to obtain acceptance among local buyers of the principal’s goods in order to leverage performance advantages (Anderson 1985; Clasen 1991). Managers from principal suppliers typically outsource the foreign sales functions to ISAs, who may also provide other added value activities to help penetrate foreign markets (Bello and Lohtia 1995). As ISAs act out to fulfill complex buying motives on the part of foreign customers they
comprise an important part of international HR development as they engage their knowledge and experience of the market.

Historically, managing such international agents can be challenging as their independent status often leads them to prioritize efforts on those principal suppliers who provide the greatest financial rewards (normally a substantive commission), or those who provide unique offerings that easily sell. It is not uncommon therefore for suppliers to feel that their ISAs shirk responsibility and do not market their product lines as effectively as they ought to. This, combined with an often short supply of reputable parties to choose from in certain international markets makes the international manager’s task even more demanding (Murry and Heide 1998). As managing across borders has now become the norm instead of the exception, it is important to probe the attitudes, motivation and aspirations of individuals operating in lucrative growth markets around the globe (Mehta et al. 2003; Steers et al. 2004).

Exporting companies entering foreign markets often make use of ISAs to gain access to countries of interest. According to Aylward (2006), the appointment of agents in international territories is frequently the most preferred market entry option. These individuals often have a degree of in-market expertise and have highly valuable international contacts (Czinkota and Kotabe 1990; Terpstra and Yu 1990). While managers expend a considerable amount of time and effort for the efficient and effective design of IHRM systems to serve their target markets, true success in achieving the firm’s distribution objectives may not be realized without implementing a systematic program for motivating their partners (Rosenbloom 1990; Mehta et al. 2003).

The current study is rooted in the cognitive theory of goal and achievement motivation theory (McClelland 1951; Atkinson 1964; Nicholls 1984; Ames and Archer 1988; Dweck and Leggett 1988; Locke and Latham 1990). A key assumption of achievement motivation theory is
that a person selects a behavior in an attempt to attain their desired goals (Nicholls 1984). In fact, the theory asserts that goals are the central determinants of behavioral patterns which encompass how a person thinks, feels and behaves in pursuit of a goal (Elliott and Dweck 1988). Although a psychological concept in its origin, this theory now has much wider implications for the behavior of individuals across different fields of management (McClelland 1951; Atkinson 1964; Nicholls 1984; Mehta et al. 2003).

This study aims to examine the impact of goal orientations and its effect on work behavior of ISAs located in the Gulf. Despite knowledge that exercising control over the actions of ISAs in the Middle East can be fraught with difficulties (Stern and El-Ansary 1982) the study of behavioral motivation and HR practices among such parties has not been theoretically explored nor empirically tested using non-descriptive methods. Although the “carrot and stick” philosophy of Western-based economies used for motivating ISAs has in the past failed in the Middle East (Dunn 1979), it is apparent that the characteristics associated with such personnel in the marketplace today are inherently different. These differences are not only cultural due to diverse populations, but driven by the increased Westernization of Arab and sub-continental workforces e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Sri Lankan operating in the Middle East (Rees et al. 2007).

Research examining the impact of Western business practices on the goals and achievement motivation of ISAs in the Middle East appears non-existent. It is important to understand the processes by which ISAs adjust their working behavior when considering the multicultural work environment and high levels of transnational migration that are apparent in these fast changing markets. The need to understand values that drive business behavior in the Middle East is therefore important, especially when considering that the differences of individual
values and work behavior of employees have been largely unexplored and substantially under-researched in this region (Ralston et al. 2012). With this being the case, it is of theoretical importance to test if the behavioral motivation surrounding ISAs that are influenced by Western based practices hold in this context.

In this study, we focus our attention on the more emergent context of the Middle East by exploring the orientations and behavioral preferences of ISAs who primarily operate within markets of the United Arab Emirates. The UAE alone has recently been cited as the world’s third largest re-export nation and a host of international companies are recognizing the potential of Dubai as a leading trading hub, with state of the art infrastructure and a convenient location for providing a gateway to other lucrative emerging markets of the future including India and China (Economic Times 2007; Gupta 2008; Sheth 2009).

Overall, by drawing on a sample of ISAs from the UAE, this study intends to make a clear contribution by addressing the shortage of empirical investigations on goal and achievement motivation theory in the Middle East. Specifically, we contribute to existing theory by addressing the need for an empirical understanding of behavioral processes and the impact of Western business practices affecting ISAs operating in this dynamic Middle East region. Previous studies that have considered Western based management perspectives of motivation have only done so from a managerial stance and have not empirically examined the situation from an ISA perspective (Dunn 1979; El-Ansary 1982). By seeking to explore goal and achievement motivation from an ISA perspective, our study provides fresh insights into the important behavioral practices facing HR managers in a UAE context.

The manuscript is organized as follows: we first provide further detail relating to the background of the study and then develop several hypotheses relating to the concept in general.
Our research methodology within the context of the Middle East is then described ahead of the findings section. The implications follow before the conclusion section that also points out the study’s limitations and provides direction for future research.

**Background**

A paucity of attention has been devoted to examining ISAs that are employed in rapidly developing economies (Parsa et al. 2002), resulting in research activity and its potential value to both scholars and practitioners being overlooked (Johnston 1997; Meyer and Dornach 1997; Neyer 2000; Ahmed 2002). This is somewhat surprising bearing in mind the size and significance of such emerging markets. Agents are one of the most commonly used and necessitated intermediary types in the Middle East. The advantages of having ISAs acting as local representatives are numerous. They can provide a host of information and knowledge relating to the market, they often have powerful connections and can also provide service support. Such activities can be paramount for supporting principal suppliers, with many finding such ISAs indispensable, particularly in the Middle East (Dunn 1979; Moore 1989).

Typically the key criteria for selecting ISAs in the Middle East may include their financial strength; good connections; other obligations (such as a representative handling direct competitors), facilities and equipment (Dunn 1979). Appointing the right agent may also be crucial in governing export achievement (Duguid and Jacques 1971). However, the peculiarities of the Middle Eastern environment stemming from its uniqueness and different legal systems make this market rather difficult to both penetrate and maintain (Kaitaki 1976; Dunn 1979; Stern and El-Ansary 1982). Bearing in mind the greater separation between international workforces in terms of both distance and cultures, it is particularly important for manufacturers to make a
concerted effort to address the needs and problems facing ISAs and provide appropriate support where feasible.

With a shift toward a more value-added paradigm of HR now seeking to widen the scope of examining HR functionalities in non-traditional marketplaces, this research is important to this agenda as it examines how effective motivational HR practices in goal and work behavior can steer exporters toward more productive management of international agents as sales workers in markets inclusive of the Arab Middle East (AME) (see Afouni et al. 2013). Extant literature in HR corroborates the importance of managing sales people who are seen to constitute a unique class of boundary spanning employees (Onyemah et al. 2010; Morelli and Braganza 2011). However, research on how practitioners can better manage ISAs is scarce, especially in business-to-business markets.

With the exception of fairly recent interest on re-seller rejection and the crafting of incentive programs (Mehta 2000; Mehta et al. 2003; Gilliland 2001, 2003, 2004), the majority of research on intermediary motivation is somewhat outdated (Rosenbloom 1978, 1990; Sibley and Teas 1979; Shipley 1984, 1987; Abratt and Pitt 1989). The extant literature is largely descriptive in nature (Sibley and Teas 1979; Shipley 1984, 1987; Abratt and Pitt 1989) with empirical studies virtually non-existent. In addition, other contributions have tended to be exploratory or have focused purely on the domestic environment (Shipley et al. 1989; Rosenbloom and Larsen 1992; Gilliland 2004).

In contrast, the subject of worker motivation has been considered an important issue in the area of sales management (Walker et al. 1977; Winer and Schiff 1980; Cron et al. 1988; Brown et al. 1998). Such managers play an integral role in acting as trainers, motivators and evaluators for their staff. Managerial drivers and motivations are therefore crucial to a firm’s
success. In fact, their relationships harbor many similarities to the relationships pertaining to exporting channels. However, despite this, very little research has been reported that links this interface, with nothing being reported from the Middle East.

Several recent studies have employed the theory of goal and achievement motivation to identify key success factors surrounding high-performing staff (Fang et al. 2004; Lee et al. 2006; Ahearne et al. 2010). A pioneering study was led by Sujan, Weitz and Kumar (1994), who first modeled the inter-related links between feedback, goal orientation, work behavior and performance among U.S. sales people. This effort was followed in similar studies by Kohli et al. (1998) and VandeWalle et al. (1999). Empirical research reporting on goal orientations related to employee motivation and work behavior has generated mixed findings (Silver et al. 2006), suggesting that further investigation into the cause and effects of goal orientations is warranted.

Our model is important as it examines how goal orientation can lead to better HR training and development practices for ISAs by contributing to the issues on people flows (Afiouni et al. 2013), away from a single country case perspective (see studies by Budhwar, Al-Yahmadi and Debrah 2002; Marouf and Rehman 2004 and Al-Madhoun 2006). In doing so we consider the unique role of ISAs as workers operating without single contracts but instead have agreements with multiple organizations. Typically ISAs work with different suppliers, all with different HR practices for commission and training. With exposure to several versions of practices, managers need to consider the uncertainties in which these workers operate in and craft careful HR practices that are clearly accountable to their needs.
Concept and hypotheses development

The conceptual framework of the study is adapted from that of Sujan et al. (1994) to examine achievement motivation patterns which are likely to arise in different cultural contexts, in different forms and channeled towards accomplishing different types of goals (Bhagat and McQuaid 1982). It is important to extend the findings of empirical studies so that more general support can be established for theoretical relationships that predict well in one setting to be tested in other contexts (Robey and Farrow 1982; Robey et al. 1989, 1993). This study extends the original framework of Sujan et al. (1994) by considering further relationships. In total ten hypothesized relationships (H$_1$ – H$_{10}$) are posited for testing in this international context among agents in the Middle East (see Figure 1).

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Feedback and Goal orientation

The provision of feedback has been considered to affect motivation (Hackman and Oldham 1980). In particular, Klein (1989) asserted that feedback and goal orientations are two units of the same motivation process that empirically endorse a relationship. Scholars have described goals as cognitive representations of the things that one wishes to accomplish (Harackiewicz et al. 1998). Two types of goal i.e. learning orientation and performance orientation represent two distinct dimensions (Ames and Archer 1988). Different goals motivate people to achieve different outcomes (Dweck and Leggett 1988). For example, whilst learning goals orient people to improve their competences and master the task they perform, performance goals focus more on extrinsic motivation to obtain extrinsic rewards from third parties.
Supervisory feedback is an important aspect of the work environment and thus positive and negative evaluations of outcomes and behaviors have been found to affect goal orientations among individuals (Carver and Scheier 1981; Boggiano and Barrett 1985). The provision of support and frequent communication represent a need among international agents (Webster 1975; Bobrow 1976; Sibley and Teas 1979). In fact, further understanding the impact of both positive and negative supervisory feedback on ISAs can enable principal suppliers to better judge the nature of supplementary contact and improve communications between the two parties (Gilliland 2001).

Individuals with a strong learning orientation are likely to seek information which can develop their competencies. It is expected that individuals with a learning orientation are by definition in favor of situations where opportunities for learning and improvements exist (Dweck and Leggett 1988). Supervisory feedback provides for these opportunities and has a significant effect on motivating those that would like to enhance learning and improve their skills (Sujan et al. 1994). A strong desire for self-improvement apparently ties learning orientation to an individual’s intrinsic motivation and as a result, these individuals tend to happily welcome both positive and negative feedback from their supervisors. Because a learning orientation motivates behavior that is designed to improve skills, it is expected that feedback will have a greater impact on this particular goal orientation.

Existing research confirms managers should typically avoid dictating to agents or disputing their wisdom in the Middle East (Dunn 1979). The advice to manufacturers in the past has been to blatantly not defer, or question agent decisions in the Middle East - bearing in mind that it is likely to conjure negative responses among workers. Despite this, however, personal relationship management is valued by ISAs in the Middle East who have showed preference for
being handled gently instead of being criticized (Dunn 1979). With differing rules of conduct working in the Middle East, as a heterogeneous environment, the mechanisms of feedback and its effect on motivation is important to be considered among ISAs.

Positive feedback plays the role of confirming the agent’s competence and mastery of the task at hand (Janssen and Prins 2007) and their learning is nurtured in the right direction. Furthermore, negative feedback is also expected to increase learning orientation among agents by signaling the need for self-improvement. Feedback of a negative type can be useful and point out which measures need to be taken to get competencies back on track (cf. Tsui and Ashford 1994). It is therefore likely that ISAs who are learning-oriented will interpret negative feedback from their suppliers more diagnostically than destructively. As a result of this, it is hypothesized that:

H1: Positive feedback will positively influence the learning orientation among ISAs in the Middle East.

H2: Negative feedback will positively influence the learning orientation among ISAs in the Middle East.

In contrast to learning orientation, individuals with performance orientation are more concerned with showing evidence of ability and being judged ‘able’ by being successful in their tasks (Ames and Archer 1988). As a result, such individuals are often more reluctant to experiment with new approaches and face challenges. This type of behavior is purposeful and performed with the intention of avoiding negative perceptions or evaluations (Ames and Archer 1988; Dweck and Leggett 1988; Meece et al. 1988). Causality between negative feedback and performance orientation has been confirmed in the extant research (Sujan et al. 1994). The argument for this is that an individual’s desire to demonstrate ability is further heightened when
receiving negative feedback that showcases their inadequacies and indicates to them that they have failed to demonstrate ability (VandeWalle 1997; Elliot and Church 1997; Elliot 1999).

In contrast with research undertaken in a domestic context (Walker et al. 1977; Sujan et al. 1994), the extrinsic needs of performance orientation may be increased among international agents following positive evaluation where access to suppliers is predominantly managed at arm’s length. ISAs often lack support from their respective companies, which may be a consequence of distance and the fact they are not directly employed. It is therefore deemed important to investigate the relationship between both negative and positive feedback and performance goal orientation, as it is considered that managers providing both types of feedback are looking to motivate their ISAs. Moreover, in the Middle Eastern context where vertical social hierarchy and high power distance co-exist (Tayeb 1991; Hofstede 1994; Budhwar and Mellahi 2007), ISAs are highly likely to value both positive and negative feedback from their principles. Such feedback is therefore considered useful for enhancing performance orientation goals among ISAs. In response, we posit that:

**H3:** Positive feedback will positively influence the performance orientation among ISAs in the Middle East.

**H4:** Negative feedback will positively influence the performance orientation among ISAs in the Middle East.

**Goal orientations and Work behavior**

By understanding goal orientation, psychologists identified links from learning and performance goals to the motivational elements of persistence, intensity and choice in work behavior (Campbell and Pritchard 1976; Weiner 1980). Persistence refers to the duration over which effort is devoted to work and the continuation to try in the face of failure, whereas intensity captures
the level of mental and physical effort expended over a task. Both of these elements combined together form attributes of working hard. In contrast, working smart is the direction chosen to channel effort (Coad 1996). Working smart encompasses behavior directed towards knowledge development and the utilization of knowledge in task performance. It requires planning or mental preparation, being confident in one’s ability to alter behavior and making situational appropriate adjustment in behavior (Sujan et al. 1994).

In a Middle Eastern context, prior research has found that managers must be sensitive to the ways of doing business with ISAs. In particular managers were warned that getting agents to engage in aggressive promotions to increase sales purely through monetary incentives were not likely to work. Instead effort put into learning about the customs and traditions that affect the behavior of ISAs would be more beneficial. Previous studies found that few ISAs had access to training or showed much interest in utilizing marketing support to carry out functions such as sales forecasting, market planning and detailed coordination of marketing programs (Duguid 1971; Dunn 1979 and Moore 1989). However, in this investigation, we argue that it is important to understand the goal orientations and work behavior of ISAs. This is because such individuals are more likely to seek to maximize their personal advantage by the adoption of more Western attitudes and behavior. This is likely to work well for them in more ambiguous operating environments, i.e. within agencies influenced by a greater mix of Sub-continental, Western and Arab management practices (Hills and Atkins, 2013).

Learning-oriented individuals possess attributes connected with intelligence, skills and dynamism. With the intrinsic motivation to improve skills, individuals tend to have a desire to learn and develop from engagement in challenging work endeavors (Sansone and Smith 2000) and they are also likely to become self-sufficient in order to gain efficiency in their job role. In a
sales context, learning orientation enhances a salesperson’s willingness to increase his or her knowledge of relevant sales strategies (VandeWalle et al. 2000). Having a learning orientation motivates people to engage in planning, develop knowledge and skill bases in order to improve their capabilities. It may also increase their willingness to change strategies and experiment with new approaches.

As the process of learning is valued, the attainment of mastery is seen as being dependent on one’s effort (Coad 1996). In particular, effort as an attribute is believed to be appropriate for strategic development in one’s activities. Learning orientated people tend to show increased persistence and continue striving in the face of failure because they do not feel overwhelmed by difficulties (Ames and Archer 1988). In the scenario where for example particular setbacks may have occurred due to a lack of skill, some people are motivated to work harder to achieve an outcome (cf. Tsui and Ashford 1994). Learning orientation therefore provides a motive to work longer hours primarily due to the intrinsic reward gained from enjoying work and is therefore expected to positively relate to overall time and effort expended on the job (Dweck and Leggett 1988; VandeWalle et al. 1999). In order to test these propositions in an international context it is hypothesized that:

**H5:** Learning orientation will positively influence working smart among ISAs in the Middle East.

**H6:** Learning orientation will positively influence working hard among ISAs in the Middle East.

The impact of performance orientation on work behavior has also been studied in the extant literature. Dweck and Leggett (1988) and Ames and Archer (1988) found that a link between performance orientation and working hard was substantiated and this result was later empirically
proven by Sujan et al. (1994). The argument posited was that performance orientated people believe their skills and abilities are fixed and therefore tend to rely on increasing overall effort to gain better outcomes in terms of their performance. They reject experimenting with new methods that can jeopardize successful outcomes, and as a result, favor evaluations in light of their competences (Dweck and Bempechat 1983). Though a number of studies have suggested that performance orientated people are unlikely to be motivated to work smart, it has been stated by Silver et al. (2006) that further investigation into the impact of this type of behavior is warranted. Theory has suggested that different achievement goal orientations can co-exist among individuals and therefore the extent to which one distinct goal orientation is present can vary (cf. Button et al. 1996; Janssen and Yperen 2004).

Channel intermediaries operating as ISAs are predominantly paid by commission (Hollensen 2011). In fact, the appointment of commission based agents is the preferred method among firms when venturing into international markets (Ford and Rosson 1982; Aylward 2006) and working hard alone may not be sufficient to achieve targets. As an independent workforce, such international agents are often sole operators in their markets and are dependent on themselves for increasing performance outcomes. The ability to plan and determine the suitability of workplace behavior in the context of ISAs is therefore likely to be critical in today’s competitive market.

Previous research suggests that a common attitude in the Middle East among ISAs is that they do not sell products, but instead people and personal connections tend to play a more pivotal role. It was found that financial arrangements may not be the primary motivator for ISAs to push products aggressively when selling processes are long and complex, as they often are for industrial products (Dunn 1979). With executives reporting that motivation requires more than
just the prospect of future earnings, by possessing the capacity to engage in a wide range of behaviors and being flexible, ISAs would be in a better position to succeed. These qualities mentioned are incidentally a manifestation of working smart (Earley et al. 1987, Paulhus and Marting 1987, 1988) and we posit therefore that international channel members driven towards increasing performance in the Middle East context are motivated to work both smart and hard. Based on these discussions, we hypothesize that:

**H7:** Performance orientation will positively influence working smart among ISAs in the Middle East.

**H8:** Performance orientation will positively influence working hard among ISAs in the Middle East

**Work behavior and Performance**

The theoretical perspective of this research draws on the attribution theory of motivation, which claims people are motivated not only to maximize their rewards, but also to attain a cognitive mastery over their environment (Kelley 1967). It was also suggested that an individual’s motivation to work smarter is perhaps greater than their motivation to work harder. Based on theories relating to job performance and empirical research in the area (Churchill 1985), an individual’s performance depends on both types of work behavior: (1) working hard (increasing the amount and intensity of effort extended to achieve goals) and (2) working smart (increasing the efficiency of activities as a result of effective planning and adaptation on the basis of situational considerations) (Weitz et al. 1986; Coad 1996; Spiro and Weitz 1990; Steers et al. 2004). According to Usunier and Lee (2005), precise direct measurements of sales peoples’ performance can be considered inappropriate in the Middle East and various types of motivation need to be considered. As consistent flows of communication were found to stimulate interest
and sales performance among ISAs (Usunier and Lee 2005; Doole and Lowe 2008) we argue that job behavior is important for managers to grasp. Therefore as the pertinent literature suggests that both working hard and smart are useful predictors for enhancing performance, it is important to consider this further from a work behavior perspective. Based on the above discussion, the following hypotheses are posited:

**H9: Working smart will positively influence performance among ISAs in the Middle East.**

**H10: Working hard will positively influence performance among ISAs in the Middle East.**

**Research methods**

This research was undertaken in association with the Institute for International Research (IIR), a company responsible for organizing ‘Arab Health’ - the largest medical trade fair in the Gulf region, located in Dubai, UAE. Prior to undertaking primary research, pre-testing was conducted to increase the face validity of our proposed research instrument (Zikmund and Babin 2006). A draft questionnaire was prepared and circulated to a total of twenty respondents within three target groups in a three phase qualitative process. At the initial stage, three experienced research professionals from IIR (all of whom had considerable knowledge of, and experience with survey design and implementation in their field) were approached for their comments as to the clarity / appropriateness of the constructs and the format of the instrument. Based on their input, a number of refinements were made to the sequencing and layout of the instrument as well as the color of the paper used.
A second pre-test group was composed and the revised questionnaire was subjected to critical evaluation by twelve international agents tied to two key organizers of Arab Health. This was undertaken, so that the wording and terminology used in the instrument was suitable for the respondents. In the last phase, the final questionnaire was delivered to five agents in Dubai and tested further. No additional amendments were suggested at this stage and the questionnaire was considered ready for dispatch at the trade show. The entire process of pre-testing was particularly helpful in increasing the face validity of the research instrument and providing support by knowing that the questions posed were suitable for measuring what they intended to measure (McGivern 2008; Zikmund and Babin 2006).

Approximately 80% of all the respondents approached agreed to take part in the study. Respondent were characterized as being employed by companies operating in the UAE, they were typically Western educated and enrolled as boundary spanning ISAs. Individual agents were approached using a mall intercept style inception approach. In an attempt to randomly select respondents, 1 in 10 visitors to the trade show were approached. This was undertaken in order to verify their key informant status and ascertain their eligibility to participate in the study. Once a key informant was identified and willing to take part in the study, they were escorted to a research space and asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire.

The sample consisted of ISAs who were mainly of Indian and Pakistani origin. Those indigenous to the Middle East - from the UAE represented less than 10%. The respondents typically traded throughout the Gulf region and worked directly with overseas principal suppliers in the healthcare sector. The gender was 100% male and on average they had over 10 years’ experience of working in the private medical sector. Although the UAE is an Arab Muslim State, indigenous born citizens are estimated to represent less than 19% of the population (National
Media Council of the UAE 2010). The rapidly increasing expatriate population in the UAE is known to comprise of 1.75 million Indians, 1.25 million Pakistanis who along with 500,000 Bangladeshis, 500,000 Westerners and 1 million from other Asian communities represent the melting pot of this market (Rasheed 2009). As such 90% of the labor workforce is from the Sub-continent and ISAs typically work in agencies that are part of local Arab companies or owned by established Emirati families in the private sector.

Agents were chosen because they represent the major mode of entry for exporters to gain access into new foreign markets (Ford and Rosson 1982; Hollensen 2011) and they often play a vital role for companies venturing into the UAE. To this end, three conditions were maintained when seeking data from such parties. They all had to be a) importing sales agents, b) they were principally located in the UAE and c) engaged directly in active trade with principal export suppliers in the healthcare sector (not through overseas purchasing offices).

At the end of the exhibition, 239 returned questionnaires were received in total. However, fourteen were incomplete and these were therefore not included in the analysis. This provided a grand total of 225 useable responses and a 94.1% response rate. The research instrument was developed using seven-point Likert scales measuring international agents’ attitudes and behavior towards their export managers.

Each construct was operationalized using multi-item scales taken and modified from previous empirical research. The constructs of measurement included: positive feedback and negative feedback (Jaworski and Kohli 1991); learning orientation and performance orientation (Ames and Archer 1998); working smart (Earley et al. 1987; Paulhus and Martin 1987; Sujan et al. 1994; Spiro and Weitz 1990); working hard (Sujan et al. 1994) and performance (Behrman and Perreault 1982; Sujan et al. 1994). Working smart is a second order construct made up of
three distinctive parts (planning for the sale, functional flexibility and adaptive selling). Although, each of the three parts adopted seven point Likert scales, it is important to note that the question structure in the second part ‘functional flexibility’ was in the style of a checklist-type index. Also, the measurement of performance was designed using an eleven-point Likert scale ranging from ‘much worse’ to ‘average’ and ‘much better’. A copy of the questions from the research instrument is presented in Appendix 1.

Findings

Measure validation

The validity of all measures was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis. All items yielded high scores of internal consistency with Cronbach alpha scores for each measurable construct being greater than 0.7 (Hair et al. 1992; Nunnally and Bernstein 1994) except for the construct working hard, which at 0.67 was nearly identical to the 0.68 reported in Sujan et al. (1994). Functional flexibility (a component of the second–order factor of working smart) was exempt from this test due to it being a formative index. Scale reliability was further tested by calculating the composite reliability (CR), with each reaching the 0.7 threshold (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Further to this, adequate convergent validity was demonstrated as the lowest t-value was 4.73 and the highest was 11.14. To evaluate discriminant validity the stringent criterion of AVE was used (adopting Fornell and Larcker 1981) and all the constructs were found to have an AVE of 0.50 and above.
Structural model

The findings confirmed each of the ten hypotheses posited and these were substantiated in the final calibrated model. Specifically the ratio of chi-squared to degrees of freedom at (1.62) is significant (p=0.01). The measures of fit are all robust (GFI = 0.943; CFI = 0.951; RMSEA= 0.33) (Liu et al. 2007). The findings demonstrate that the hypothesized impact of positive feedback on learning orientation is significant and thus hypothesis H\textsubscript{1} is substantiated (H\textsubscript{1}: $\beta = 0.21$; t-value = 2.40; p < 0.05), indicating that positive feedback from managers is positively related to international agents improving their learning abilities and mastering the tasks they perform (see Table 1). The second hypothesis postulated that negative feedback positively influences a leaning orientation (H\textsubscript{2}). The findings provide support for negative feedback influencing learning orientation, suggesting that when ISAs receive negative evaluation feedback, this helps to improve, realign and motivate a learning orientation (H\textsubscript{2}: $\beta = 0.17$; t-value 2.04; p < 0.05). The findings also confirm a significant effect of positive feedback on performance orientation (H\textsubscript{3}: $\beta = 0.35$; t-value 4.30; p < 0.001) and support negative feedback having a positive direct effect on performance orientation (H\textsubscript{4}: $\beta = 0.20$; t-value 2.57; p < 0.05). This suggests that ISAs are stimulated towards achieving performance related goals when a lack of ability is shown.

[Hyp text is too lengthy for the table]

Hypotheses H\textsubscript{5} and H\textsubscript{6} suggest that a learning orientation positively influences both working smart and working hard. This implies that orientation towards improving skills and capabilities motivate ISAs to engage in planning, adaptability and being functionally flexible. This in turn leads to a desire to work smarter. The findings signal a positive and significant effect of learning
orientation on working smart (H₅: β = 0.56; t-value 8.75; p < 0.001) and support hypothesis H₅. With respect to H₆, a positive relationship is posited between learning orientation and working hard. With a view to mastering tasks, ISAs oriented towards learning expend more time and effort thus working harder. The result indicates that learning orientation has a significant positive influence on working hard (H₆: β = 0.55; t-value 8.40; p < 0.001), providing support for hypothesis H₆.

It is also found that the relationships between performance orientation on working smart (H₇: β = 0.20; t-value 3.16; p < 0.01) is confirmed (H₇) along with hypothesis H₈ which posits a positive effect from performance orientation to working hard (H₈: β = 0.20; t-value 3.08; p < 0.01), suggesting that ISAs who are oriented to outperform others, in turn, work harder. Hypotheses H₉ and H₁₀ infer that both working smart and working hard will influence performance. Hypothesis H₉ suggests that when ISAs work smart, in that they are adaptive and flexible, individual performance will improve. Meanwhile, hypothesis H₁₀ posits that when there is a heightened amount of work effort among ISAs, their performance levels are likely to increase. The results indicate that the impact of working smart on performance (H₉: β = 0.54; t-value 7.96; p < 0.001) and working hard on performance (H₁₀: β = 0.14; t-value 2.06; p < 0.05) are both significant, and the two hypotheses are accepted.

Discussion

Theoretical implications

The study aimed to provide fresh insights into the work behavior surrounding ISAs working in the Middle East. The findings advocate that individuals in the UAE make their own behavioral and attitudinal choices within the social framework of organizations and society at large (Molavi
Research by Hills and Atkins (2013) suggests that even the indigenous tend to converge on Western practice and behavior in the workplace. Although this is not a region with a dominant Western culture, commercial organizations are found to incorporate a mix of Western, Sub-continental and Arab management behavior - as non-national workers as well as Gulf Arabs tend to lean towards more Western cultural models. Specifically this study stresses the significance of feedback and its impact on both learning and performance orientations for intermediaries operating in new industrial markets in this region of the world. Our concept also discovered that within this context, positive feedback motivates performance orientation more for international agents than negative feedback. As a result, positive evaluation feeds into the extrinsic needs (e.g. ego and self-assurance) of individuals who are motivated to achieve performance related goals.

It is interesting that results from the study suggest that a learning orientation positively influenced working hard and working smart at much higher levels than performance orientation. Although findings in HRM have shown that performance orientation is important for managing control systems and garner employee performance (Onyemah et al. 2010; House et al. 2004) our findings suggest that even though both types of goal orientations are significant, within this context, international agents are more driven by their orientation to learn and satisfy their intrinsic needs. Finally, the research concludes that behavior related to working hard and smart positively improves performance. However, in particular, motivational behavior related to working smart was found to have a greater impact on performance than working hard. Such international agents in our sample are therefore not sufficiently motivated by hard work alone.

In summary, the emphasis on goal and achievement motivation in this study provides an extension to improving performance that has previously focused on control-based governance,
non-social bonds and financial incentives (Chelariu et al. 2006; Gilliland et al. 2009). When considering Legge’s (1995) two distinct positions in HR - the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ approach, the former emphasizing quantitative, calculative and strategic business aspects associated with managing resources and the latter viewing human resources as valued assets in the organization and a container of high quality skills, it appears that adopting characteristics more in line with a soft approach may be more productive in HR practices for ISAs operating in the Gulf. The study aims to bridge a gap in the inter-firm work behavior literature by reinstating the importance of theoretical knowledge in an inter-firm context in a relatively under-researched region of the world.

Practical implications

Our study provides valuable insights for managers to develop appropriate strategies for dealing with the complexities involved with ISAs in the Middle East (Hills and Atkins, 2013), with the ultimate aim of improving performance. Based on the findings of this investigation, the following managerial implications for IHRM have been extracted. It is crucial for exporting firms to develop motivational programs that suit the characteristics and meet individual needs. In particular, managers need to recognize that intermediaries who respond creatively to challenging work opportunities, show independent thinking and are meticulous in their tasks tend to exhibit a learning orientation. Such individuals are motivated by intrinsic interests in their work, thus both positive and negative feedback should stimulate their learning responses. Managers are therefore advised to take time when crafting evaluations and appraisals of their ISAs.

It also appears that ISAs which are performance oriented typically showcase negative reactions when faced with difficulties and challenges in their tasks. To circumvent these unwarranted reactions, managers need to provide more positive and constructive feedback when
working with such partners operating in the UAE. In order to sustain goal orientation and direct behavior towards achievement, managers are encouraged to focus more attention on the characteristics of a learning orientation and the design of motivational HR practices that strategically adapt themselves to the characteristics and needs of individuals.

Information on the disposition of learning oriented individuals would be useful to export managers when setting objectives and goals for their intermediaries in the Middle East. For example, those with learning goals value the intrinsic nature of work, enjoy challenges and opportunities aimed at developing new skills and view success in terms of mastering tasks (Coad 1996). Managers should therefore actively involve their Middle Eastern agents in on the job training, provide access to market information and expand resources for joint on-site customer visits. By doing so the potential benefits gained from spending quality time with intermediaries on a one-to-one basis is likely to increase learning orientation and enhance their intrinsic needs of task enjoyment.

By feeding goal orientation effectively, managers will be in a better position to motivate their partners towards working smart and improved performance. A key to winning support in this particular region would be to include task responsibilities that involve planning, adaptability, the development of new skills and flexible incentive opportunities (in a non-monetary sense). Managers ought to familiarize themselves with the attributes related to smart work behavior such as planning, adaptability and functional flexibility and use this in the formulation of their strategies, targets and HR practices.
Conclusions, limitations and future research

This research confirms that there is a need to establish legitimacy and purpose to research in different international environments (Negandhi 1983; Tsang 2002) including the Middle East. Despite its obvious contribution, this investigation has been the subject of inherent limitations. In the original study, additional tests were also administered on the moderating effects of self-efficacy. When tested in this extended model, the interaction effect tested non-significant, leading us to question the theoretical underpinning of the self-efficacy construct in a Middle Eastern international context. Another potential limitation of this study which was also apparent in the original study concerned the use of a self-reported measure of performance and this may have led to the relationship between work behavior and performance being somewhat inflated. However, some precautions were followed to reduce this potential bias. These included the anonymity of responses, as according to Henemen (1974), the leniency bias in performance evaluation is reduced with anonymous responses. In addition, Mabe and West (1982) suggested that the use of output criteria (as used in this investigation) are more in line with ‘objective’ indicators of performance than the use of input evaluation criteria.

The results of this study may also be context-specific. Although it is theoretically feasible to extend this study in other locations, the specific traits found amongst ISAs purely in the UAE restrict the study’s findings. A similar investigation, however, repeated within different regions of the world would be of interest for empirical generalization, as would further research in other emerging areas, such as India, China and South America (O'Neill 2003). As a result, the research delineates avenues for future studies to explore inter-cultural issues related to ISAs amongst these three regions. Given the knowledge that feedback acts as a motivator for goal orientation, future research should further explore to what extent other antecedents feed motivational goal
orientation among international sales agents. In particular, and from an international intermediary perspective, research on inter-firm team management would also be of value in relationship-oriented cultures like India, China and the Middle East compared with task oriented cultures such as the U.S.

Future research should also investigate whether theory needs to be confirmed and whether the accepted hypotheses are a generalized finding of the motivational effect within international sales agents, or simply a phenomenon of work practice within the Middle East region. To assess the generalizability of these findings, researchers are also advised to look more deeply into the theoretical significance of these links between positive feedback and performance orientation and performance orientation and working smart. As cross-sectional data were used in this study, it did not allow for explicit causal interpretation among the factors being observed. As a result, longitudinal research would add more value in future studies. For example, to overcome the potential leniency bias from the performance evaluation data collected, this extension (at time 1) could be compared to data collected in the future (time 2) using actual financial data relating to performance. In an ideal situation and with the availability of more time and financial resources, a dyadic study evaluating motivational orientation amongst specific parties would be useful. Research in these areas are likely to make significant contributions that will be valued by academics, managers and business support providers alike as they grapple with developing strategies for motivating their agents on an international scale.

In conclusion, the ability to plan and determine the suitability of workplace behavior is critical in today’s competitive marketplace. By understanding the capacity of ISAs to engage in a wide range of behavior and being flexible, managers are in a better position to succeed. This is especially the case in the UAE, where unique heterogeneous workforces exist which often
converge on Western attitudes and behavior (Hills and Atkins, 2013). As a result of transnational migration in the region, it is therefore important from a theoretical perspective to further understand how such convergences in workforce behavior are taking place within this multicultural marketplace. It has been suggested that different achievement goal orientations can co-exist among individuals (cf. Button et al. 1996; VandeWalle 1997; Janssen and Van Yperen 2004) and therefore, the extent to which one distinct goal orientation is present can vary. According to Silver et al. (2006) further investigations into the impact of behavior is warranted and this study attempts to address this in the dynamic context of the Middle East.
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Figure 1: Conceptual framework
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Table 1: Estimation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Std Estimates</th>
<th>T-values</th>
<th>P-values</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF→ LO</td>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>.016*</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF→ LO</td>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>.041*</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF→ PO</td>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF→ PO</td>
<td>H₄</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>.010*</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO→ WS</td>
<td>H₅</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>8.747</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO→ WH</td>
<td>H₆</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>8.400</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO→ WS</td>
<td>H₇</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>3.155</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO→ WH</td>
<td>H₈</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS→ PERF</td>
<td>H₉</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>7.955</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH→ PERF</td>
<td>H₁₀</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>.040*</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Regression is significant at 0.001 level (p < 0.001).
** Regression is significant at 0.01 level (p < 0.01).
* Regression is significant at 0.05 level (p < 0.05).
Appendix 1: Questions from the research instrument

1. Sales Planning (Working Smart (A))
Please respond to the following statements by circling the number which best reflects your ability to plan for selling activates.

As an International Sales Agent….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. we get to work without spending too much time on planning. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. we list the steps necessary for getting an order.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. we think about strategies we will fall back on if problems in a sales interaction arise.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. because too many aspects of our job are unpredictable, planning is not useful. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. we keep good records about our accounts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. we set personal goals for each sales interaction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. each week we make a plan for what we need to do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. we do not waste time thinking about what we should do. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. we are careful to work on the highest priority tasks first.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. planning is a waste of time. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. planning is an excuse for not working. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. we don't need to develop a strategy for a customer to get the order. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Work Characteristics (Working Hard)
Please respond to the following statements by circling the number which best reflects your working style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Describes my Style perfectly</th>
<th>Describes my style not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We work long hours to meet our sales objectives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We do not give up easily when we encounter a customer who is difficult to sell to.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We work untiringly at selling to a customer until we get an order.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On average, how many hours a week does your organization currently work?</td>
<td>Please estimate hours:_________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sales Situation (Working Smart (B))
Please respond to the following statements by circling the number which best reflects your behaviour in the following sales situations. When the sales the sales situation seems to need it, being….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Easy for Me</th>
<th>Very Easy for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. dominant is</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. warm is</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. aloof is</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Selling Characteristics (Learning Orientation)
Please respond to the following statements by circling the number which best reflects your style of selling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Making a tough sale is very satisfying.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An important part of being a good agent is continually improving your sales skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Making mistakes when selling is just part of the learning process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is important for us to learn from each selling experience we have.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There really are not a lot of new things to learn about selling. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We are always learning something new about our customers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is worth spending a great deal of time learning new approaches for dealing with customers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Learning how to be a better agent is of fundamental importance to us.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We put in a great deal of effort sometimes in order to learn something new.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Adaptive Selling (Working Smart (C))
How well do you consider yourself to be able to adapt your behavior in different selling environments? (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Describes My Style Not at all</th>
<th>Describes my Style Perfectly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basically, we use the same approach with most customers. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We vary our sales style from situation to situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We like to experiment with different sales approaches.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We use a set sales approach. (R)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. We can easily use a wide variety of selling approaches.  
6. We find it difficult to adapt our presentation style to certain buyers. (R)  
7. Each customer requires a unique approach.  
8. We are very sensitive to the needs of our customers.  
9. When we find that our sales approach is not working, we can easily change to another approach.  
10. It is easy for us to modify our sales presentation if the situation calls for it.  
11. We feel that most buyers can be dealt with in pretty much the same manner. (R)  
12. We are very flexible in the selling approach we use.  
13. We try to consider how one customer differs from another.  
14. We feel confident that we can change our planned presentation when necessary.  
15. We do not change our approach from one customer to another. (R)  
16. We treat all buyers pretty much the same. (R)  

6. Performance Orientation:
Please indicate how important selling outcomes are in relation to your motivations to sell?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is very important to us that our suppliers see us as a good agent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We very much want our suppliers to consider us to be good at selling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We feel very good when we know we have outperformed other agent of our suppliers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We always try to communicate our accomplishments to our suppliers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We spend a lot of time thinking about how our performance compares with other agents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We evaluate ourselves using our suppliers’ criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Performance
In terms of performance and achievement, please evaluate yourself relative to other competing international sales agents (you are familiar with) that operate in the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well do you as an International Sales Agent…</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. acquire a good market share.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sell high profit-margin products.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. generate a high level of sales revenue</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. quickly generate sales of new products.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. identify major accounts in your region and sell to them.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. exceed sales targets.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. assist your suppliers to meet their goals.</td>
<td>-5 -4 -3 -2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Positive Feedback
Please comment on the nature of your suppliers feedback/evaluations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When our suppliers think our performance is good, they provide us with positive feedback.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Our suppliers make it a point of telling us when they think we manage our time well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Our suppliers commend us when they think we are using the &quot;right&quot; selling techniques.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Our suppliers let us know when they think we are producing good results.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When we make an important sale, our suppliers make it a point of mentioning it to us.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Our suppliers tell us when we deal with customers appropriately.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Our suppliers express their approval when they see us going about our job as they expect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>When our suppliers are satisfied with our sales output, they comment about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Negative Feedback
Please comment on the nature of your supply managers feedback/evaluations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Our suppliers let us know when they are upset with our performance results.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>When our suppliers think we have done something wrong, they let us know about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Our suppliers make it a point to tell us when they think we are not using the right selling techniques.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Our suppliers are prompt in letting us know when our output is below their expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When we deal with customers in a way which our suppliers disapprove, they let us know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Our suppliers would let us know if we did not demonstrate a new product/service properly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When we fail to meet their sales expectations, our suppliers indicate their dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>When our suppliers don’t find us working the way they expect, they let us know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>