

# Gender Differences in Dispositional Traits of Sales Representatives

*By Jane McKay-Nesbitt and Malcolm C. Smith*

Gender differences in sales representatives' three specific dispositional traits - self-regulatory orientation, achievement orientation, and tendencies to experience positive versus negative emotions in a sales context, along with the impact of sales experience on these traits, were investigated amongst sales representatives working in the United States. Data were collected online from 93 male and 87 female sales representatives. Respondents sold a variety of industrial and consumer products in business-to-business and business-to-consumer settings. Females reported significantly lower prevention regulatory focus, performance achievement orientation, and fewer negative emotions regarding their sales performance. For males, but not for females, as sales experience increased, prevention focus decreased, performance orientation decreased, and negative emotions decreased. Implications for sales management practices as well as theory are discussed.

Although females make up approximately half of the United States' workforce and 51.5% of managerial and professional positions (Mandelbaum 2017; Voria 2018), they represent only 39% of sales representatives. The percentage of females in sales increased by only 3% from 2004 to 2014 (Mandelbaum 2017). Thus, it is likely that research in sales has been carried out mostly on males and consequently, we know little about individual differences between female and male salespeople. We aim to begin to close this gap.

Some research has investigated behavioral differences between genders in a sales context. For instance, Chakrabarty (2020) found that female insurance sales representatives exhibited more effective non-verbal communication skills and higher levels of interpersonal skills than their male counterparts. Comer and her colleagues (1995) identified differences in how sales representatives respond to female sales managers. Whereas males responded better to leaders who displayed individualized consideration and managed by exception, females responded better to charismatic leaders and intellectually stimulating management methods. Piercy and his colleagues (2003) found gender differences in control strategies employed by male and

female sales managers. Female sales managers exhibit more behavioral (i.e., monitor, direct, evaluate, and reward) versus outcome (i.e., incentive pay) control strategies than their male counterparts. Piercy and his colleagues (2003) also found, that female sales managers used more behavioral control strategies than male sales managers and were better at employing them. Others have recently identified gender differences in types of behavior controls to which sales representatives respond best (Gottfried, Ambrose, and Plank 2017). Female sales representatives' intrinsic motivation is enhanced by capability controls (i.e., controls that allow them to develop essential selling skills), but male sales representatives' intrinsic motivation is enhanced by output controls that focus on sales quotas. MacIntosh and Krush (2014) examined links between gender and salesperson networking behaviors, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. They found that professional networking provides objective benefits for female sales representatives while customer networking provides objective benefits for male sales representatives. Identifying the aforementioned behavioral differences between genders is important; however, identifying what causes these behavioral differences will aid our understanding of the reasons that female sales representatives may behave differently from their male counterparts.

A root cause of behavior is a person's dispositional traits which are tendencies to choose certain actions in particular circumstances (e.g., Ripski, LoCasale-Crouch, and Decker 2011). In fact, research has shown

---

**Jane McKay-Nesbitt** (Ph.D. University of Manitoba), Professor of Marketing (retired), Bryant University, jmckayne@bryant.edu

**Malcolm C. Smith** (Ph.D. University of Oregon), Professor of Marketing and F. Ross Johnson Fellow, University of Manitoba, malcolm.smith@umanitoba.ca

that an individual's dispositional traits are useful in predicting attitudes, behaviors, performance, and outcomes in organizational settings (Ones et al. 2007); they predispose individuals to interpret events in a particular way. This predisposition affects behaviors and interactions with others (Kokkinos 2007).

Recent research has also demonstrated that sales representatives' dispositional traits are important predictors of sales effectiveness (e.g., Deeter-Schmelz and Sojka 2003; Rozell, Pettijohn, and Parker 2006; Silver, Dwyer, and Alford 2006; Sojka and Deeter-Schmelz 2008). For example, Caza and Posner (2019) found that grit, defined as a personality trait, influences the frequency with which sales managers engage in leadership behaviors. There has also been some consideration given to the effects of emotional intelligence (EQ), which is also considered to be a dispositional trait, on sales effort (Borg and Johnston 2013). Ogilvie and her colleagues (2017) found that for business-to-business sales representatives with high EQ, more effort resulted in better relational performance (i.e., ability to build relationships with customers). For low EQ sales representatives however, additional effort reaches a point of diminishing returns where additional effort does not yield better relational performance. Although the effects of dispositional traits such as grit and EQ on sales performance have been explored, to our knowledge, gender differences in dispositional traits have received limited attention in the sales literature.

Therefore, our goal is to investigate the topic of gender differences in dispositional traits among sales representatives. A better understanding of these differences may aid our knowledge of why gender differences in sales behavior may occur, thus aiding efforts to recruit, maintain, and manage both female and male sales representatives. Additionally, our goal is to contribute to theory and provide direction for future research.

In this research, we examine gender differences in sales representatives' three specific dispositional traits - self-regulatory orientation, achievement orientation, and tendencies to experience positive versus negative emotions in a sales context. We further consider the impact of sales experience on these dispositional traits.

This paper proceeds as follows. We review the literature and develop research questions regarding gender differences in the above-mentioned dispositional traits and effects of sales experience on these traits. We then present the results of an empirical study undertaken with sales representatives in the United States to address these research questions. The paper concludes with managerial implications of our findings and suggestions for further research.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

### **Self-regulatory Orientation: Promotion versus Prevention Focus**

Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT; Higgins 1998) proposes that individual differences in self-regulatory orientation (i.e., regulatory focus) emerge due to socialization during childhood. Individuals develop two distinct self-regulatory orientations: a promotion orientation (focus) and a prevention orientation (focus). Both orientations are approach-oriented motivational systems (Molden, Lee, and Higgins 2008) but differ in their focus on outcomes and strategies for achieving those goals.

Promotion-focused individuals focus on hopes, aspirations, and ideals and are motivated by accomplishment, advancement, and growth. These individuals strive to achieve goals by ensuring that they do not miss opportunities; they employ eager strategies to pursue their goals (Brockner and Higgins 2001). Promotion-focused individuals are concerned more about achieving success than avoiding failure. Promotion-focused individuals have a strong desire to seize opportunities and are willing to adopt risky strategies (Crowe and Higgins 1997; Pham and Avnet 2004). Promotion focus has also been shown to be associated with positive emotions (Bhatnagar and McKay-Nesbitt 2016; Gorman et al. 2012).

Prevention-focused people focus on duties and obligations and are motivated by safety, security, and prevention of losses. Prevention-focused individuals strive to avoid mistakes and employ careful strategies to pursue their goals. They are more concerned about avoiding failure than achieving success. A prevention-focused person adopts conservative, non-risky strategies

to avoid mistakes. Prevention-focus is associated with negative emotions (Bhatnagar and McKay-Nesbitt 2016; Gorman et al. 2012).

RFT has not received much attention in the sales literature. There is evidence however, that a sales person's regulatory focus is associated with sales role. DeCarlo and Lam (2015) found that a promotion focus is more strongly related than a prevention focus to a hunter sales role, whereas a prevention focus is more strongly associated than a promotion focus with a farmer sales role. Others have found that employees' regulatory focus may influence self-regulation and behavior at work (Brockner and Higgins 2001; Johnson et al. 2015; Lanaj, Chang, and Johnson 2012; Wallace, Johnson, and Frazier 2009). Because a promotion focus results in focusing on accomplishing goals, promotion-focused employees engage in work strategies that maximize gains and productivity. Conversely, prevention-focused employees are more cautious and engage in behavior that increases safety performance and are less concerned with maximizing productivity.

Sales representatives are typically most concerned with achieving success and they are willing to take risks to do so (Morris, Avila, and Teeple 1990). Sales representatives have been described as having a "powerful, unrelenting, internal drive to excel" (Lill and Lill 2012, p.19). They want to maximize sales. Effective sales representatives are enthusiastic, optimistic, and eagerly pursue their goals (Dubinsky and Ingram 1984; Martin 2011). Lounsbury, Gibson, and Hamrick (2004) found that both salespersons and sales managers were ambitious and exhibited higher levels of work drive than other occupations. Since sales representatives eagerly pursue goals and are not risk averse, it is possible that they are more promotion- than prevention-focused.

Although little attention has been paid to gender differences in self-regulatory orientation, there is some evidence that these differences exist (McKay-Nesbitt, Bhatnagar, and Smith 2013). Females (males) have been shown to be more prevention- (promotion-) focused than males (females). These findings are consistent with literature that finds females to be more risk-averse than males (Hersch 1996). Our research questions, therefore, are as follows:

RQ1: Will sales representatives tend to be more promotion- versus prevention-focused?

RQ2: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit a promotion versus a prevention regulatory focus?

### **Achievement Orientation: Learning versus Performance Orientation**

Achievement Theory seeks to explain how individuals regulate behavior to become competent in tasks to achieve goals (Ames 1992; Ames and Archer 1988; Dweck and Leggett 1988). As with regulatory focus, individuals have two distinct orientations toward developing and demonstrating competence: a learning achievement orientation and a performance achievement orientation (Ames 1992).

Individuals with a learning achievement orientation typically believe that ability can be developed. These individuals view achievement situations as opportunities to develop competence through hard work and effort (Dweck and Leggett 1988). They are motivated to achieve intrinsic rewards that come from mastering a task and they are risk tolerant. Sales representatives with a learning orientation who face difficult situations or failures are persistent and renew efforts to succeed (Sujan, Weitz, and Kumar 1994). There is evidence that females are more likely than males to exhibit a learning orientation (Akin 2010).

Individuals with a performance achievement orientation believe that success is a result of ability which is difficult to develop (Dweck and Leggett 1988). These individuals think that innate ability is needed to demonstrate competence, and that effort will only pay off for the very skilled. Performance-oriented individuals want to be viewed as competent and successful and are motivated to achieve results by extrinsic rewards (Ames and Archer 1988). They are however, risk averse and reluctant to try new approaches as they are concerned about failure and being judged as incompetent. Adopting a performance achievement orientation may cause sales representatives to avoid challenging situations to reduce possibilities of failure (Sujan et al. 1994). Males are more likely than females to exhibit a performance orientation (Akin 2010).

Therefore, our research questions are:

RQ3: Do sales representatives tend to have stronger learning- versus performance-achievement orientations?

RQ4: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit learning- versus performance-achievement orientations?

### **Emotions: Positive versus Negative**

In general, emotions motivate and drive behavior (see Frijda 1986; Passyn and Sujun 2006) and are integral to all aspects of organizational life (Brotheridge and Lee 2008). Barsade and Gibson (2007) found overwhelming evidence that "experiencing and expressing positive emotions and moods enhances performance at individual, group and organizational levels" (p. 51). Similarly, Hazelton (2014) found that in the workplace, positive emotions help to build individual and organizational success. Ozelik, Langton, and Aldrich (2008) showed that a positive emotional climate within business organizations has positive effects on organizational outcomes including increased revenue and increases in sales. Barsade and Gibson's (2007) review also revealed that negative emotions within individuals in organizations can do significant harm by negatively influencing perceptions of leaders, even leading to aggression and violence. Additionally, negative workplace emotions have been shown to be associated with increased sick time and intentions to quit (Fugate, Kinicki, and Prussia 2008).

Differences in tendencies of females and males to express positive (females) versus negative (males) emotions have also been identified. Women express discrete positive emotions (e.g., happy) more frequently than men (Linley et al. 2016), and males have been shown to express more negative emotions than females (e.g., shame; Ferguson, Eyre, and Ashbaker 2000; Silfver 2007). It is not known however, whether gender differences are evident in tendencies of sales representatives to express positive versus negative emotions regarding their sales performance. Therefore, our research questions are:

RQ5: Are sales representatives more likely to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?

RQ6: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?

### **The Role of Sales Experience**

There is evidence that both regulatory focus and achievement orientation may be influenced by situations (Ames and Archer 1988; Friedman and Forster 2001; Sujun et al. 1994). It is possible that sales experience, a situational influence, may impact these dispositional traits. Similarly, it is possible that experienced sales representatives may feel differently than inexperienced sales representatives about their sales performance vis-à-vis their peers. Therefore, we ask the following research question:

RQ7: What is the effect of sales experience on sales representatives' tendencies to a) be promotion- versus prevention-focused, b) be learning- versus performance-oriented, and c) report positive versus negative emotions when considering their sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants**

A survey of business-to-business (64.4%) and business-to-business plus business-to-consumer (44.8%) sales representatives was conducted to explore the above research questions. Data were collected online using a Qualtrics panel. Attention checks were embedded in the questionnaire; only data from those who passed the attention check were included. A total of 180 usable responses were obtained from 93 male and 87 female sales representatives currently working in the United States. Respondents sold a variety of industrial and consumer products. Male ages ranged from 25 to 61 years with a mean (standard deviation) of 40.69 (9.32) years. Female ages ranged from 25 to 60 years with a mean (standard deviation) age of 37.68 (8.98) years.

The mean (standard deviation) years of sales experience for males was 13.11 (8.44) years and 10.63 (7.03) years for females.

### Procedure and Measures

After consenting to participate in the study, participants provided information about their gender and years of sales experience. They then responded to questions to assess chronic regulatory focus and achievement orientation. The questionnaire concluded with questions to assess participants' emotions regarding their overall sales performance relative to their peers.

### Independent variable

Gender was the only independent variable. Participants were asked to indicate whether they considered themselves to be male or female.

### Dependent variables

*Chronic regulatory focus* was measured via the General Regulatory Focus Measure (GRFM; Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda 2002) which consists of nine 9-point scale items that measure promotion focus (e.g., "I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future") and nine that measure prevention focus (e.g., "In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life"), where 1 = *not at all true of me* and 9 = *very true of me*. Analyses revealed that the promotion and prevention scales were reliable (Cronbach's  $\alpha_{\text{promotion}} = .89$ ; Cronbach's  $\alpha_{\text{prevention}} = .86$ ) and items were averaged to form promotion- and prevention-focus indices.

*Achievement orientation* was measured using previously published scales (Kohli, Shervani, and Challagalla 1998). Learning orientation was measured with six, and performance orientation was measured with five 5-point Likert scale items. Endpoints were anchored with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. Learning-orientation scale items assess concerns with developing skills and abilities (e.g., "An important part about being a salesperson is continually improving your sales skills"). Performance orientation items assess concerns with being perceived as a successful salesperson (e.g., "I feel very good when I know that I have outperformed other salespeople in my company"). Analysis of learning orientation items revealed that

an acceptable reliability level could be maximized by removing the first item (Cronbach  $\alpha = .86$ ), so the remaining five items were averaged to form an index of learning achievement orientation. The performance orientation scale reliability was acceptable (Cronbach  $\alpha = .80$ ) so the five items were averaged to form an index of performance achievement orientation.

*Emotions* were measured using scales adapted from previously published measures (Thompson 2007). Participants were asked to think about their overall sales performance relative to their peers and indicate how often they experienced positive emotions (pride, enthusiasm, inspiration) and negative emotions (shame, guilt, embarrassment). Responses were recorded on 5-point Likert scales, anchored with 1 = *very infrequently* and 5 = *very frequently*. Reliability of the measures for positive and negative emotions was acceptable (Cronbach  $\alpha_{\text{positive emotions}} = .77$ ; Cronbach  $\alpha_{\text{negative emotions}} = .90$ ), so the items were averaged to form scales for positive and negative emotions.

### Covariate

Sales experience was included as a covariate. It is possible that the length of time a person has worked in sales may impact their tendencies to i) be promotion- versus prevention-focused, ii) be performance- versus learning-oriented, and iii) display positive versus negative emotions when considering their sales performance vis-à-vis their peers.

## RESULTS

### Regulatory Focus

*RQ1: Will sales representatives tend to be more promotion- versus prevention-focused?*

RQ1 was tested with a paired-samples t-test. Results showed that sales representatives tend to be more promotion- versus prevention-focused. Sales representatives' mean promotion score ( $M = 7.16$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ,  $N = 180$ ) was significantly higher than their mean prevention score ( $M = 5.84$ ,  $SD = 1.62$ ,  $N = 180$ ;  $t(179) = 9.51$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

*RQ2: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit a promotion versus a prevention regulatory focus?*



Follow-up tests to assess male and female differences regarding promotion and prevention focus were conducted with paired-samples *t*-tests. Paired-samples *t*-test results showed that both male and female sales representatives tend to be more promotion- than prevention-focused. Male sales representatives' mean promotion score ( $M = 7.20$ ,  $SD = 1.12$ ,  $N = 93$ ) was significantly higher than their mean prevention score ( $M = 6.19$ ,  $SD = 1.69$ ,  $N = 93$ ;  $t(92) = 5.60$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Similarly, females' mean promotion score ( $M = 7.12$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ,  $N = 87$ ) was significantly higher than their mean prevention score ( $M = 5.46$ ,  $SD = 1.46$ ,  $N = 87$ ;  $t(86) = 7.93$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Further testing of female and male differences regarding regulatory focus was conducted using ANCOVA.

*RQ7a: What is the effect of sales experience on sales representatives' tendencies to be promotion- versus prevention-focused?*

Follow-up ANCOVAs with promotion- and prevention-focus scores as dependent variables, gender as the factor, and sales experience as a covariate, revealed that male and female sales representatives do not differ in promotion-focus scores ( $M_{\text{males}} = 7.20$ ,  $M_{\text{females}} = 7.12$ ;  $F(1,177) = .151$ ,  $p = .698$ ); their prevention-focus scores differ significantly however ( $M_{\text{males}} = 6.19$ ,  $M_{\text{females}} = 5.46$ ;  $F(1,177) = 13.15$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Male sales representatives reported a stronger prevention focus than do female sales representatives. Sales experience had no effect on promotion-focus scores ( $F(1,177) = .032$ ,  $p = .858$ ) whereas it had a significant effect on prevention-focus scores ( $F(1,177) = 9.40$ ,  $p = .003$ ).

Further investigation of the relationship between prevention-focus scores and sales experience using Pearson's correlation coefficient revealed a significant negative linear relationship between prevention-focus scores and sales experience for males ( $r(93) = -.326$ ,  $p = .001$ ) but not for females ( $r(87) = -.073$ ,  $p = .499$ ). The mean (standard deviation) for prevention-focus scores was 6.19 (1.69) and for sales experience was 13.11 (8.44) for males; for females the mean (standard deviation) for prevention-focus scores was 5.46 (1.46) and for sales experience was 10.63 (7.03) years. For male sales representatives, as sales experience increases, prevention-focus scores decrease.

## Achievement Orientation

*RQ3: Do sales representatives tend to have a stronger learning- versus performance-achievement orientation?*

RQ3, as to whether sales representatives are more learning- versus performance-oriented, was tested with a paired-samples *t*-test. Results showed that sales representatives tend to be more performance- than learning-oriented. Sales representatives' mean performance score ( $M = 5.21$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ,  $N = 180$ ) was significantly higher than their mean learning score ( $M = 4.24$ ,  $SD = .68$ ,  $N = 180$ ;  $t(179) = 12.32$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

*RQ4: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit a learning- versus a performance-achievement orientation?*

Follow-up tests to assess male and female differences regarding learning and performance orientations were conducted with paired-samples *t*-tests. Paired-samples *t*-test results showed that both male and female sales representatives tend to be more performance- than learning-oriented. Male sales representatives' mean performance score ( $M = 5.39$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ,  $N = 93$ ) was significantly higher than their mean learning score ( $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = .54$ ,  $N = 93$ ;  $t(92) = 11.08$ ,  $p = .000$ ); females' mean performance score ( $M = 5.03$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ,  $N = 87$ ) was also significantly higher than their mean learning score ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = .81$ ,  $N = 87$ ;  $t(86) = 6.72$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Further testing of male and female differences regarding achievement orientation was conducted using ANCOVA.

*RQ7b: What is the effect of sales experience on sales representatives' tendencies to be more learning- versus performance- oriented?*

Follow-up ANCOVAs with performance- and learning-achievement scores as dependent variables, gender as the factor, and sales experience as a covariate, revealed that male and female sales representatives' mean learning-orientation scores do not differ ( $M_{\text{males}} = 4.25$ ,  $M_{\text{females}} = 4.23$ ;  $F(1,177) = .138$ ,  $p = .711$ ); their mean performance-orientation scores differ significantly however ( $M_{\text{males}} = 5.38$ ,  $M_{\text{females}} = 5.03$ ;  $F(1,177) = 5.76$ ,  $p = .017$ ). Male sales representatives report a stronger performance orientation than do female sales representatives. The ANCOVA showed that sales

experience had no effect on learning orientation scores ( $F(1,777) = 1.34, p = .248$ ); however, it had a marginally significant effect on performance orientation scores ( $F(1,177) = 3.45, p = .065$ ).

Further investigation of the relationship between performance orientation scores and sales experience using Pearson's correlation coefficient revealed a significant negative linear relationship between performance-orientation scores and sales experience for male ( $r(93) = -.235, p = .023$ ) but not for female sales representatives ( $r(87) = -.021, p = .850$ ). For male sales representatives, as sales experience increases, performance-orientation scores decrease. The mean (standard deviation) for performance-orientation scores was 5.39 (1.10) and for sales experience was 13.11 (8.44) for male sales representatives. For female sales representatives, the mean (standard deviation) for performance-orientation scores was 5.03 (1.14) and for sales experience was 10.63 (7.03) years.

## Emotions

*RQ5: Are sales representatives more likely to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?*

RQ5, as to whether sales representatives report more positive versus negative emotions regarding their sales performance relative to their peers, was tested with a paired-samples *t*-test. Results showed that sales representatives tend to report more positive versus negative emotions regarding their sales performance relative to their peers. Sales representatives' mean positive emotions score ( $M = 3.83, SD = .81, N = 180$ ) was significantly higher than their mean negative emotions score ( $M = 2.09, SD = 1.20, N = 180; t(179) = 16.26, p = .000$ ).

*RQ6: Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?*

Follow-up tests to assess male and female differences regarding positive versus negative emotions were conducted with paired-samples *t*-tests. Paired-samples *t*-test results showed that both male and female sales representatives tend to report more positive versus

negative emotions regarding their sales performance relative to their peers. Male sales representatives' mean positive emotions score ( $M = 3.80, SD = .80, N = 93$ ) was significantly higher than their mean negative emotions score ( $M = 2.44, SD = 1.35, N = 93; t(92) = 9.46, p = .000$ ). Females' mean positive emotions score ( $M = 3.86, SD = .83, N = 87$ ) was also significantly higher than their mean negative emotions score ( $M = 1.71, SD = .88, N = 87; t(86) = 14.48, p = .000$ ). Further testing of male and female differences regarding positive versus negative emotions was conducted using ANCOVA.

*RQ7c: What is the effect of sales experience on sales representatives' tendencies to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?*

Follow-up ANCOVAs with positive and negative emotions scores as dependent variables, gender as the factor, and sales experience as a covariate, revealed that, when considering past sales performance relative to their peers, male and female sales representatives do not report differences in mean positive emotions scores ( $M_{\text{males}} = 3.80, M_{\text{females}} = 3.86; F(1,177) = .333, p = .565$ ). Their mean negative emotions scores however, differ significantly ( $M_{\text{males}} = 2.44, M_{\text{females}} = 1.71; F(1,177) = 23.19, p = .000$ ). Male sales representatives report greater negative emotions than female sales representatives when they consider their sales performance vis-à-vis their peers. The ANCOVA showed that sales experience did not influence positive emotions ( $F(1,177) = .374, p = .542$ ) but it had a significant effect on negative emotions ( $F(1,177) = 10.62, p = .001$ ).

Further investigation of the relationship between negative emotions and sales experience using Pearson's correlation coefficient revealed a significant negative linear relationship between negative emotions scores and sales experience for male ( $r(93) = -.270, p = .009$ ) but not for female sales representatives ( $r(87) = -.18, p = .095$ ). The mean (standard deviation) for negative emotions scores was 2.44 (1.35) and for sales experience was 13.11 (8.44) for males. For females, the mean (standard deviation) for negative emotions scores was 1.71 (.88) and for sales experience was 10.63 (7.03) years. As males' sales experience increases, negative emotions decrease.

In summary, our analysis shows that female versus male sales representatives report a weaker prevention focus, a weaker performance orientation, and fewer negative emotions regarding their sales performance. Females and males also differ with respect to the influence of sales experience on prevention focus, performance orientation, and negative emotions. Whereas, for females, sales experience had no effect on prevention focus, performance orientation, or negative emotions, as males' sales experience increased, prevention focus, performance orientation and negative emotions all declined.

Our results revealed some female and male similarities. Both female and male sales representatives are more likely to i) be promotion- versus prevention-focused, ii) have performance- versus learning-achievement orientations, and iii) report more positive versus negative emotions when considering their sales performance relative to their peers. For both females and males, sales experience had no effect on promotion focus, learning orientation, or positive emotions. Our results are summarized in Table 1.

## **DISCUSSION OF IMPLICATIONS AND POSSIBLE FUTURE RESEARCH**

### **Managerial Implications**

Our findings have important implications for sales professionals which we discuss using our research questions as a framework.

#### ***Regulatory focus***

Our results show that sales representatives tend to be more promotion- versus prevention-focused regardless of gender (RQ1), but male sales representatives are more prevention-focused than females (RQ2).

Past research has shown however, that promotion- and prevention-regulatory focus dispositional traits can be changed by situational cues (Friedman and Forster 2001; Liberman et al. 1999). Situational cues centred on ideals and gains tend to arouse a promotion focus; situational cues focused on avoiding failure tend to arouse a prevention focus. Our results suggest that sales managers can foster a predominant promotion focus in female and male sales representatives by using coaching strategies

that encourage new sales tactics. Sales managers may also aid employees to become less prevention-focused by encouraging them to avoid being too cautious when engaging in sales activities. Sales management efforts should reduce punishments associated with unsuccessful sales innovations. Given our findings that male sales representatives tend to be more prevention-focused than female sales representatives, these sales management efforts will be especially important for males, who thrive when sales managers provide individualized attention (Comer et al. 1995).

Female and male sales representatives should be aware of situational influences that impact their tendencies to be prevention-focused. Male sales representatives should be especially mindful of situations that may arouse concerns with avoiding failure. Awareness of these situations may assist sales representatives to reduce their prevention focus. This may encourage them to take risks necessary to enhance their ability to be successful in sales.

#### ***Achievement orientation***

Our investigation of RQ3 revealed that both female and male sales representatives tend to be more performance- than learning-oriented. Ames and Archer (1988) showed that performance-oriented employees are reluctant to try new approaches and believe that competence is a result of innate ability. They exert effort only if they perceive themselves to be already skilled. This may cause sales representatives to avoid challenging situations, thus reducing possibilities for failure (Sujan et al. 1994). They may be especially concerned about being viewed as successful and competent, and motivated by extrinsic rewards such as praise.

As with regulatory focus, an individual's chronic achievement orientation may be shifted by situational factors (e.g., competition; VandeWalle et al. 1999) or other people (e.g., sales manager; Button, Mathieu, and Zajack 1996). Thus, sales managers can decrease a salesperson's performance orientation and increase their learning orientation by "managing" sales team culture. Frequent training to acquire new skills and continually offering words of encouragement may assist sales representatives to reduce a performance orientation and increase their learning orientation. Managers



TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

	Question	Results	Gender Differences	Gender Similarities
<i>RQ1 Regulatory Focus</i>	Will sales representatives tend to be more promotion-versus prevention-focused?	Sales representatives tend to be more promotion- than prevention-focused.		
<i>RQ2 Gender differences in Regulatory Focus</i>	Are there gender difference in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit promotion versus a prevention regulatory focus?		<b><i>Male sales representatives report a stronger prevention focus than do female sales representatives</i></b> (see Results for RQ7a).	Both male and female sales representatives tend to be more promotion- than prevention-focused.  Male and female sales representatives do not report differences in promotion-focus scores (see Results for RQ7a).
<i>RQ3 Achievement Orientation</i>	Do sales representatives tend to have a stronger learning-versus performance-achievement orientation?	Sales representatives tend to be more performance- than learning-oriented.		
<i>RQ4 Gender differences in Achievement Orientation</i>	Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to exhibit a learning-versus a performance-achievement orientation?		<b><i>Male sales representatives report a stronger performance-achievement orientation than do female sales representatives</i></b> (see Results for RQ7b).	Both male and female sales representatives tend to be more performance- than learning-oriented.  Male and female sales

				representatives' mean learning achievement scores do not differ (see Results for RQ7b).
<i>RQ5</i> <i>Positive versus negative emotions</i>	Are sales representatives more likely to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?	Sales representatives tend to report more positive versus negative emotions regarding their sales performance relative to their peers.		
<i>RQ6</i> <i>Gender differences in positive versus negative emotions</i>	Are there gender differences in sales representatives' tendencies to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?		<b><i>Male sales representatives report greater negative emotions than female sales representatives regarding their sales performance relative to their peers</i></b> (see Results RQ7c).	Both male and female sales representatives tend to report more positive versus negative emotions regarding their sales performance relative to their peers.  Male and female sales representatives do not report differences in mean positive emotions scores regarding their sales performance relative to their peers (see Results for Q7c).

<i>RQ7a Sales experience and Regulatory Focus</i>	What is the effect of sales experience on a sales professional's tendency to be promotion- versus prevention-focused?	.	<b><i>For male (but not female) sales representatives, as sales experience increases, prevention-focus scores decrease.</i></b>	Sales experience is not related to promotion-focus scores for either males or females.
<i>RQ7b Sales experience and Achievement Orientation</i>	What is the effect of sales experience on a sales professional's tendency to be learning- versus performance-oriented?		<b><i>For male (but not female) sales representatives, as sales experience increases, performance-orientation scores decrease.</i></b>	Sales experience is not related to learning-orientation scores for either male or female sales representatives.
<i>RQ7c Sales experience and emotions</i>	What is the effect of sales experience on a sales professional's tendency to report positive versus negative emotions when considering past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers?		<b><i>For male (but not female) sales representatives, as sales experience increases, negative emotions decrease.</i></b>	Sales experience is not related to positive emotions scores for either male or female sales representatives.

may also de-emphasize short-term performance goals and emphasize long-term competency goals. Sales representatives may focus less on immediate performance when learning new skills is rewarded and negative consequences of taking time to do so are decreased. Some suggest that it is 'important for sales managers to have a clear and focused learning orientation' (Paparoidamis 2005, p. 1060) because learning-oriented organizations outperform those that are only performance oriented.

Our analysis of RQ4 revealed that female sales representatives have lower performance orientations

than male sales representatives. These results agree with past research that has shown that males are i) more performance-oriented than females (Akin 2010) and ii) respond better than females to controls that focus on sales quotas (Gottfried et al. 2017). Because female sales representatives tend to be less performance-oriented than male sales representatives, they may be less motivated by extrinsic rewards than males. Thus, while still using extrinsic rewards to recognize competence for both female and male sales representatives, managers may want to add some intrinsic rewards for females (e.g., ability to set own sales goals). For male sales representatives, as with the case of prevention-

focus, if managers reduce the impact of possible failure when new tactics are tried, male sales representatives may become more willing to try new courses of action.

Sales representatives may also want to be cognizant of situations that increase their tendencies to be performance-oriented and focus on extrinsic rewards. Making an effort to focus on the intrinsic rewards that come from selling may assist them to become less performance-oriented and more learning-oriented in their sales efforts.

### ***Emotions***

RQ5 and RQ6 investigated the frequency of feeling positive versus negative emotions when sales representatives consider their past sales performance vis-à-vis their peers. Gender differences in sales performance emotions are important, given evidence that positive emotions are good for business while negative ones are not. Our results show that both female and male sales representatives report more positive than negative emotions when considering their sales performance relative to their peers. When compared to male sales representatives however, female sales representatives express fewer negative emotions regarding their sales performance. It could be that males are more competitive than females and if they are not at the “head of the pack”, they feel more shame, guilt, etc. Given that negative emotions can negatively impact organizational performance (Barsade and Gibson 2007; Fugate et al. 2008), this finding should concern both sales managers and sales representatives.

Managers are especially important for helping sales force members express positive emotions (Sy, Cote, and Saavedra 2005). Managers who express positive emotions are more likely to have employees who express positive emotions, and who are confident and optimistic. Expressions of negative emotions by managers on the other hand, are associated with negative outcomes such as increased perceptions of poor organizational performance (Daniels 1998). By publicly expressing their positive, but not negative emotions, sales managers can create a “positive-emotion friendly” workplace culture.

Dogan and Vecchio (2001) report that unfortunately employees often experience negative emotions in the workplace. Sales managers can encourage sales representatives to manage their negative emotions through stress management techniques, peer encouragement, etc. Although these sales management strategies will be beneficial for females and males, since our research suggests that males are more prone than females to express negative emotions, these activities will be especially important for male sales representatives.

### ***Sales experience and dispositional traits***

RQ7 examined the relationship between sales representatives’ sales experience and a) regulatory focus, b) achievement orientation, and c) emotions when considering sales experience relative to their peers. For male sales representatives, as sales experience increases, i) prevention-focus decreases, ii) performance-orientation decreases, and iii) negative emotions decrease. Taken together, these findings highlight the importance of employing sales management strategies that permit male sales representatives to increase their sales experience. Understanding that these traits decrease with sales experience will i) assist sales managers to work at retaining less-experienced male sales representatives, and ii) provide male sales representatives with motivation needed to persist with sales careers. Because our results showed that sales experience had no impact on female sales representatives’ dispositional traits, sales management strategies that encourage females to persist with sales careers may be less necessary for females.

### **Theoretical Implications and Possible Future Research**

Our research adds to the growing sales literature that explores sales professionals’ dispositional traits. It extends this literature by considering how female and male sales representatives differ with respect to regulatory focus, achievement orientation, and tendencies to experience positive versus negative emotions in a sales context.

Our findings have also contributed to an understanding of RFT which contends that an individual’s chronic regulatory focus emerges as a result of childhood



socialization processes (Higgins et al. 2001). Conversely, our results suggest that socialization processes during adulthood may also influence chronic regulatory focus. Individuals who were more socialized into a sales culture (i.e., had more sales experience) exhibited lower levels of prevention focus than those with fewer years of sales experience. To our knowledge, this study is the first to show that chronic regulatory focus fluctuates with work experience. Furthermore, this is one of the first studies to consider the contribution that RFT may make to research in sales.

This research has also contributed to our understanding of Achievement Theory. To our knowledge, this study is the first to consider gender differences in achievement orientation among sales representatives. Previous research has found evidence that female students are more mastery- (i.e., learning-) oriented than males and that males are more performance-oriented than females (Kayis and Ceyhan 2015). Our research however, suggests that male sales representatives are equally as likely as female sales representatives to be learning-oriented whereas male sales representatives tend to be more performance-oriented than female sales representatives. Further research is needed to explore the effects of role (i.e., student versus sales professional) and age on achievement orientation.

Finally, this work contributes to literature on emotions by demonstrating gender differences in negative, but not positive emotions, regarding work outcomes. It also provides evidence to suggest that while positive emotions about work outcomes do not change with work experience, negative emotions decline. Further research could provide additional understanding as to why these changes are evident for negative but not positive emotions.

Our work has identified possible avenues for future research. This research suggests that male sales representatives are more prevention-focused than female sales representatives, whereas previous research suggests that female students are more prevention-focused than male students (McKay-Nesbitt et al. 2013). Further research is necessary to explore why these regulatory differences between student and sales representatives samples occur. Further research is also needed to identify why female sales representatives are

less prevention-focused than their male colleagues.

Relationships between sales experience and prevention focus, performance orientation and negative emotions identified here, suggest that there may be important differences between sales managers and sales representatives with respect to the dispositional traits we have investigated. Further research is needed to understand the effects of sales managers' sales experience on their regulatory focus, achievement orientation and emotions. Further research could also identify the effects on sales performance of congruence (or lack thereof) between sales representatives and their managers with regard to these dispositional traits. Additional research is also needed to determine the impact of these dispositional trait differences on sales performance when there are gender differences or similarities between sales managers and sales representatives who report to them (i.e., male sales representative/female manager; female sales representative/male manager). Finally, the impact of different sales roles (e.g., hunter versus farmer; DeCarlo and Lam 2015) on gender differences identified in this research could provide additional insight on how to effectively recruit and manage females and males.

## REFERENCES

- Akin, A. (2010), "Achievement Goals and Academic Locus of Control: Structural Equation Modeling," *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 10(38), 1-18.
- Ames, C. (1992), "Classrooms: Goals, Structures, and Student Motivation," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261-271.
- Ames, C. and J. Archer (1988), "Achievement Goals in the Classroom: Students' Learning Strategies and Motivation Processes," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(September), 260-267.
- Barsade, S.G. and D.E. Gibson (2007), "Why Does Affect Matter in Organizations?" *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 36-59.
- Bhatnagar, N. and J. McKay-Nesbitt (2016), "Pro-Environment Advertising Messages: The Role of Regulatory Focus," *International Journal of Advertising*, 35(1), 4-22.

- Borg, S.W. and W.J. Johnston (2013), "The IPS-EQ Model: Interpersonal Skills and Emotional Intelligence in a Sales Process," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 33(1), 39-51.
- Brockner, J. and E.T. Higgins (2001), "Regulatory Focus Theory: Implications for the Study of Emotions at Work," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 35-66.
- Brotheridge, C.M. and R.T. Lee (2008), "The Emotions of Managing: An Introduction to the Special Issue," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2), 108-117.
- 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.
- Caza, A. and B.Z. Posner (2019), "An Exploratory Investigation into How Grit Influences the Leadership Practices of Sales Managers," *Journal of Selling*, 19(2), 36-45.
- Chakrabarty, S. (2020), "Gender Differences in Sales People: Implications for Sales Organizations," *Journal of Selling*, 20(1), 60-68.
- Comer, L.B., M.A. Jolson, A.J. Dubinsky, and F.J. Yammarino (1995), "When the Sales Manager is a Woman: An Exploration into the Relationship between Salespeople's Gender and Their Responses to Leadership Style," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 15(4), 17-32.
- Crowe, E. and E.T. Higgins (1997), "Regulatory Focus and Strategic Inclinations: Promotion and Prevention in Decision-Making," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117-132.
- Daniels, K. (1998), "Toward Integrating Emotions into Strategic Management Research: Trait, Affect, and Perceptions of the Strategic Environment," *British Journal of Management*, 9(3), 163-168.
- DeCarlo, T.E. and S.K. Lam (2015), "Identifying Effective Hunters and Farmers in the Salesforce: A Dispositional-situational Framework," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(4), 415-439.
- Deeter-Schmelz, D.R. and J.Z. Sojka (2003), "Developing Effective Salespeople: Exploring the Link between Emotional Intelligence and Sales Performance," *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 211-220.
- Dogan, K. and R.P. Vecchio (2001), "Managing Envy and Jealousy in the Workplace," *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 33(2), 57-64.
- Dubinsky, A. J. and T.N. Ingram (1984), "From Selling to Sales Management: A Developmental Model," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 1(3), 43-52.
- Dweck, C.S. and E.L. Leggett (1988), "A Social-Cognitive Approach to Motivation and Personality," *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.
- Ferguson, T.J., H.L. Eyre, and M. Ashbaker (2000), "Unwanted Identities: A Key Variable in Shame--Anger Links and Gender Differences in Shame," *Sex Roles*, 41(3/4), 133-157.
- Friedman, R. and J. Forster (2001), "The Effects of Promotion and Prevention Cues on Creativity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1001-1013.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986), *The Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fugate, M., A.J. Kinicki, and G.E. Prussia (2008), "Employee Coping with Organizational Change: An Examination of Alternative Theoretical Perspectives and Models," *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 1-36.
- Gorman, C.A., J.P. Mariac, B.L. Overstreet, S. Apodaca, A.L. McIntyre, P. Park, and J.N. Godbey (2012), "A Meta-Analysis of the Regulatory Focus Nomological Network: Work Related Antecedents and Consequences," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 160-172.
- Gottfried, A., S. Ambrose, and R. Plank (2017), "Inside Sales Force and Gender: Mediating Effects of Intrinsic Motivation on Sales Controls and Performance," *Journal of Selling*, 17(1), 20-36.
- Hazelton, S. (2014), "Positive Emotions Boost Employee Engagement: Making Work Fun Brings Individual and Organizational Success," *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 22(1), 34-37.
- Hersch, J. (1996), "Smoking, Seat Belts, and Other Risky Consumer Decisions: Differences by Gender and Race," *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 17(5), 471-481.
- Higgins, E.T. (1998), "Promotion and Prevention: Regulatory Focus as a Motivational Principle," In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (30, pp. 1-46). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Higgins, E.T., R.S. Friedman, R.E. Harlow, L.C. Idson, O.N. Ayduk, and A. Taylor (2001), "Achievement Orientations from Subjective Histories of Success: Promotion Pride versus Prevention Pride," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(1), 3-23.
- Johnson, P.D., M.B. Smith, J.C. Wallace, A.D. Hill, and R.A. Baron (2015), "A Review of Multilevel Regulatory Focus in Organizations," *Journal of Management*, 20(10), 1-29.
- Kayis, A. and A.A. Ceyhan (2015), "Investigating the Achievement Goals of University Students in Terms of Psycho-Social Variables," *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(2), 445-462.
- Kokkinos, C.M. (2007), "Job Stressors, Personality and Burnout in Primary School Teachers," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 229-243.
- Kohli, A.K., T.A. Shervani, and G.N. Challagalla (1998), "Learning and Performance Orientation of Sales People: The Role of Supervisors," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(May), 263-274.
- Lanaj, K., C.H. Chang, and R.E. Johnson (2012), "Regulatory Focus and Work-Related Outcomes: A Review and Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(5), 998-1034.
- Liebermann, N., L.C. Idson, C.J. Camacho, and E.T. Higgins (1999), "Promotion and Prevention Choices between Stability and Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1135-1145.
- Lill, D.J. and J.K. Lill (2012), *Selling: The Profession*, Antioch, TN: DM Bass Publications.
- Linley, P.A., H. Dovey, S. Beaumont, J. Wilkinson, and R. Hurling (2016), "Examining the Frequency and Intensity of Experience of Discrete Positive Emotions," *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(2), 875-892.
- Lockwood, P., C.H. Jordan, and Z. Kunda (2002), "Motivation by Positive and Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854-864.
- Lounsbury, J.W., L.W. Gibson, and F.L. Hamrick (2004), "The Development and Validation of a Personological Model of Work Drive," *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 427-451.
- MacIntosh, G. and M. Krush (2014), "Examining the Link between Salesperson Networking Behaviors, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment: Does Gender Matter?" *Journal of Business Research*, 67(12), 2628-2635.
- Mandelbaum, A. (2017), "Women in Sales in 2017," <https://www.badgermapping.com/blog/women-in-sales>, retrieved February 2, 2020.
- Martin, S.W. (2011), "Seven Personality Traits of Top Salespeople," *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/2011/06/the-seven-personality-traits-o>, retrieved November 8, 2017.
- McKay-Nesbitt, J., N. Bhatnagar, and M.C. Smith (2013), "Regulatory Fit Effects of Gender and Marketing Message Content," *Journal of Business Research*, 66(11), 2245-2251.
- Molden, D.C., A.Y. Lee, and E.T. Higgins (2008), "Motivations for Promotion and Prevention," In J.Y. Shah, and W.L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation Science*, (pp. 169-187). New York: Guilford Press.
- Morris, M.H., R.A. Avila, and E.E. Teeple (1990), "Sales Management as an Entrepreneurial Activity," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 10(2), 1-15.
- Ogilvie, J., A. Rapp, R. Agnihotri and D.G. Bachrach (2017), "Translating Sales Effort into Service Performance: It's an Emotional Ride," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 37(2), 100-112.
- Ones, D.S., S. Dilchert, C. Viswesvaran, and T.A. Judge (2007), "In Support of Personality Assessment in Organizational Settings," *Personnel Psychology*, 60(4), 995-1027.
- Ozcelik, H., N. Langton, and H. Aldrich (2008), "Doing Well and Doing Good: The Relationship Between Leadership Practices that Facilitate a Positive Emotional Climate and Organizational Performance," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2), 186-203.
- Paparoidamis, N.G. (2005), "Learning Orientation and Leadership Quality: Their Impact on Salespersons' Performance," *Management Decision*, 43(7/8), 1054-1063.
- Passyn, K. and M. Sujaan (2006), "Self-Accountability Emotions and Fear Appeals: Motivating Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(4), 583-589.
- Pham, M.T. and T. Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(4), 503-518.

- Piercy, N.F., D.W. Cravens, and N. Lane (2003), "The New Gender Agenda in Sales Management," *Business Horizons*, 46(July-August), 39-46.
- Ripski, M.B., J. LoCasale-Crouch, and L. Decker (2011), "Pre-Service Teachers: Dispositional Traits, Emotional Traits, and Quality of Teacher-Student Interactions," *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(2), 77-96.
- Rozell, E.J., C.E. Pettijohn, and R.S. Parker (2006), "Emotional Intelligence and Dispositional Affectivity as Predictors of Performance in Salespeople," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 14(2), 113-124.
- Silfver, M. (2007), "Gender Differences in Value Priorities, Guilt, and Shame among Finnish and Peruvian Adolescents," *Sex Roles*, 56(9-10), 601-609.
- Silver, L.S., S. Dwyer, and B. Alford (2006), "Learning and Performance Goal Orientation of Salespeople Revisited: The Role of Performance-Approach and Performance-Avoidance Orientations," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 26(1), 27-38.
- Sojka, J.Z. and D.R. Deeter-Schmelz (2008), "Need for Cognition and Affective Orientation as Predictors of Sales Performance: An Investigation of Main and Interaction Effects," *Journal of Business Psychology*, 22(3), 179-190.
- Sujan, H., B.A. Weitz, and N. Kumar (1994), "Learning Orientation, Working Smart, and Effective Selling," *Journal of Marketing*, 58(July), 39-52.
- Sy, T., S. Cote, and R. Saavedra (2005), "The Contagious Leader: Impact of a Leader's Mood on the Mood of Group Members, Group Affective Tone, and Group Processes," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2), 295-305.
- Thompson, E.R. (2007), "Development and Validation of an Internationally Reliable Short-Form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(2), 227-242.
- VandeWalle, D., S.P. Brown, W.L. Cron, and J.W. Slocum Jr. (1999), "The Influence of Goal Orientation and Self-Regulation Tactics on Sales Performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(2), 249-259.
- Voria, R. (2018), "Why We Need More Women in Sales," <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2018/01/17/why-we-need-more-women-in-sales/#689a3dcb30ce>, retrieved February 2, 2020.
- Wallace, J.C., P.D. Johnson, and L. Frazier (2009), "An Examination of the Factorial, Construct, and Predictive Validity and Utility of the Regulatory Focus at Work Scale," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(6), 805-831.