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THE PROACTIVE ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR OF SALESPEOPLE: A MODEL OF ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES

Abstract

Using an interactionist perspective (Bandura 1986), we extend the existing proactive behavior literature by modeling antecedents and outcomes of the proactive entrepreneurial nature of salespeople. Antecedents are based on the personal characteristics that define an individual as entrepreneurial. Outcomes are based on determinants of selling performance. By sampling 157 industrial salespeople, we tested a model to confirm that salespeople tend to engage in proactive entrepreneurial behaviors when they are intrinsically motivated, confident in the tasks of selling, and willing to take risks. These proactive behaviors resulted in our salesperson sample demonstrating high levels of behavior performance and job involvement. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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Proactive behavior has been of interest to researchers in the areas of entrepreneurship, sales, and marketing for some time (Thomas et al. 2010). As a key dimension of entrepreneurship, proactivity has been identified as a way for individuals to intentionally and directly change current circumstances that impact their situation, both personally and professionally (Bateman and Crant 1993). In an entrepreneurial and sales setting, proactivity may serve to establish, build, and maintaining buyer-seller relationships as such behaviors center on taking action to impact change and solve customer problems. Employees are often asked to meet company objectives during times of rapid change in technology, regulations, and the competitive environment. Top performers recognize their environmental constraints and create circumstances that facilitate personal and organizational success (Ashford and Black 1996; Chan and Schmitt 2000). This type of proactive behavior has been broadly characterized as an active facilitation of meaningful personal or environmental change (e.g., Bateman and Grant 1993; Grant and Ashford 2008). As such, proactive behavior has been correlated with performance, satisfaction, and affective organizational commitment (Thomas et al. 2010).

To promote proactive behavior, firms (like 3M and Google) are emphasizing and encouraging their employees to be more intra- as well as entrepreneurial by spending time on the job creating new ideas and innovative ways of approaching business problems. This is because they recognize that an action orientation is necessary to attract new customers and retain existing ones. This focus on proactive behavior in relationship selling and entrepreneurship is not new (see Mallin and Pullins 2009; Saxe and Weitz 1982; Thomas, Soutar, and Ryan 2001) however, little is known about the factors that affect an individual’s predisposition to engage in proactive entrepreneurial behaviors.
Within the sales, marketing, and entrepreneurship literature, proactive behavior has been identified as a dimension of entrepreneurship and associated with successful sales performance (Morris, Avila and Teeple 1990; Pitt, Ewing and Berthon 2002). Morris et al. (1990) examined the role of entrepreneurship as it applies to the sales organization. They found that proactive behavior is a critical factor that is related to both entrepreneurial and sales success. Pitt et al. (2002) examined the relationship between proactive behavior and individual salesperson performance. They found that a small but significant relationship existed between the level of proactive behavior and a salesperson’s performance as judged by the sales manager. Yet, there are few studies that consolidate these two perspectives and focus on the set of personal characteristics that define sales people as entrepreneurial and examine the resulting relationship with performance. From this research domain, we adopt the definition of “proactive behavior” as a dispositional construct that identifies differences among people in the extent to which they take action to influence their environments (Bateman and Crant 1993). Using this definition allows us to apply the interactionist perspective of Bandura (1986) whereby in order to impact their environment, “people can learn to function as agents in their own self motivation” (Bandura, 1986, p. 13). The purpose of this study is to examine the entrepreneurial behavior of salespeople, its antecedents and outcome results. Using an interactionist perspective (Bandura 1986), we extend the existing proactive behavior literature by modeling antecedents and outcomes of the proactive entrepreneurial nature of salespeople. Antecedents are based on the personal characteristics that define an individual as entrepreneurial. Outcomes are based on determinants of selling performance.
BACKGROUND

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the theoretical framework of (SCT) Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura 1986; 1991; 2000; 2001). SCT explains individual behavior as shaped and controlled by internal dispositions and environmental influences. The premise behind this theory is that people, as producers, are not just reactive. They are self-regulators of motivation and self-organizing of their thoughts and actions. These actions operate partly through internal standards and evaluative reactions to their own behaviors (Bandura 1991). Anticipated self-satisfaction from fulfilling valued performance standards serve as motivators for action.

An important dimension of SCT is one of forethought. Most human behavior is directed by planning for events and outcomes projected into the future. For example, individuals set goals and anticipate the likely outcome of their prospective actions. SCT suggests that such forethoughtful perspective on matters of value can provide direction, coherence, and meaning to one’s life and work (Bandura 2000). People have the capacity to exert control over their level of functioning and events that affect their lives. The willingness to do so reflects an individual’s propensity to take initiative rather than reacting to events (i.e., being proactive). According to SCT, one’s efficacy to behave in such a way determines the goals they set for themselves and their commitment to and how much effort they put forth toward achieving said goals, how long they persevere in the face of obstacles, their resilience to adversity, and the outcomes they expect their efforts to produce (Bandura 2001). This theoretical presentation of SCT may be operationalized in the domain of professional selling. The sections to follow do this with a discussion of the interaction between individual characteristics, their behaviors, and the effects on their environment. Specifically, we identify key entrepreneurial characteristics that are
predicted to impact proactive behaviors. In turn, such behaviors are predicted to impact environmental (sales) outcomes.

**Entrepreneurship, Individual Characteristics, and Proactive Behavior**

There have been over 60 different definitions of entrepreneurship over the years. However, a contemporary view of entrepreneurship is that it is an attitude, a way of thinking, and behaving. It is a state of mind; an artful, insightful and innovative mentality rather than a form of business administration. Entrepreneurship is a way of perceiving and exploring opportunity wherever it may be found (Finkle 2006; Mallin and Finkle 2007; 2009).

Prior research on the personal characteristics of entrepreneurs has not provided a single agreed-on "profile" of the entrepreneur, however, a relatively common set of traits has been identified throughout the literature. Among these traits are: drive/need for personal achievement, internal locus of control, confidence, calculated risk taking, opportunity orientation, determination, perseverance, optimism, foresight, low need for status and power, problem solving ability, feedback seeking, independence, and tolerance for ambiguity (Hornaday 1982; Kuratko 2009; Shaver 1990). Research to identify characteristics of salespeople has yielded similar traits. Among the many personal characteristics of successful salespeople, those that are common to entrepreneurs include: need for achievement, motivation, determination, internal locus of control, self-efficacy, competitiveness, and perseverance (Churchill, Ford, and Walker 1979; Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1975).

Some studies have correlated specific entrepreneurial characteristics with success in sales. For example, Morris, Avila, and Teeple (1990) identified the factors viewed as the most critical for entrepreneurial success relative to a sales career. Using sales manager subjects, they found drive (motivation), self-confidence, action orientation, persistence, and risk-taking to be
these sales professionals’ top entrepreneurial characteristics. A key finding of this study was that sales professionals, acting in an entrepreneurial fashion, demonstrated a reasonable awareness of the risks involved in work ventures as they systematically attempted to manage these risks. This result is consistent with the work of Brockhaus (1982) and Allen (2012) who also found that risk-taking propensity was a key contributor to both sales and entrepreneurial behaviors.

Previous studies in both sales and entrepreneurship have shown that individuals with a high need for achievement and an internal locus of control proactively take actions to affect their work outcomes. As such we propose that the individual characteristic of intrinsic motivation will directly impact proactive behavior tendencies. Likewise, task confidence should impact proactivity based on the notion that by taking control, individuals believe that a desired result will be achieved. Finally, a negative relationship between an individual’s tendency to avoid risk and proactivity is predicted. Based on the entrepreneurial trait of willingness to take risks, a “high risk – high reward” mentality should encourage proactive behavior in search of goals. This discussion can be summarized by the following three hypotheses:

H1: *Salesperson levels of intrinsic motivation* will be positively related to *proactive entrepreneurial behavior*.

H2: *Salesperson levels of task confidence* will be positively related to *proactive entrepreneurial behavior*.

H3: *Salesperson propensity to avoid risk* will be negatively related to *proactive entrepreneurial behavior*.

**Proactive Entrepreneurial Behavior and Outcomes**

*Sales Performance.*

In their research on proactive behavior, Gerhardt, Ashenbaum, and Newman (2009) note that individuals have the capacity to proactively structure situations to manage their own destinies.
They draw from Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura 1986, p.2) to conceptualize proactive behavior as people’s way of “consciously manipulating the environment to produce the end results desired.” Their research is also tied to earlier research on self-management mechanisms (Aldag, Brief, and Kolenko 1983; Saks and Ashforth 1996; Frayne and Geringer 2000) that suggest that an individual’s proactivity should be related to his/her performance. The self-managing behaviors of goal setting, self-monitoring, and self regulation for example are demonstrations of an individual making efforts to manage and modify his/her environment and behavior to maximize the likelihood for success.

Bateman and Crant (1993) also suggest that proactive behavior is a dispositional construct that identifies differences among people to the extent in which they take action to influence their environments. In the domain of professional selling, outcomes center on selling performance, and salespeople choose situations in which to participate in order to impact these outcomes of their sales efforts. Bateman and Crant (1993) studied the proactive behavior impact on selling performance among 113 industrial salespeople employed by a major European vehicle manufacturer. They found that about 8% of variation in objective sales performance could be accounted for by proactive behavior. In a subsequent study of sales performance of real estate agents, Crant (1996) used objective measures (sales volume, number of listings obtained, and commission income) to assess the effects of proactive behavior on performance. He found that proactive behavior explained a small (8.3% of the variance) but significant amount of these objective measures of agents’ job performance. The study also confirmed that the more proactive the behavior of the salesperson, the higher the effectiveness of that salesperson was perceived by his or her supervisor. These measures of effectiveness were based on more
subjective assessments of selling performance (e.g., number of home showings, referrals, marketing activity, etc.).

The sales literature distinguishes between two types of selling performance (Anderson and Oliver 1987; Challagalla and Shervani 1996; Cravens et al. 1993; Krafft 1999; Oliver and Anderson 1994). Sales outputs or outcome performance is objectively measured and based on quantifiable results such as revenue, units, profits, and market share. Given data to confirm these types of sales outputs, salespeople can be objectively measured relative to performance. It has also been conceptualized that sales performance could have a behavioral component and be observed as the various skills and activities that are important to fulfilling the responsibilities of the sales job (e.g., making sales calls, adaptive selling, teamwork, sales presentations, sales planning and sales support activities.) Since such behaviors are subjectively assessed and observed, they are harder measure. To this end, researchers have taken care to measure and test performance output/outcomes and behaviors separately. However, there is consensus in the literature that selling behavior performance directly impacts selling output performance. The premise is that certain selling behaviors (especially in relationship selling) are necessary in order to product sales outputs.

Given this distinction between two types of selling performance and the research that confirms a link between proactive behavior and performance, we propose the following relationships:

H4: Proactive entrepreneurial behavior will be positively related to sales output/outcome performance.

H5: Proactive entrepreneurial behavior will be positively related to sales behavior performance.
   H5a: Sales behavior performance will be positively related to sales output/outcome performance.
Sales Job Involvement

Job Involvement has been defined as a cognitive belief or attitude - a state of psychological identification to which an individual values the work and personal investment in their job. It involves the internalization of values about the goodness and importance of one’s work (Kanugo 1982; Blau 1985; Holmes and Srivastava 2002). As such, individuals who display high levels of involvement in their jobs consider their work to be a very important part of their lives. Within the context of salesperson effectiveness, job involvement is a relevant consequence of a salesperson's drive to take action and affect change (Brown, Cron, and Leigh 1993; Brown and Leigh 1996). Some of the key antecedent influences on job involvement from the literature include internal motivation (Gardner et al. 1989) and psychological aspects of the work environment (e.g., self-expression, feelings of making a significant contribution toward goals, work that is considered challenging, worthwhile, and rewarding). Brown and Leigh (1996) point out that a positive psychological work climate enables salespeople to utilize a variety of skills such as problem solving and creatively addressing work challenges. Such emotional resources are likely to result in greater perceived meaningfulness of the work experience. From these definitions and brief review, there are many parallels describing the proactive behavior of an individual. Thus, we connect a person’s proactive tendencies to their degree of job involvement.

Research in the sales context finds that a salesperson’s degree of job involvement has positive effects on effort and performance (Chonko 1986). Brown and Leigh’s (1991) study of salesperson psychological work climate found a significant relationship between job involvement and performance. Other studies (see Dixon, Gassenheimer, and Barr 2003; Ingram, Leigh, and Lucas 1991, Mulki, Jaramillo, and Marshall 2007) focus on a typology of high performing salespeople as those who possess higher levels of job involvement (e.g., “institutional stars” and
“lone wolves”) as compared to “organizational citizens” and “apathetics” who demonstrate lower levels of job involvement. In these studies, performance was identified as those outcomes tied to objective measure of sales (revenue, profit, market share) versus selling behaviors which are more subjectively evaluated.

Based on this discussion, we predict the following relationships between salesperson proactive behavior, sales job involvement, and sales outcome/output performance:

H6: Proactive entrepreneurial behavior will be positively related to sales job involvement.
H6a: Sales job involvement will be positively related to sales output/outcome performance.

To summarize this section, a model of these hypothesized relationship are provided in Figure 1.

METHOD
An online survey was developed to collect the data. A cross company and industry sample of salespeople was identified to complete this survey. A total of 163 salespeople started the survey of which 157 finished it for a completion rate of 96%. From these, 150 were considered usable (due to excessive missing items) making the final response rate about 90%. The top industries represented were business services, health care/medical, manufacturing, and automotive. On average, study respondents were male (65%), 25 years of age, had a little over 4 years of selling experience, and earned on average 71.4% of their compensation from salary. Study constructs were measured using multi-item measures adopted from existing literature (see appendix). Intrinsc motivation was measured using 10 items adapted from the scale developed by Aldefer
(1972). We adapted the scale developed by Wang and Netemeyer (2002) to measure task confidence using 12 items. Risk avoidance was measured using five items adapted from the scale developed by Gomez-Mejia and Balkin (1989). A 15-item proactive entrepreneurial behavior scale was used by adapting the proactive behavior measure developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). For the outcome variables we measured sales output and sales behavior performance using 4-items and 5-items respectively from the performance scale developed by Piercy, Cravens, and Lane (2001). The originally developed measure combined performance output (e.g., sales revenue, units, profit margins, etc.) items and performance behavior (e.g., sales calls, proposals delivered, post sale support activities, etc.). To isolate each type of performance in our model, we separated sales output items and sales behavior items to form two distinct measures of performance. Sales job involvement was measured by adapting 9-items from the scales developed by Kanugo (1982). To control for constraints posed by the organizational environment, we used two measures of managerial sales control systems. Outcome-based sales control was measured using 7-items and behavior-based sales control was measured using 9-items from the scales originally developed by Piercy, Cravens, and Lane (2001).

**ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

Convergent validity of the model measures was confirmed by computing the average variance extracted (AVE). According to Fornell and Larker (1981) convergent validity is judged to be adequate when AVE equals or exceeds .50. All AVE values for model variables fell within this range. Furthermore, all Cronbach alpha scores exceeded the .70 threshold recommended by Nunnally (1978) to ensure construct reliability. Lastly, all measurement items had significant loadings on their corresponding constructs. This result, combined with the acceptable composite reliability measures, indicated convergent validity (Fornell and Larker 1981). To test
discriminant validity, we conducted an analysis to ensure that each item is associated with only one construct; that is, no item loaded more highly on another construct than it did on the construct it intends to measure (Fornell and Larcker 1981; Green, Salkin, and Akey 2000). All single items’ correlation (to its own scale) exceeded that of any of the other scales, thus demonstrating discriminant validity of the model constructs. Based on this as well as the checks for reliability and validity discussed, we conclude that the measures used in our study appropriately represent the constructs of interest. Table 1 illustrates these properties.

SmartPLS (Ringle, Wende, and Will 2005) was used to estimate the measurement model and test the hypothesized path relationships using a (partial least squares) structural model (Anderson and Gerbing 1988; Joreskog and Sorbom 1984). Partial least squares was used because it has no distribution constraints and is appropriate for analyzing relatively smaller samples (Chin 1998). The model fit and test of individual hypotheses was assessed by examining the magnitude (beta coefficient) and statistical significance (t-value) of the path estimates.

The results are summarized in Table 2. Support was found for H1 as the path between salesperson intrinsic motivation (EM) and proactive entrepreneurial behavior (PEB) was significant (b = .12, t = 1.68). The hypothesized positive relationship between salesperson task confidence (TC) and PEB was significant (b = .57, t = 7.83) thus H2 is supported. Limited support for H3 was found as the hypothesized negative relationship between salesperson risk avoidance (RA) and PEB was marginally significant (b = -.07, t = 1.24). Overall, the three individual (entrepreneurial) characteristic antecedents of our model explained about 46% (R-squared = .46) of propensity to exhibit proactive entrepreneurial behavior. Results for the outcomes portion of our model showed mixed results for our hypothesized
relationships. Specifically, the (H4) predicted positive relationship between PEB and (SOP) sales output performance was reversed as a significant but negative relationship was observed (b = -.07, t = 1.79). H5 and H5a were supported as the positive relationship between PEB and sales behavior performance (SBP) was significant (b = .30, t = 3.37) as was the positive relationship between SBP and SOP (b = .86, t = 28.99). Finally the sales job involvement (SJI) predictions (H6 and H6a) showed mixed results as we confirmed the positive relationship between PEB and SJI (b = .32, t = 5.71) and found marginally significant results for the positive relationship between SJI and SOP (b = .06, t = 1.17). To ensure that the constraints of the sales organizational environment were accounted for, the two managerial sales control system variables (behavior- and outcome-based) were tested. Neither control variable significantly impacted proactive entrepreneurial behavior (PEB) in the model results (b = .05 and b = .02 respectively).

Insert Table 2 about here

DISCUSSION

Organizations need salespeople with the confidence to proactively identify and present solutions to customers that address business problems and opportunities. This ability and desire has been linked to performance within both entrepreneurial and sales organizations. Our study found that proactive salespeople have a high degree of confidence in their abilities and strong levels of intrinsic motivation. These salespeople show a propensity for independent thought and action and have the confidence that they can execute their plans successfully. The lack of a significant relationship between risk-taking propensity and proactive entrepreneurial behavior within salespeople might be explained in a number of ways. Industrial salespeople already have a job, whereas sales entrepreneurs have to create their own job and their destiny is based upon their
own initiative and perseverance. Furthermore, risk may not be as prominent for salespeople because they have already investigated an opportunity, are prepared, and have confidence in their ability to execute. Thus, the element of risk may not be a significant factor in the selling process. This thought process may be similar to rock climbers, who do not see their activity as risky, but the general public may not hold that same view.

Additionally, our study found that the proactive behavior of salespeople is linked to positive sales performance. Proactive salespeople strive to meet the needs of their customers through the products, services, and capabilities of their organization. However, it is their approach to solving business issues and addressing business opportunities that enable proactive salespeople to succeed when others may not. Specifically, we found proactive entrepreneurial behavior to be positively related to sales job involvement and sales behavior performance – both in turn impacted sales output performance. For our salesperson sample, higher levels of job involvement (e.g., “I love my job”) and behavior performance (e.g., “taking care of my customers”) are indicative of a high level of service and support to their customers. So, rather than proactive entrepreneurial behaviors directly impacting sales performance outputs (e.g., revenue, profits, market share, etc.) as we originally predicted, proactivity impacted sales performance via the job involvement and behaviors that salespeople demonstrated. This makes sense (post-hoc) based on the notion that our measure of proactive entrepreneurial behavior centers on items relative to taking action, affecting change, and problem solving. Such items are indicative of selling activity that is focused on a customer orientation versus a more transactional selling orientation (Mallin and Pullins 2009; Saxe and Weitz 1982). This may also explain the unexpected negative relationship between proactive entrepreneurial behavior and sales output performance. A proactive nature based on a problem solving approach to selling takes time in
that the single call sales transaction is replaced by a series of more time-consuming customer meetings to identify needs (problems), propose solutions, and get commitment. We might also speculate that although proactivity is a desired trait for salespeople, the immediate impact on sales results may not be realized. To be sure, further research is needed to examine the relationship between the proactivity of salespeople and the specific conditions under which they have a positive or negative impact on sales output performance.

This study may also help sales managers begin to assess the potential role of proactive salespeople within their sales organizations. Understanding that proactivity (both directly and indirectly) impacts selling performance, managers might specifically attempt to identify some of these proactivity characteristics during the interview process. Asking a candidate about a situation that demonstrated their proactive nature (e.g., the situation, tasks, actions, and results) might give a manager good insight as to whether the salesperson is likely to demonstrate proactive behaviors in the selling role. Questions to reveal the important antecedent characteristics (e.g., motivation, confidence, risk-taking) can give a manager further insight into whether a candidate has the internal make-up to want to demonstrate proactive entrepreneurial behaviors.

Although our study provides some interesting insight to managers and researchers, some limitations must be pointed out. First, our study centered on three entrepreneurial characteristics (antecedents) that we subjectively judged to be relevant for this study. Although these antecedents explain over 40% of the variance in the proactive entrepreneurial behavior construct, a larger sample size might be conducive to investigating several more characteristics via an extended model. Second, recognizing that the focal construct of our study is proactive entrepreneurial behavior, it would have been ideal to have a sample large enough that we could include mainly those salespeople that were also
entrepreneurs. Seeing that most industrial salespeople have some degree of autonomy in managing their customer base, we do not feel this limitation severely biased our results. Lastly, because we did not know how many salespeople were invited to complete the survey, it was impossible to compute the actual response rate (we reported the completion rate). Based on these study limitation, we must consider our findings as speculative until further research on the topic can be conducted.
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(*** p < .01; ** p < .05; * p < .10)

H1  .12**
H2  .57***
H3  .07*
H4  -.07**
H5  -.30***
H6  .32**
H6a  .06*
H5a  .86***

Intrinsic Motivation
Task Confidence
Risk Avoidance
Proactive Entrepreneurial Behavior
Sales Job Involvement
Sales Output Performance
Sales Behavior Performance

Managerial Behavior-Based Sales Control
Managerial Outcome-Based Sales Control

NS
NS
NS

Behavioral Intentions (Proactive)
Environmental Outcomes (Sales)
### Table 1
Means, Standard Deviation, and Correlation among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMotiv</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaskConf</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiskAvoid</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProactiveEnt</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OutPerf</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BehPerf</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobInvolve</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgrBBSC</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgrOBSC</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean       | 5.97 | 5.73 | 3.30 | 5.56 | 5.39 | 5.23 | 4.13 | 5.59 | 4.96 |
StdDev.    | .77  | .78  | 1.27 | .85  | 1.21 | 1.22 | 1.24 | 0.72 | 0.72 |
Adj. R²     | .46  | .09  | .71  | .10  |     |     |     |     |     |
CR          | .92  | .93  | .93  | .95  | .95  | .93  | .89  | .88  |     |
AVE         | .56  | .54  | .74  | .56  | .79  | .78  | .60  | .53  | .52  |

* p < .05;  **p<.01;  Numbers in the diagonal cells are Cronbach's alphas for study measures

**Key:** IMotiv = Intrinsic Motivation; TaskConf = Task Confidence; RiskAvoid = Risk Avoidance; ProactiveEnt = Proactive Entrepreneurship Behavior; OutPerf = Sales Outcome Performance; BehPerf = Sales Behavior Performance; JobInvolve = Sales Job Involvement; MgrBBSC = Managerial Behavior-Based Sales Control; MgrOBSC = Managerial Outcome-Based Sales Control. CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted.

### Table 2
Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMotiv → ProactiveEnt</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.68**</td>
<td>H₁ supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaskConf → ProactiveEnt</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>7.83***</td>
<td>H₂ supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RiskAvoid → ProactiveEnt</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.24*</td>
<td>H₃ limited support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProactiveEnt → OutPerf</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.79**</td>
<td>H₄ reversed finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProactiveEnt → BehPerf</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.37***</td>
<td>H₅ supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BehPerf → OutPerf</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>28.99***</td>
<td>H₅a supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProactiveEnt → JobInvolve</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5.71***</td>
<td>H₆ supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobInvolve → ProactiveEnt</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
<td>H₆a limited support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables

| MgrBBSC → ProactiveEnt | 0.05 | 0.52 |
| MgrOBSC → ProactiveEnt | 0.02 | 0.26 |

* p < .10;  **p<.05;  ***p<01

**Key:** IMotiv = Intrinsic Motivation; TaskConf = Task Confidence; RiskAvoid = Risk Avoidance; ProactiveEnt = Proactive Entrepreneurship Behavior; OutPerf = Sales Outcome Performance; BehPerf = Sales Behavior Performance; JobInvolve = Sales Job Involvement; MgrBBSC = Managerial Behavior-Based Sales Control; MgrOBSC = Managerial Outcome-Based Sales Control.
### Appendix (sample items from measures used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Motivation</strong> ($\alpha = .91$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that the following are extremely important to you): 10 items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new skills and knowledge at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for independent thought and action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Task Confidence** ($\alpha = .92$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that the following describes you): 12 items |       |       |
| When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work. |       |       |
| When I set important goals for myself, I always achieve them. |       |       |
| When unexpected problems occur, I handle them well. |       |       |

| **Risk Avoidance** ($\alpha = .91$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that the following describes you): 5 items |       |       |
| I would not describe myself as a risk taker. |       |       |
| I do not like taking too many chances to avoid making a mistake. |       |       |
| I am seldom the first person to try anything new. |       |       |

| **Proactive Entrepreneurial Behavior** ($\alpha = .94$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that the following describes you): 15 items |       |       |
| I feel driven to make a difference in my community and maybe the world. |       |       |
| I tend to be a powerful force for constructive change. |       |       |
| Nothing is more exciting to seeing my ideas turn into reality. |       |       |
| I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition. |       |       |
| I am great at turning problems into opportunities. |       |       |

| **Sales Job Involvement** ($\alpha = .92$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that best describes aspects of your job.): 9 items |       |       |
| I am very much personally involved with my job. |       |       |
| To me, my job is a large part of who I am. |       |       |
| I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time. |       |       |

| **Sales Output Performance** ($\alpha = .94$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that best describes aspects of your job performance.): 4 items |       |       |
| I generate a high level of dollar sales. |       |       |
| I generate a high level of unit sales. |       |       |
| I make sales of those products with the highest profit margins. |       |       |

| **Sales Behavior Performance** ($\alpha = .90$; 7-point scale; rate the degree that best describes aspects of your job performance.): 5 items |       |       |
| I make a high number of sales calls on my customers. |       |       |
| I generate a high number of sales proposals and presentations to my customers. |       |       |
| I provide a high level of post sales service and support to my customers |       |       |