



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *The Relationship Between Goal Orientation of Salespeople and Their Knowledge Sharing Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Norms*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/104398/>

Version: Accepted Version

Proceedings Paper:

Menguc, B orcid.org/0000-0002-4116-3047, Auh, S, Kim, Y et al. (1 more author) (2016) The Relationship Between Goal Orientation of Salespeople and Their Knowledge Sharing Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Norms. In: Proceedings of the 2016 Winter Marketing Academic Conference. 2016 Winter Marketing Academic Conference, 26-28 Feb 2016, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA. American Marketing Association , E8-E9. ISBN 9781510823679

© 2016 by American Marketing Association. This is an author produced version of a paper published in Proceedings of the 2016 Winter Marketing Academic Conference.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The Relationship Between Goal Orientation of Salespeople and Their Knowledge Sharing Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Norms

ABSTRACT

Despite growing academic and managerial interest in the interplay between goal orientation (i.e., learning, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance oriented) and external cues, much remains unknown. The motivation behind this study was to fill part of the gap in the literature by investigating (a) the relationship between three different types of goal orientation and knowledge sharing behaviors, and (b) how this relationship can change under the moderating role of knowledge sharing norms in the business-to-business sales context. By taking advantage of the nested structure of the dataset, the authors examined the cross-level interaction effects between goal orientation and knowledge sharing norms on salespeople's knowledge sharing behaviors. Results indicate that norms have different moderating effects for salespeople with different goal orientations. Implications for knowledge sharing are discussed along with future research directions.

Keywords: knowledge sharing, learning orientation, performance-approach orientation, performance-avoidance orientation, knowledge sharing norms

As organizations strive to build relationship marketing and knowledge management competencies that are founded on customer-centric solutions, the opportunities for the sales function to contribute to this goal are enormous (Weitz and Bradford 1999). One avenue that has garnered increasing attention is salespeople's engagement in knowledge sharing behaviors (KSBs hereafter) (Flaherty and Pappas 2009; Le Bon and Merunka 2006). Given their boundary-spanning role, salespeople are in a unique position to contribute to KSBs. By KSBs we refer to those activities that are undertaken by salespeople to disseminate customer-related knowledge with personnel outside the sales unit.

The knowledge management literature suggests three broad factors that can lead to KSBs: organizational, social/relational, and individual (e.g., Le Bon and Merunka 2006).

Notwithstanding, very little is understood regarding what sales organizations can do to foster KSBs, especially with regards to factors that reside at multiple levels. The motivation behind our study rests on two observations that have limited theoretical and practical advancement in sales research. First, prior studies in sales have investigated knowledge sharing (e.g., Davies et al. 2010; Flaherty and Pappas 2009) and goal orientations (e.g., Kohli, Shervani, and Challagalla 1998; Sujan, Weitz, and Kumar 1994) in parallel fashion without efforts to integrate the two. We deem this to be an important gap in the literature that has restricted our understanding of how salespeople with different goal orientations can promote KSBs. The goal orientation–KSB relationship merits attention because knowledge sharing is about the willingness to disseminate what one has learned and goal orientation has been shown to be strongly related to individual learning (Payne, Youngcourt, and Beaubien 2007). Second, we explore the role of knowledge sharing norms on the goal orientation-KSB relationship. Investigating the goal orientation–KSB relationship under the contingency lens of norms addresses the long held argument that the

motivation to learn and hence share knowledge is different for individuals with different goal orientations. To this end, our study reflects how norms strengthen or weaken the motivation to engage in KSBs for learning- and performance-oriented salespeople.

Our study contributes to the sales literature by examining the relationship between salespeople's goal orientation and their KSBs, and how knowledge sharing norms moderate the goal orientation–KSB relationship. The findings from the interaction between goal orientation and knowledge sharing norms illuminate theoretical and managerial implications because knowledge sharing is not exercised in a vacuum but within a social context. Salespeople with different goal orientations will respond differently to knowledge sharing norms because some salespeople are more intrinsically motivated (e.g., learning-oriented salespeople) while others are more extrinsically motivated (e.g., performance-approach and performance-avoidance oriented salespeople) to share knowledge (Kozlowski and Bell 2006). We test our model using salespeople in a business-to-business context. The sales context is an ideal environment to test our model because there is an increasing consensus that salespeople engage in KSBs because they are frontline employees who are most proximal to customers (Flaherty and Pappas 2009).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

We define KSBs as those activities that are undertaken by salespeople to share such explicit customer-related information as current and future needs, satisfaction, or changes in preferences with coworkers outside the sales unit. Knowledge sharing is a social behavioral process which is initiated essentially by the holder of knowledge (Hansen, Nohria, and Tierney 1999) and customer-relevant knowledge is the currency of this process (Constant, Kiesler, and Sproull 1994). Prior studies have largely acknowledged that the decision to engage in such

behavior is made under the consideration of certain costs and benefits of sharing knowledge with others (e.g., Kankanhalli, Tan, and Wei 2005).

The benefits that motivate salespeople to engage in KSBs may be viewed in terms of four broad categories. First, salespeople form social networks and relationships with those who are instrumental in furthering their career-related goals (e.g., Clary and Snyder 1999; Lavelle 2010). Second, KSBs can help salespeople achieve personal growth and development through learning new tasks, gaining unique perspectives, and utilizing unique skills and abilities (e.g., Clary and Snyder 1999; Lavelle 2010). Third, since most forms of KSBs involve interactions with others, salespeople may also meet their social needs by using KSBs as a means to make friends, especially for those new to the firm (e.g., Clary and Snyder 1999; Lavelle 2010). Fourth, KSBs may be driven by ego-enhancement motives such as the desire to show one's ability, to feel needed and important, and to increase self-esteem (e.g., Bock et al. 2005; Kankanhalli, Tan, and Wei 2005; Wasko and Faraj 2005). Despite the above-mentioned benefits, knowledge sharing may also entail certain costs and risks that can detract from engaging in KSBs. The costs are related to the time and effort required to share knowledge (i.e., opportunity costs) and the perceived loss of knowledge power (e.g., Kankanhalli et al. 2005). The risks are related to knowledge exploitation (or misappropriation) or lack of reciprocity.

Drawing on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), we posit that salespeople are likely to make calculative decisions by comparing the benefits with the costs of sharing their knowledge (e.g., Constant, Kiesler, and Sproull 1994). That is, when the perceived benefits exceed the perceived costs, salespeople will be willing to engage in KSBs (e.g., Kankanhalli et al. 2005). Nevertheless, as we discuss in depth below, employees' willingness to share their knowledge with others within the organization is a self-determined, goal-oriented behavior (e.g., Poortvliet

et al. 2007). To this end, we focus on an individual-level factor—salesperson’s goal orientation—and the moderating role of an organizational-level factor—knowledge sharing norms on KSBs.

Goal Orientation

Achievement motivation theory describes goal orientation as a motivational orientation that influences how individuals approach, interpret, and respond to achievement situations (Dweck and Leggett 1988). Goal orientation reflects both self-development beliefs and how these beliefs lead individuals to interpret and engage with their environment (VandeWalle et al. 1999). In this study, we utilize a three-factor structure of goal orientation: learning, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance (VandeWalle, Cron, and Slocum 2001).

Salespeople’s differences in goal orientation may help explain their differences in KSBs because different goal orientations can lead to different self-regulatory processes. Kozlowski and Bell (2006) maintain that learning-oriented salespeople are driven by intrinsic motivation, whereas performance-oriented salespeople are affected by extrinsic motivation. Based on this distinction, learning, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance oriented salespeople will be influenced differently by knowledge sharing norms. Knowledge sharing norms constitute a specific dimension of an organizational climate, which exerts influence on how individuals interpret the cues in their environment. We define knowledge sharing norms as shared perceptions regarding the extent to which organization-wide knowledge sharing is encouraged, expected, and important (e.g., Bock, Kankanhalli, and Sharma 2006; Fisher, Maltz, and Jaworski 1997). The different role of norms on goal orientation is consistent with Button, Mathieu, and Zajac (1996, p. 28) who stated that situational cues can cause individuals with a particular goal orientation to “adopt a different or less acute response pattern for a particular situation.”

Hypotheses

Learning Orientation

Learning orientation is the extent to which salespeople focus on developing competences by learning from current experiences and exploring new knowledge and skills to better serve customers (e.g., Kohli et al. 1998). Learning-oriented salespeople are intrinsically motivated in their jobs (e.g., Sujana et al. 1994) to acquire and enhance their skills, knowledge, and abilities (Porath and Bateman 2006). Salespeople who are eager to learn new skill sets may perceive KSBs as a means of achieving their learning and development goals. The benefits associated with a learning orientation are essentially learning and understanding (i.e., personal growth and development at work), and building social relationships (i.e., networking), which will enable salespeople to achieve career and task related goals. Learning-oriented salespeople are intrinsically motivated to engage in self-development and view knowledge sharing as a means to achieving this end. They are able to self-generate as opposed to relying on external factors to realize the benefits of KSBs. Since they view their knowledge, skills, and abilities as malleable, they believe that they do not lose their knowledge when they share it with others (Poortvliet et al. 2007). Also, as Poortvliet et al. (2007) have suggested, learning-oriented individuals help others by sharing their knowledge openly and willingly. Consequently, the benefits should outweigh the perceived costs and risks associated with KSBs. Hence,

H1: Learning orientation will be related positively to KSBs.

Learning-oriented salespeople do not need to rely on norms to realize the benefits of knowledge sharing because they are intrinsically motivated. The true testament to KSBs for such salespeople is expected to occur when norms are low as opposed to high. When norms are low, there is no expectation or encouragement from management to indicate that knowledge sharing is

important and, therefore, whether one pursues knowledge sharing or not will largely be driven by one's intrinsic motivation. Thus, when norms are low, the level of learning orientation determines the extent to which KSBs occur. However, when norms are high, this is not expected to affect the extent to which a salesperson engages in KSBs because such individuals are self-motivated to share knowledge and do not need norms to emphasize the benefits of KSBs. Hence,

H2: Learning orientation is related positively to KSBs as knowledge sharing norms become less intensified.

Performance-Approach Orientation

Performance-approach orientation is the extent to which a salesperson focuses on demonstrating competence and gaining favorable judgments from others (VandeWalle 1997, p. 1000). Such salespeople engage in KSBs mainly for enhancing their ego (self-image, self-worth), gaining social recognition, and improving their social standing at work. Because the main interests and motivation of such salespeople are focused on the outcome, external motivational factors play a pivotal role in their KSBs. Salespeople high in performance-approach can be said to be extrinsically motivated because they can be expected to engage in KSBs only when the benefits of KSBs are made salient to them such as through rewards or norms (e.g., Sujana et al. 1994). Hence,

H3: Performance-approach orientation in the absence of knowledge sharing norms will not be related to KSBs.

Norms are a compatible external motivational factor for performance-approach oriented salespeople because for such salespeople, norms are able to bring out the benefits of pursuing KSBs that would otherwise have been dormant. Such salespeople will want to engage in KSBs because as norms become intensified, they are more motivated to use knowledge sharing to achieve ego-enhancement (self-image, self-worth), social recognition, and social standing at

work. In sum, there is congruence between the dispositions of performance-approach oriented salespeople and norms. Hence,

H4: Performance-approach orientation is related positively to KSBs as knowledge sharing norms become intensified.

Performance-Avoidance Orientation

Performance-avoidance orientation is the extent to which salespeople focus on avoiding negation of their competence and negative judgments from others (VandeWalle 1997, p. 1000). Such salespeople are reluctant to take on challenging tasks that may expose their weakness and incompetence. When confronted with a challenging task, they view it as a threat that could undermine their capability and self-worth. They are more focused on avoiding and hiding the consequences of negative performance from the eyes of others. In this respect, they are likely to engage in KSBs only under extrinsic factors that can safeguard them from being vulnerable to mistakes and negative feedback or criticism. Avoiding or safeguarding negative feedback or criticism will likely influence whether they are motivated to engage in KSBs. External contextual cues need to be considered when examining the effects of performance-avoidance orientation on KSBs. Therefore,

H5: Performance-avoidance orientation in the absence of knowledge sharing norms will not be related to KSBs.

Salespeople with performance avoidance will withdraw from KSBs because as norms become more intensified, the expectation and importance of KSBs increase in proportion, and unless there is a psychological climate that can safeguard them from the risks and costs of KSBs, knowledge sharing will be curtailed (Edmondson 1999). Given their aversion to being perceived as incompetent, the presence of high norms is expected to exert pressure and increase the burden of sharing knowledge. They will be reluctant to pursue KSBs because without the reassurance of

a safety net that preserves the status quo, the costs and risks of receiving negative feedback or being exposed as incompetent in the eyes of others will prevent them from engaging in KSBs (Edmondson 1999). In this respect, norms are an incompatible external factor for performance-avoidance salespeople because norms highlight the risks and costs over the benefits of KSBs.

Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

H6: Performance-avoidance orientation is related negatively to KSBs as knowledge sharing norms become intensified.

RESEARCH METHOD

Sample and Data Collection Procedures

We selected salespeople employed at industrial firms in South Korea to test our model and its hypotheses. From a directory of 500 industrial firms (i.e., electronics, computer parts, software development, manufacturing equipment, etc.) compiled by a market research company, we randomly contacted the top sales or sales-related managers of 100 medium- and large-sized firms either by a formal letter or by phone. The managers of twenty-eight firms agreed to participate in our survey. Most managers nominated a contact person (a sales unit manager in most cases) to help us distribute the surveys to their salespeople. We mailed a total of 673 survey packets. Each packet contained a cover letter, a survey, and a prepaid return envelope. The cover letter specifically expressed the guaranteed confidentiality to all salespeople. Salespeople mailed the completed survey directly to us. After two waves of mailings, we received surveys from 209 salespeople from a total of 28 firms. The salesperson responses across firms varied between 3 and 16. Overall, the response rate was 31%. The test results based on demographic variables and the key variables of the model did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents. Eighty-two percent of the respondents were males and 84% had an

undergraduate and above education. The average age was 33 years, average company tenure was 6 years, and average sales career experience was 7 years.

Measures

We developed the survey questionnaire in English by borrowing and/or adapting the measures available in the literature. We employed back translation and group-translation methods before we administered the questionnaire in the Korean setting (Brislin, Lonner, and Thorndike 1973). We measured KSBs, goal orientations, and control variables at the individual level (i.e., salesperson), and knowledge sharing norms at the organization level. Unless otherwise mentioned, all scales were measured with a five-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree; 5-strongly agree). The measures and the respective scale items are reported in Table 1.

Individual-level measures. We measured knowledge sharing behaviors with an eight-item scale (1-not at all; 5-to a great extent). This scale was an adaptation of Jaworski and Kohli's (1993) scale which was developed to measure knowledge dissemination at the organization level. Therefore, we reworded the respective scale items to capture salespeople's KSBs. We instructed the respondents that the scale items reflect the extent to which they share their information and expertise about customers with other coworkers outside the sales unit. We relied on salespeople's self-reported measures of KSBs. Although self-reports are not ideal, obtaining manager responses to salespeople's KSBs for this study would be extremely difficult from a practical perspective as this would have entailed having managers track their subordinates' KSBs with coworkers outside the sales unit.

Goal orientations were measured with the scales previously developed and established in the literature. More specifically, we measured learning orientation with a nine-item scale and

performance-approach orientation with a six-item scale (Sujan et al. 1994). Performance-avoidance orientation was measured with a five-item (VandeWalle 1997).

Control variables. We included coworker relationship quality and demographic variables in addition to the main constructs of our study in order to test alternative explanations and control for likely suppression effects. We measured coworker relationship quality with a six-item, five-point scale (1-strongly disagree; 5-strongly agree) adapted from Rindfleisch and Moorman (2001) and Ganesan, Malter, and Rindfleisch (2005). Among the possible demographic variables, we chose to control for firm experience (in years) and age (in years). Since the majority of respondents are male (82%) with higher education (84%), we excluded gender and education from the consideration set of control variables.

Organization-level measure. We measured salespeople's perceptions of knowledge-sharing norms with a five-item scale (1-not at all; 5-to a great extent), adapted from (Fisher et al. 1997). We conceptualized knowledge sharing norms as an aggregated, organization-level variable. We found that within-organization agreement ($r_{wg} = .88$) and intraclass correlations ($ICC(1) = .27$, $ICC(2) = .74$) were all above the recommended values reported in the literature (Schneider, White, and Paul 1998). Therefore, aggregation was appropriate.

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Measurement Validation

We estimated a six-factor measurement model to test the validity of the measures. After dropping the item with the low factor loading in the scale of performance-approach orientation, the measurement model provided an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2(df = 687) = 1580.1$, $GFI = .90$; $TLI = .91$; $CFI = .92$; $RMSEA = .07$). As Table 1 indicates, composite reliabilities were greater than .70 (Gerbing and Anderson 1988) and the AVE values were greater than .50 (Bagozzi and

Yi 1988). These findings support the convergent validity of the constructs. Notably, the square of the intercorrelations between two constructs was less than the AVE estimates of the same constructs for all pairs of constructs (Fornell and Larcker 1981). The confidence interval of the correlation coefficient of any construct did not include 1.0 ($p < .05$) (Anderson and Gerbing 1988). These two tests supported discriminant validity of the constructs.

Testing for Common Method Bias

We tested the likely threat of common method bias by employing Malhotra, Kim, and Patil's (2006) technique, which is an alternative to Lindell and Whitney's (2001) marker variable approach. Malhotra et al. (2006) suggest that the second lowest correlation between the manifest variables may be used as a proxy for common method bias especially when there is no pre-arranged marker variable, which is the case in our survey. As Table 2 (below the diagonal) indicates, the second lowest correlation is ($r_M = .05$), after excluding the correlations between demographic variables. We computed the adjusted correlations and their statistical significance level. After the adjustment, none of the significant correlations became nonsignificant (Table 2, above the diagonal), suggesting that common method bias is less likely to be a threat.

Hypotheses Tests

The nested nature of our data coupled with the multilevel model requires a statistically appropriate treatment in testing the hypotheses. In this case, Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM 6; Raudenbusch et al. 2004) is an ideal technique since it takes into account the nonindependence of data by estimating the within- and between-organization variance separately.

First, we estimated a null model of KSBs (i.e., no predictors) to compute between-organization variance. A one-way random ANOVA indicated significant between-organization variance concerning KSBs: ($ICC[1] = .33$; $\chi^2(27) = 129.98$, $p < .001$). To test Hypothesis 1, we

added the three dimensions of goal orientation to the model along with the control variables (Table 3, Model 2). Learning orientation was related positively and significantly to KSBs ($\gamma = .34, p < .01$) whereas performance-approach and performance-avoidance orientation were not related significantly to KSBs. Hence, Hypotheses 1, 3, and 5 were supported.

To test Hypotheses 2, 4, and 6, we included knowledge sharing norms and the cross-level interactions of goal orientations and norms in the model. Table 3 (Model 4) indicates significant cross-level interactions. The interaction between performance-approach orientation and norms was related positively and significantly to KSBs ($\gamma = .42, p < .01$), supporting Hypothesis 2. Simple slope analysis (Preacher, Curran, and Bauer 2006) revealed the following: at low levels of norms, the relationship between performance-approach and KSBs is negative and significant ($\gamma = -.30, p < .05$), whereas the relationship is positive and significant ($\gamma = .21; p < .05$) at high levels of norms. The interaction of performance-avoidance and norms was related negatively and significantly to KSBs ($\gamma = -.25, p < .05$). The relationship between performance-avoidance and KSBs is not significant ($\gamma = .15, ns$) at low levels of norms, whereas the relationship is negative and significant ($\gamma = -.25; p < .05$) at high levels of norms. Hence, Hypothesis 4 was supported. Finally, the interaction of learning orientation and norms was related negatively and significantly to KSBs ($\gamma = -.36, p < .01$), supporting Hypothesis 6. At low levels of norms, the learning orientation-KSBs relationship is positive and statistically significant ($\gamma = .49, p < .01$) but the relationship is not significant ($\gamma = .05, ns$) at the level of norms is high

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Theoretical Implications

Our study and its research findings make several theoretical contributions to the literature. First, learning-oriented salespeople are more likely to engage in KSBs under low (vs.

high) norms. That is, when norms are low and the value of KSBs is not widely disseminated throughout the organization, learning oriented salespeople may still be able to activate and retrieve the benefits of KSBs on their own, which leads to more KSBs. However, when norms are high and the importance of KSBs is widely permeated throughout the organization, being learning-oriented does not encourage more KSBs because high norms do not encourage KSBs for those who already may be cognizant of the values of such behavior.

Second, for performance-approach oriented salespeople who are sensitive to and influenced by external factors, the level of norms plays an important role in how they view KSBs. When norms are low, such salespeople may focus on the risks of KSBs such as losing power and being exploited by sharing knowledge. They fall victim to the “knowledge is power” syndrome and become passive in sharing knowledge with coworkers. They become protective of knowledge and preserve the sense that they own the knowledge. Conversely, when norms are high, the values of knowledge sharing may be highlighted and the advantages that accrue from KSBs may be enacted. Thus, these salespeople engage in more KSBs.

Third, because salespeople with performance avoidance are very much concerned about their lack of competency and weak performance being exposed, norms may put excessive pressure on them, driving them to shy away from engaging in KSBs. Norms may reveal their dark side and put pressure on these salespeople to comply with knowledge sharing practices and behaviors. For those who want to protect themselves from being perceived as incompetent, in the absence of a psychological safety climate to safeguard them from their weaknesses being exposed, higher norms are only likely to exacerbate their reluctance to engage in KSBs. For such salespeople, because of their lack of confidence and capabilities, high norms may prompt them to

activate the risks of KSBs by being overly worried and concerned about looking bad in the eyes of others and not performing to meet other's expectations.

Managerial Implications

From a managerial perspective, our study provides several implications. First, it is important for managers to realize that salespeople may engage in KSBs for different reasons, such as being driven by the benefits of learning and development or impression management. While salespeople with performance approach and avoidance seem to engage in KSBs as a means of impression management, KSBs resulting from such benefits may not always be sustainable. Hence, we advise managers to select and develop salespeople with high learning-goal orientations instead. However, learning-oriented salespeople also require effective supervision that stimulates learning and professional development. Given this, supervisory orientations that emphasize end-results and the development of selling skills may further motivate learning-oriented salespeople to engage in KSBs. In the absence of norms, sales organizations gain by having more learning oriented salespeople.

When salespeople with performance approach are left on their own, they are not willing to engage in KSBs unless norms motivate them to pursue such sharing activities. When sales organizations have such salespeople, the need to develop norms becomes imperative if KSBs are to be encouraged. Because these salespeople are not intrinsically motivated, the benefits of knowledge sharing may need to be explicitly emphasized. Sales leadership can take an active role in this respect. By having leaders endorse the importance of norms and convince everyone in the organization to accept the strategic role that KSBs can play in better serving customers, knowledge sharing can become widely prevalent. Also, building a climate that values social interactions and relationship quality with coworkers outside the sales unit is important in

encouraging individuals to agree on the importance and value of knowledge sharing. Managers need to understand that building communal relationships rather than exchange relationships can facilitate the development of knowledge sharing norms.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

As with all studies, the results of ours should be interpreted with some caution. First, we collected the data from a small number of organizations. Future researchers may eliminate these limitations by collecting data from a larger number of organizations. Second, in testing the first part of the model where we hypothesized the main and interactive effects, we relied on a single source to respond to our survey. Future research should attempt to collect KSBs from different sources, such as from sales managers, as combining the cross-level research design used in our study with a multiple informant research design would make the results more robust. Third, our study was tested in the Korean context. Therefore, the results of our model may be confined to the dynamics of how interpersonal relationships are conducted in South Korea. As such, norms may play a stronger and more active role in the Korean context than in organizations in the West.

Despite the above limitations, our study opens several avenues for promising research in this domain. First, there is a need for a more comprehensive scale to measure salespersons' KSBs. Second, future researchers could replicate and extend our model by investigating whether the hypothesized relationships indicate differences in those firms where KSBs are formally rewarded. Fourth, future researchers should examine other potential determinants of salespeople's KSBs, such as leadership style, learning versus performance climate, and sales force control systems (i.e., outcome and behavioral control).

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. C. and D. W. Gerbing (1988), Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach, *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3), 411-423.

Bagozzi, R. P. and Y. Yi, Y. (1988), On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models, *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 16 (1), 74-94.

Blau, P. M. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley.

Bock, G.W., A. Kankanhalli, and S. Sharma (2006), Are Norms Enough?: The Role of Collaborative Norms in Promoting Organizational Knowledge Seeking, *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15 (4), 357-367.

Bock, G. W., R. W. Zmud, Y. G. Kim, and J. Lee (2005), Behavioral Intention Formation in Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Social-Psychological Forces, and Organizational Climate, *MIS Quarterly*, 29 (1), 87-111.

Brislin, R., W. J. Lonner, and R. M. Thorndike (1973), *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*, New York: Wiley.

Button, S. B., J. E. Mathieu, and D. M. Zajac (1996), Goal Orientation in Organizational Research: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67 (1), 26-48.

Clary, E. G. and M. Snyder (1999), The Motivations to Volunteer: Theoretical and Practical Considerations, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 156-159.

Constant, D., S. Kiesler, and L. Sproull (1994), What's Mine Is Ours, or Is It?: A Study of Attitudes About Information Sharing, *Information Systems Research*, 5 (5), 400-421.

Dweck, C. S. and E. L. Leggett (1988), A Social-Cognitive Approach to Motivation and Personality, *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.

Edmondson, A. (1999), Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 350-383.

Fisher, R. J., E. Maltz, and B. J. Jaworski (1997), Enhancing Communication Between Marketing and Engineering: The Moderating Role of Relative Functional Identification, *Journal of Marketing*, 61 (July), 54-70.

Flaherty, K. E. and J. M. Pappas (2009), Expanding the Sales Professional's Role: A Strategic Re-orientation?, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38, 806-813.

Fornell, C., and D. F. Larcker (1981), Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.

Ganesan, S., A. J. Malter, and A. Rindfleisch (2005), Does Distance Still Matter?: Geographic Proximity and New Product Development, *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (4), 44-60.

Gerbing, D. W. and J. C. Anderson (1988), An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development Incorporating Unidimensionality and Its Assessment, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25 (2), 186-192.

Granovetter, M. (1985), Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness, *American Journal of Sociology*, 91 (3), 481-510.

Hansen, M. T., N. Nohria, and T. Tierney (1999), What's Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge, *Harvard Business Review*, (March-April), 106-116.

Hofmann, D. A. and M. B. Gavin (1998), Centering Decisions in Hierarchical Linear Models: Implications for Research in Organizations, *Journal of Management*, 24, 623-641.

Jaworski, B. J. and A. Kohli (1993), Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences, *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (3), 53-70.

Kankanhalli, A., B. C. Y. Tan, and K. Wei (2005), Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation, *MIS Quarterly*, 29 (1), 113-143.

Kohli, A., T. A. Shervani, and G. M. Challagalla (1998), Learning and Performance Orientation of Salespeople: The Role of Supervisors, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35 (May), 263-274.

Kozlowski, S. W. J. and B. S. Bell (2006), Disentangling Achievement Orientation and Goal Setting: Effects on Self-Regulatory Processes, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4), 900-916.

Lavelle, J. J. (2010), What Motivates OCB?: Insights from the Volunteerism Literature, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 918-923.

Le Bon, J. and D. Merunka (2006), The Impact of Individual and Managerial Factors on Salespeople's Contribution to Market Intelligence Activities, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23, 395-408.

Lindell, M. K. and D. J. Whitney (2001), Accounting for Common Method Variance in Cross-Sectional Research Designs, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (1), 114-121.

Liu, S. S. and L. B. Comer (2007), Salespeople as Information Gatherers: Associated Success Factors, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 565-574.

Malhotra, N. K., S. S. Kim, and A. Patil (2006), Common Method Variance in IS Research: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches and a Reanalysis of Past Research, *Management Science*, 52 (12), 1865-1883.

Payne, S. C., S. S. Youngcourt, and J. M. Beaubien (2007), A Meta-Analytic Examination of the Goal Orientation Nomological Net, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (1), 128-150.

Poortvliet, P. M., O. Janssen, N. W. Van Yperen, and E. Van de Vliert (2007), Achievement Goals and Interpersonal Behavior: How Mastery and Performance Goals Shape Information Exchange, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33 (10), 1435-1447.

Porath, C. L. and T. S. Bateman (2006), Self-Regulation: From Goal Orientation to Job Performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (1), 185-192.

Preacher, K. J., P. J. Curran, and D. J. Bauer (2006), Computational Tools for Probing Interaction Effects in Multiple Linear Regression, Multilevel Modeling, and Latent Curve Analysis, *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 31, 437-448.

Raudenbusch, S., A. Bryk, Y. F. Cheong, R. Congdon, and M. du Toit (2004), HLM 6: Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling, SSI Scientific Software International, IL.

Rindfleisch, A. and C. Moorman (2001), The Acquisition and Utilization of Information in New Product Alliances: A Strength-of-Ties Perspective, *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (2), 1-18.

Schneider, B., S. S. White, and M. C. Paul (1998), Linking Service Climate and Customer Perceptions of Service Quality: Test of a Causal Model, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (2), 150-163.

Sujan, H., B. A. Weitz, and N. Kumar (1994), Learning Orientation, Working Smart, and Effective Selling, *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (July), 39-52.

VandeWalle, D. (1997), Development and Validation of a Work Domain Goal Orientation Instrument, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57 (6), 995-1015.

VandeWalle, D., S. P. Brown, W. L. Cron, and J. W. Slocum (1999), The Influence of Goal Orientation and Self-Regulation Tactics on Sales Performance: A Longitudinal Field Test, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (2), 249-259.

VandeWalle, D., W. L. Cron, and J. W. Slocum (2001), The Role of Goal Orientation Following Performance Feedback, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (4), 629-640.

Wasko, M. M., S. and Faraj (2005), Why Should I Share?: Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice, *MIS Quarterly*, 29 (1), 35-57.

Weitz, B. A., and K. D. Bradford (1999), Personal Selling and Sales Management: A Relationship Marketing Perspective, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27 (2), 241-254.

TABLE 1 - Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations, and Reliability Estimates

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Learning orientation		.33**	-.36**	.30**	.26**	.24**	.17**	.06
2. Performance approach orientation	.36**		-.11	.05	.30**	.32**	.06	.01
3. Performance avoidance orientation	-.29**	-.05		-.15*	-.28**	-.06	-.22**	-.18*
4. Knowledge sharing behaviors	.33**	.10	-.09		.33**	.16*	.03	.03
5. Knowledge sharing norms	.30**	.33**	-.22**	.36**		.04	.02	.13*
6. Coworker relationship quality	.28**	.35**	-.01	.20**	.09		.01	.03
7. Age	.21**	.11	-.16*	.08	.07	.04		.49**
8. Firm experience	.11	.05	-.12	.08	.17*	.08	.49**	
Mean	3.91	3.76	2.60	3.55	3.97	3.49	33.09	.00
Standard deviation	.73	.78	.79	.91	.31	.81	7.10	.90
<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>	.81	.81	.84	.86	.79	.83	-	-
Composite reliability	.82	.83	.86	.88	.81	.84	-	-
Average variance extracted	.53	.52	.58	.56	.50	.54	-	-

Notes: Correlations between all variables except knowledge sharing norms are operationalized at the individual (i.e., salesperson) level. Correlations between knowledge sharing norms and all other variables were computed by assigning the same value for each salesperson's responses to the individual-level variables. Correlations after marker variable adjustment are shown above the diagonal. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed test)

TABLE 2 - Results of HLM-Based Regression Analysis

Variables	Model 1	Model 2^a	Model 3^b	Model 4^a
Intercept	3.33***	3.33***	3.33***	3.33***
Level 1 variables				
Age		.64	.54	.51
Sales experience		.05	.03	.04
Coworker relationship quality		.18**	.14*	.12*
Learning orientation		.34**	.24*	.27*
Performance approach orientation		.05	-.03	-.05
Performance avoidance orientation		-.01	-.02	-.01
Level 2 variables				
Knowledge sharing norms			.30**	.27*
Cross-level interactions				
Learning orientation x Norms				-.36**
Performance approach orientation x Norms				.42**
Performance avoidance orientation x Norms				-.25*
Deviance (df)	427.66*** (3)	384.78*** (9)	375.98*** (10)	364.03*** (13)
Δ Deviance (Δ df)	-	42.88*** (6)	8.81** (1)	11.95** (3)
Pseudo R ² _{within-organization}	-	.20	.24	.28
Pseudo R ² _{between-organization}	-	-	.58	.66

Note. N = 209 at the salesperson level (Level 1). N = 28 at the organization level (Level 2). Fixed effects with robust standard errors are reported. ^aGroup mean centering for Level 1 variables and grand mean centering for Level 2 variables. ^bGrand mean centering for both Level 1 and Level 2 variables (Hofmann and Gavin 1998).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ level (two-tailed test).