



Lebanese American University Repository (LAUR)

Post-print version/Author Accepted Manuscript

Publication metadata

Title: Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate

Author(s): Omar S. Itani & Nawar N. Chaker

Journal: Journal of Business Ethics

DOI/Link: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04794-4>

How to cite this post-print from LAUR:

Itani, O. S., & Chaker, N. N. (2021). Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate. Journal of Business Ethics, DOI, 10.1007/s10551-021-04794-4, <http://hdl.handle.net/10725/12986>

© Year 2021

This Open Access post-print is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)



This paper is posted at LAU Repository

For more information, please contact: archives@lau.edu.lb

↓

Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate

Dr. Omar S. Itani*

Assistant Professor of Marketing
Adnan Kassar School of Business, Lebanese American University
Beirut, Lebanon
Phone: +9613021252
E-mail: omar.itani@lau.edu

Dr. Nawar N. Chaker

Assistant Professor of Marketing
E.J. Ourso College of Business, Louisiana State University
501 South Quad Drive, Baton Rouge, LA 70803
Phone: (225) 578-8417; Fax: (225) 578-8616
E-mail: nawarchaker1@lsu.edu

Cite this article

Itani, O.S., Chaker, N.N. (2021). Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04794-4>

Unproofed Copy

Author notes. *Corresponding author.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the notion of salesperson moral identity as a prosocial individual trait and its associated effects on customer and coworker relationships. In addition, this study examines the underlying processes in which these effects occur as well as the moderating role of internal competitive climate. Our empirical investigation of business-to-business (B2B) sales professionals reveals that moral identity has both direct and indirect effects on a salesperson’s customer- and team-directed outcomes. Specifically, our results demonstrate that salesperson moral identity positively affects both salesperson-customer identification and organizational identification, which, in turn, impact customer service provision and teamwork. Our findings also indicate that internal competitive climate exacerbates the positive effects of salesperson moral identity on customer service provision and teamwork.

Keywords: salesperson moral identity; customer identification; organizational identification; internal competitive climate; teamwork; service provision; social identity theory

Harnessing the Power Within: The Consequences of Salesperson Moral Identity and the Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate

Introduction

In today's dynamic marketplace, salespeople are being tasked with not only having to achieve sales targets, but also an increased responsibility in managing relationships with both external clients and internal coworkers in order to enrich customer- and job-related outcomes. Indeed, modern salespeople are operating in a sales ecosystem that consists of an increasingly complex social environment and richer mutually dependent interpersonal relationships, where salespeople are now expected to constantly engage with and meet the demands of various internal and external stakeholders (Hartmann et al. 2018). The formation and maintenance of these relationships are heavily based and dependent on an individual's: 1) personal identity (e.g., Steward et al. 2009) and 2) social identity (e.g., Beeler et al. 2020). Personal and social identity are where the sense of "self" emerges, which is the driving force behind one's attitudes and behaviors (Hogg et al. 1995). This "self" also determines and influences the interactions, relationships, and behaviors salespeople enact with customers and coworkers (Kalra et al. 2017). The importance of an individual's identity in sales settings is evident in research that underscores the profound impact of salesperson identification (e.g., with an organization) on customer-related outcomes and job performance (Ahearne et al. 2005; Beeler et al. 2020; Kalra et al. 2017; Wieseke et al. 2009). This is because identification acts "as the primary psychological substrate for the kind of deep, committed, and meaningful relationships" that are important to build between salespeople and organizations as well as customers (Bhattacharya and Sen 2003, p. 76).

For salespeople, identification-based relationships have the power of "oneness or belongingness" with an identification object, with a focus on organizations and customers (e.g., Ashforth and Mael 1989). For example, a recent study by Beeler and her colleagues (2020)

1
2
3
4 examines the impact of salesperson organizational identification, as a sense of oneness with the
5
6 organization, on job-outcomes (i.e., turnover intention, sales performance) and customer
7
8 responses (i.e., acquisition, salesperson trustworthiness) when it comes to selling to friends in a
9
10 direct selling context. While extant research has mainly focused on the role of salesperson
11
12 identification as it relates to aspects of the job and a state-based sense of belongingness, scholars
13
14 have neglected to consider other prevailing and arguably important types of trait-based identities
15
16 that are anticipated to have an impact on how salespeople behave and react in their roles. In
17
18 particular, moral identity, which is broadly defined as “the degree to which being a moral person
19
20 is important to an individual’s identity” (Hardy and Carlo 2011, p. 12), is believed to have a
21
22 prominent role in sales settings, which, surprisingly, up to this point has not been examined in
23
24 the sales ethics literature.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Moral identity is aligned with the internalization of Kantian-like moral traits into the self
32
33 (Hannah et al. 2020). The “self-model” of moral functioning, developed by Blasi (1983), reveals
34
35 the importance of studying moral identity in understanding why and how individuals behave
36
37 with others. More precisely, moral identity, which “reflects individual differences in the degree
38
39 to which being moral is a central or essential characteristic of the sense of self” (Shao et al. 2008,
40
41 p. 514), increases an individual’s concern toward others as well as the respect for other people’s
42
43 rights and well-being (Hardy et al. 2010). In psychology, identity, or self-importance, is similar
44
45 to identity salience, where a more prominent central identity is chronically accessible and
46
47 activated by an individual across situations (Stets 2010). Individuals with high moral identity
48
49 identify themselves as being moral and take moral actions in favor of the well-being of others
50
51 (Hardy et al. 2014) as a way to promote their moral self. They are described as virtuous
52
53 individuals whom moral schema is habitually accessible for assessing and understanding the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 social landscape (Lapsley and Narvaez 2005).
5

6
7 While the notion of moral identity has gained recent interest in the marketing literature
8
9 (e.g., Fajardo et al. 2018) and management literature (e.g., Johnson and Umphress 2019), it has
10 largely been overlooked in the sales literature despite the potential value of its implications. The
11 role of moral identity is especially critical for salespeople, who not only have to constantly
12 overcome negative stereotypes about being unethical (e.g., Sparks and Johlke 1996), but also
13 face unique ethical dilemmas on a frequent basis (McClaren 2000). Bush and her colleagues
14 (2017) indicate that when it comes to ethics, salespeople, unlike other members of an
15 organization, “face different challenges both within and outside that organization which could
16 result in a different mindset when it comes to ethical behavior” (p. 550). This is largely owing to
17 the boundary-spanning and fluid character of the sales role (Ameer and Halinen 2019), where
18 salespeople are responsible for a host of activities within and between customer-, work-, and
19 peer-related situations where ethical concerns may arise (Rousselet et al. 2020). As part of this,
20 salespeople have to constantly balance their own interests as well as the interests of their
21 customers and coworkers, which, at times may come in direct conflict with one another. In
22 addition, salespeople are faced with considerable pressure to perform and meet sales quotas, and
23 they may be away from direct observation (DeConinck 2011), making the sales profession more
24 prone to ethical conflicts and misconduct (Itani et al. 2019). The combination of these factors as
25 well as the multifunctional nature of sales underscores the need to explicitly examine and better
26 understand the role of individual moral identity in sales settings in order to further describe
27 moral functioning.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 The literature suggests that morality is essential when it comes to “developing mutually
56 beneficial relationships with two critical stakeholders—customers and salespeople” (Evans et al.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 2012, p. 97). As such, and given the prominent role of identification and belongingness in the
5
6 sales domain, we consider the impact of moral identity on the identification-based relationships
7
8 that a salesperson develops with their firm (e.g., Gabler et al. 2014) as well as the organization's
9
10 customers¹ that they serve (e.g., Cardador and Pratt 2018). Specifically, we take a moral agency
11
12 perspective in an attempt to describe and understand salesperson moral identity as the driving
13
14 force behind salesperson-organization identification and salesperson-customer identification and
15
16 the resulting customer- and coworker-directed outcomes – namely, customer service provision
17
18 and teamwork. Our research is therefore guided by the following research questions: (1) What is
19
20 the impact of salesperson moral identity on customer- and coworker-directed outcomes? (2)
21
22 What are the processes in which salesperson moral identity affects these outcomes? (3) What
23
24 important boundary condition influences the effects of salesperson moral identity, and how?
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 To address these questions, we leverage a social-cognitive approach of moral identity and
32
33 social identity theory (Aquino and Reed 2002) to empirically investigate the process through
34
35 which salesperson moral identity affects customer service provision and teamwork through
36
37 identification, or a salesperson's perceptions of "oneness or belongingness" with an object (e.g.,
38
39 Ashforth and Mael 1989). We argue that salesperson moral identity serves as an important two-
40
41 sided moral agent that drives salespeople, on one side, to focus on better serving their customers
42
43 by means of identifying with them even further. On the other side, we contend that salesperson
44
45 moral identity impacts teamwork with coworkers, by way of higher levels of organizational
46
47 identification. In other words, we suggest that moral identity plays a chief role in motivating
48
49 salespeople to show concern and better serve external business partners and their internal
50
51 business team (e.g., Plouffe et al. 2016). Additionally, Walker and Frimer (2007) have called for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹ In business-to-business (B2B) sales settings, customers are buying organizations represented by individual buyers
60 that salespeople work with and sell their product or service offerings to.
61

1
2
3
4 “more systematic exploration of the interaction of personal and situational variables in the moral
5
6 domain” (p. 857). This interactionist view provides better understanding of salesperson work
7
8 attitudes and behaviors (Agnihotri et al. 2019). So, we also identify and claim that the internal
9
10 competitive climate in which salespeople operate is a significant situational factor that acts as a
11
12 boundary condition on the linkages between salesperson moral identity and its consequences.
13
14
15 Our conceptual model that summarizes the relationships hypothesized is depicted in Figure 1.
16
17

18
19 This study offers multiple contributions to the literature. First, this study formally
20
21 introduces the notion of salesperson moral identity as a critical individual difference variable and
22
23 underscores the relevance of moral psychology in selling situations. As a result, this research
24
25 departs from existing sales ethics research that primarily focuses on ethical behaviors (e.g.,
26
27 Lussier et al. 2019) and brings to light how certain salespeople are morally motivated and wired
28
29 to sincerely do well by and for others. Second, this research ascertains the effects of salesperson
30
31 moral identity on diverging job-directed outcomes as they relate to customers and coworkers. By
32
33 recognizing customer service provision and teamwork as important outcomes of salesperson
34
35 moral identity, we offer insight into how moral identity uniquely influences the sales force when
36
37 it comes to exerting effort in developing and maintaining both customer and coworker
38
39 relationships. This goes beyond the literature that largely identifies the individual benefits of
40
41 moral identity (e.g., Aquino and Reed 2002). Third, we contribute to the growing sales literature
42
43 on identification by examining the dual and simultaneous role of identification (i.e., salesperson-
44
45 customer identification and organization identification) on salesperson behaviors with customers
46
47 and coworkers. In doing so, we expand on the limited research that explores the mechanisms
48
49 linking moral identity to action (Hardy et al. 2014). Lastly, our research advances internal
50
51 competitive climate, where research on the subject remains scarce (e.g., Kalra et al. 2020;
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Schrock et al. 2016), as an important situational factor that impacts the effects of the schema-
5
6 activated moral identity of salespeople. As such, we further emphasize the significance of the
7
8 interaction between individual and situational factors (Ross and Robertson 2003). Overall, we
9
10 offer insights and a novel theoretical model related to moral identity, where “much work is need”
11
12 (Hardy and Carlo 2011, p. 216) and pave the way for future studies in this previously
13
14 unexamined research area in sales.
15
16

17
18
19 -- Insert Figure 1 about here --
20

21 **Theoretical Framework**

22 *Social Identity Theory*

23
24 Social identity theory posits that one’s self-concept spreads through a personal-self and social-
25
26 self, which are characterized by the relationships an individual has with another person or entity
27
28 (Tajfel and Turner 1979). The theory is rooted in sociology and psychology research, and
29
30 encompasses a few interconnected topics, such as an individual’s self-concept, interpersonal
31
32 relationships, group solidity, and members’ relations (Hogg et al. 1995). As such, social identity
33
34 theory has been widely used as an overarching framework in organizational and customer
35
36 identification research (e.g., Ahearne et al. 2005; Bhattacharya and Sen 2003; Hughes and
37
38 Ahearne 2010).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Social identity theory posits that an individual develops certain identification that “may
47
48 occur as one’s identity expands to include another target, be it a customer, an organization, or a
49
50 work group” (Cardador and Pratt 2018, p. 2074). For example, when self-identity is embedded as
51
52 part of a group, identification with organizations or customers is based on the notion of “feeling
53
54 of belongingness” and “consciousness of kind” with other group members (Bagozzi and
55
56 Dholakia 2006). Identification-based relationships help individuals “satisfy one or more key self-
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 definition needs” (Bhattacharya and Sen 2003, p. 77). In this way, the “social-self” is expanded
5
6
7 by the identification that individuals have with an organization, community, and customers
8
9 (Fombelle et al. 2012).

10
11 Identification is active, selective, and volitional on the individual’s part and causes them
12
13 to engage in favorable, as well as potentially unfavorable, identification object-related behaviors
14
15 (Bhattacharya and Sen 2003). Accordingly, individuals hold on to particular identities when they
16
17 internalize certain roles characterized as “sets of behavioral expectations associated with given
18
19 positions in the social structure” (Ebaugh 1988, p. 18). These roles are “social” in nature as their
20
21 meaning depends on whom the individual interacts with when he or she enacts that role.
22
23
24 Therefore, role identities need to be considered and understood through the connection an
25
26 individual has with other individuals or entities (Serpe and Stryker 2011).
27
28
29
30

31 Social identity theory also suggests that individuals are active agents in their self-identity
32
33 (Ashforth and Mael 1989). As such, identities guide the behaviors of individuals who seek
34
35 activities that are consistent with how they view themselves. That is, the meanings and
36
37 expectations form certain identity beliefs and values direct an individual’s behavior (Burke and
38
39 Reitzes 1981). Individuals behave in line with their identities in a matter of self-definition, self-
40
41 verification, and identity-based expectations. As part of this, identification-based relationships
42
43 drive individuals to participate in actions that are beneficial to the group (Hogg and Terry 2000).
44
45
46
47

48 Furthermore, from a social identity perspective, people value the groups’ members with
49
50 whom they identify with (Hogg and Turner 1985). As part of “in-group” dynamics, identification
51
52 leads individuals to seek a common ground with other members by, for instance, helping them
53
54 and behaving altruistically and in solidarity with group members (Levine et al. 2005). It also
55
56 motivates individuals to favor, collaborate with, and support these members (Algesheimer et al.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 2005). When it comes to salesperson identification, there is a sense of a “psychologically
5
6 intertwined” fate and “belongingness” with the organization, customers, or coworkers (Mael and
7
8 Ashforth 1992). For example, a meta-analysis by Lee et al. (2015) reveals that organizational
9
10 identification engenders employees’ work attitudes, such as job involvement, and satisfaction,
11
12 and has a positive impact on in-role and extra-role behaviors.
13
14

15 16 ***Moral Identity*** 17

18
19 In their seminal work, Aquino and Reed (2002) show that an individual identifies one’s self with
20
21 moral traits and values that are assimilated into the self to develop a moral identity. These traits
22
23 are internalized within one’s self and are a “deep and relatively stable part of one’s self-concept
24
25 or self-schema” (Weaver 2006, p. 345) linked together through an associative social and
26
27 cognitive network. Moral identity is separated into two dimensions: internalization (“having”,
28
29 more private and inward-focused) and symbolization (“doing”, more public and outward-
30
31 focused). Internalization represents the degree to which an individual’s moral traits are rooted at
32
33 the core of one’s self (Aquino et al. 2009) and reflects the self-importance or centrality of moral
34
35 traits to one’s self (Skarlicki et al. 2016). In contrast, symbolization includes the behavioral
36
37 outcomes of moral identity as a reflection of one’s moral concerns (Hannah et al. 2020). In the
38
39 current study, our definition of moral identity focuses on the internalization dimension. The
40
41 symbolization dimension is not included in this study since “it is less consistent with
42
43 conceptualizations of moral identity in the literature and is less frequently predictive of moral
44
45 outcomes” (Hardy et al. 2014, p. 47). While Aquino and Reed (2002) initially developed both
46
47 dimensions of moral identity, their findings show inconsistency in outcomes between the
48
49 dimensions. The same authors, as well as others, have opted to mainly use the internalization
50
51 dimension to represent moral identity in their later studies (e.g., Aquino et al. 2009; Skarlicki et
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 al. 2016; Hannah et al. 2020). Reviews on moral identity research show that internalization,
5
6 compared to symbolization, yields more consistent results (e.g., Hertz and Krettenauer 2016;
7
8 Jennings et al. 2015).
9

10
11 Moral identity is characterized by the cognitive and social schema, a unique and
12
13 organized mental knowledge structure, that an individual holds about the virtuosity of one's
14
15 character and represents the chronic accessibility of the moral self (Aquino et al. 2009). An
16
17 individual's self-concept "can also be organized around moral characteristics and that moral
18
19 identity is another potential social identity that may be a part of a person's social self-schema"
20
21 (Aquino and Reed 2002, p. 1424). Moral identity implicates a unity between an individual's
22
23 sense of morality and identity (Blasi 1995). The definition of moral identity "implies that if the
24
25 identity is deeply linked to a person's self-conception, it tends to be relatively stable over time"
26
27 (Aquino and Reed 2002, p. 1425). Furthermore, moral identity acts as a "kind of self-regulatory
28
29 mechanism that motivates moral action" (Aquino and Reed 2002, p. 1423) and a key resource of
30
31 moral motivation since individuals normally desire to sustain self-consistency (Blasi 2004).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The moral associative-cognitive network is chronically stronger for individuals with
39
40 higher moral identity (Choi and Winterich 2013). In line with the social-cognitive model, moral
41
42 identity guides a moral self-schema to be highly accessible and organizes matters of right and
43
44 wrong in social situations to drive moral behaviors (Stets 2010). This centrality shapes the "self"
45
46 of an individual around: 1) moral traits, such as being caring, compassionate, fair, friendly,
47
48 generous, hardworking, helpful, honest, and kind (Aquino and Reed 2002) and 2) an individual's
49
50 moral actions toward others through his or her self-consistency and responsibility (Stets and
51
52 Carter 2011). This conceptualization is consistent with McAdams' framework of personality in
53
54 which moral identity is said to be conceptualized as a trait-like attribute (McAdams 2015). While
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 additional individual traits may be used to describe morality, the nine traits proposed by Aquino
5 and Reed (2002) are found to have appropriate content validity as “identity-invoking stimuli”
6
7 with an array of relations with other associated traits linked with one’s moral self-concept. Given
8
9 that these traits are internalized and a stable component of one’s self-concept, individuals with
10
11 stronger degrees of moral identity are more likely to behave morally towards others in the same
12
13 way (whether they are customers, coworkers, friends, or family) in order to maintain and validate
14
15 a consistent self-concept, which is a central part of their personality.
16
17
18
19
20

21 According to the social-cognitive perspective, the more central moral identity is to one’s
22
23 self, the more it is internalized and available within the active self-concept that drives individuals
24
25 to act in a way constant with their conception of morality (Detert et al. 2008). Moral identity
26
27 forms a self-schema that constitutes moral priorities, values, and behavioral scripts (Sparks 2015)
28
29 and reflects the strength of defining one’s self to a moral character (Aquino et al. 2009). The
30
31 prominence of moral self-schema to one’s general self-concept varies among people (Blasi
32
33 2004). Aquino and Reed (2002) assert that “the stronger is the self-importance of the moral traits
34
35 that define a person’s moral identity, the more likely it is that this identity will be invoked across
36
37 a wide range of situations and the stronger will be its association with moral cognitions and
38
39 moral behavior” (p. 1425). In other words, the more central moral identity is to one’s self, the
40
41 more it drives an individual to use and retrieve his or her moral schema making it more
42
43 accessible and active across different contexts and situations, influencing moral attitudes and
44
45 behaviors (e.g., Stets 2010; Hardy et al. 2020).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Moral identity also influences the kinds of relationships an individual has with others,
54
55 even those who might belong to out-groups. For example, Reed and Aquino (2003) found that
56
57 the higher (lower) moral identity individuals possess, the more (less) they perceive personal
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 obligations toward members from out-groups. Individuals with a stronger moral identity have
5
6 more expansive social group boundaries and hold a reduced psychological distance with others
7
8 (Winterich et al. 2009). The moral identity literature does not indicate that moral identity
9
10 motivates moral behavior towards only a select group of individuals. That is, moral behaviors are
11
12 not limited towards only those that are part of an in-group as opposed to an out-group, or the
13
14 other way around.
15
16
17

18
19 Moral identity supports social exchanges and helps build better relationships between
20
21 individuals. We suggest that it is associated with self-expansion or identification (Cardador and
22
23 Pratt 2018). As examples of this self-expansion process, prior studies have found a strong
24
25 positive association between moral identity, moral behaviors, and the “inclusion of other in the
26
27 self” (e.g., Choi and Winterich 2013; Hardy et al. 2010). Thus, according to social identity
28
29 theory, moral identity drives and increases self-expansion and allows stronger identification
30
31 between an individual and others (Ashforth et al. 2016). Our rationale hinges on the notion that
32
33 others (e.g., customers and coworkers alike) become important to the “self” through
34
35 identification, or a sense of belongingness and oneness.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Further, moral identity supports social bonding through self-expansion of the beholder’s
42
43 circle of moral regards (Reed and Aquino 2003). Individuals with stronger moral identity have a
44
45 tendency to to expand their moral concerns and regards towards the broader social groups that
46
47 they interact with. This moral regard for others leads to minimizing the psychological distance
48
49 between individuals (Hardy et al. 2010). Moral identity leads to prosocial attitudes and behaviors
50
51 by means of identification with customers or coworkers, strengthening a sense of oneness and
52
53 belongingness regardless of group categorization. We claim that moral identity reduces the
54
55 cognitive distancing between salespeople and their customers and coworkers. In other words,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 salesperson moral identity has to do with increased levels of bonding, closeness, and
5
6 belongingness between salespeople and their customers, as well as their organizations, leading to
7
8 heightened prosocial behaviors and interactions.
9

10 11 **Hypotheses Development**

12
13 Drawing on social identity theory and moral identity literature, we develop a conceptual model
14
15 that represents the dual effects of salesperson moral identity on customer- and coworker-directed
16
17 outcomes. Explicitly, we expect that salesperson moral identity will result in higher levels of
18
19 customer service provision and teamwork. We also expect that these effects will be mediated by
20
21 salesperson customer-identification and company-identification, respectively. In addition, we
22
23 surmise that internal competitive climate will be a critical boundary condition on the effects of
24
25 salesperson moral identity, because salespeople compete with each other for compensation,
26
27 recognition, promotion, and status (e.g., Schrock et al. 2016).
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Salesperson Moral Identity and Customer Service Provision Behaviors***

34
35 *Customer service provision behaviors* refer to salespeople's "activities that aim to help
36
37 customers fulfill their needs through their current product/service consumption portfolios"
38
39 (Jasmand et al. 2012, p. 22). These activities include, and are not limited to, identifying
40
41 customers' exact problems, providing best solutions to customers, and handling customer
42
43 complaints in the best way possible. Such activities take place during interpersonal interactions
44
45 and conversations between salespeople and their customers leading to better customer
46
47 experiences and overall positive service exchanges (Agnihotri et al. 2017; Itani et al. 2020). We
48
49 theorize that salespeople who hold stronger moral identity will behave in favor of their customers
50
51 by further engaging in service provision behaviors. This is because moral identity helps explain
52
53 why and how individuals behave in the service of others (Blasi 1983).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 According to the literature, moral identity stimulates the exchange of particularistic
5
6 resources, such as love and service (Reed and Aquino 2003). It also encourages an individual to
7
8 exhibit more concern about the welfare of others (e.g., Youniss and Yates 1999). A salesperson
9
10 “who has a highly central moral identity should feel obligated to adhere to the behavioral
11
12 prescriptions associated with his or her moral self-schema to avoid self-condemnation” (Aquino
13
14 et al. 2009, p. 125). At lower levels of moral identity, an individual is mainly concerned about
15
16 one’s self, whereas at higher levels, the individual holds more concern about the well-being of
17
18 others (Narvaez 2001). Individuals who prioritize and possesses a stronger moral identity, which
19
20 includes traits such as being caring, compassionate, friendly, and honest, are more alert to the
21
22 interests and needs of other individuals as they act with higher empathic concern (Aquino et al.
23
24 2009). As part of this empathy and moral regard for others (e.g., customers), salespeople will
25
26 understand another individual’s feelings and thoughts by placing themselves in that other
27
28 individual’s position, which entices them to engage in more helpful and supportive behaviors
29
30 (Detert et al. 2008). Moral identity therefore reinforces social exchanges and facilitates rapport
31
32 building between customers and salespeople. It clarifies why and at what time an individual acts
33
34 in a virtuous way and engages in behaviors and processes that function in the best interest and
35
36 welfare of others (Zhu et al. 2011).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Moral identity will result in salespeople holding higher onto the concerns related to their
46
47 customers, leading them to internalize and carry-out the maximum effort to ensure exceptional
48
49 customer experience in a service exchange. Thus, we posit that salespeople with stronger moral
50
51 identity will engage in higher levels of customer service provision behaviors to serve their
52
53 customers in the finest methods when it comes to delivering better interactions, increasing
54
55 service quality, solving more customer problems, and providing an overall excellent customer
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 experience. That is:
5

6
7 **H₁:** Salesperson moral identity is positively related to customer service provision
8 behaviors
9

10 *Salesperson Moral Identity and Teamwork*

11
12 *Teamwork* is defined as the “propensity for working as part of a team and cooperatively on work
13 group efforts” (Loveland et al. 2015, p. 240). Teamwork plays a key role in selling organizations
14 as selling-related tasks and sales productivity require the coordination between salespeople, their
15 coworkers, and service employees (Itani et al. 2019). Teamwork is also a critical factor that
16 increases job satisfaction and reduces turnover (Guenzi et al. 2019). Salespeople who are good
17 team players engage in helping and sportsmanship activities with other employees and members
18 of the organization (Itani et al. 2019), which, in turn, “lubricate the social machinery of the
19 organization, reducing friction, and or/increasing efficiency” (Organ et al. 2006, p. 199). Despite
20 the benefits of teamwork, not all salespeople hold teamwork initiatives at the same level, as
21 employees may differ when it comes to how they interact and collaborate with their coworkers
22 (Bahrami and Evans 1997). Modern salespeople have to spend a lot of time persuading
23 workmates to collaborate with them in order to accomplish their expanding job tasks (Plouffe et
24 al. 2016). Thus, to solve any internal problems that might arise as well as other key challenges
25 that salespeople encounter with customers and coworkers, they should participate in teamwork
26 (Hartmann et al. 2018). In this study, we speculate that salespeople’s teamwork is related to their
27 level of moral identity, which plays a vital role in the way salespeople behave with their
28 coworkers and the relationships they develop with them (Shao et al. 2008).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Moral identity motivates individuals to link their sense of self and behavior with a
55 consistent self-identity that is characterized by caring about and supporting the welfare of others
56 (Hart et al. 1998). The more salient and central moral identity is to individuals, the more likely
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 they are to build trust-based relationships with their managers (Hu and Jiang 2018), deploy
5
6 organizational citizenship behaviors (Gerpott et al. 2019), enact prosocial behaviors (Hardy
7
8 2006), and engage with their work (He et al. 2014). At the same time, moral identity has been
9
10 shown to have a negative effect on workplace deviance behaviors (O’Fallon and Butterfield
11
12 2011), self-interest behaviors (DeCelles et al. 2012), and moral disengagement (Zheng et al.
13
14 2017). Moral identity presents a basis for sustaining a positive view of oneself as a “just”
15
16 individual, which, in turn, influences further justice-based decisions and judgments (Hegtvedt
17
18 and Scheuerman 2010). Accordingly, we predict that moral identity will motivate salespeople to
19
20 coordinate and cooperate with other members in the organization. Salespeople with stronger
21
22 moral identity will therefore be more attuned to the needs and interests of other team members
23
24 (e.g., Aquino et al. 2009) resulting in more teamwork. Hence, we postulate:

25
26
27
28
29
30
31 **H₂:** Salesperson moral identity is positively related to teamwork

32 33 *The Mediating Role of Salesperson-Customer Identification*

34
35
36 The multi-layered employee-customer identification model suggests that social agency drives
37
38 employees to identify with their customers, and identification, in turn, is capable of enhancing
39
40 service effectiveness (Cardador and Pratt 2018). Customer and organizational identification act
41
42 as the critical glue that hold a salesperson’s psychological connection to the organization and its
43
44 customers (Wiesenfeld et al. 1999). Salespeople may come to identify with a general image of
45
46 the “customers” they serve (e.g., Johnson and Ashforth 2008). Based on social identity theory,
47
48 we maintain that the influence of salesperson moral identity on customer service provision
49
50 behaviors is mediated by a salesperson’s identification with his or her customers. Specifically,
51
52 we predict that salesperson-customer identification is the mechanism through which moral
53
54 identity affects customer service provision behaviors.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Given that customers play an important part in an employee’s identity dynamics,
5
6 salesperson-customer identification aligns salespeople’s objectives with those of their customers.
7
8 It is a form of relational identification that “refers to the extent to which one defines oneself in
9 terms of a given role relationship” (Cardador and Pratt 2018, p. 2055). On the other end, moral
10 identity motivates salespeople to expand and maintain their relationships with customers. Moral
11 identity drives salespeople to consider customers as psychologically proximal. In turn, customer-
12 identification discloses the quality relationships salespeople have with customers. It drives
13 salespeople to personally share in the fate of their customers due to feelings of oneness and
14 belongingness with their customers. This drives salespeople with strong moral identity to
15 cognitively and psychologically devote more care to customers they identify with, resulting in
16 salespeople interacting more cooperatively with customers as they jointly work towards
17 achieving communal goals (Bhattacharya and Sen 2003).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Prior studies show that moral identity drives individuals to shorten the psychological
34 distance with others by personally absorbing the needs of others and possessing a higher moral
35 regard for these other individuals (Choi and Winterich 2013; Reed and Aquino 2003). For
36 salespeople, moral identity extends the social self beyond an individual to include customers and
37 coworkers in their organizations. Moral identity impacts behaviors by reducing the psychological
38 distance between individuals through an expansion of the circle of moral regards (Reed and
39 Aquino 2003) and the increased inclusion of others in one’s self-concept (Hardy et al. 2010).
40 This supports a social identification influence of moral identity based on the notion of “feeling of
41 belongingness” and “consciousness of kind” (e.g., Bergami and Bagozzi 2000) that salespeople
42 experience with their customers.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Identification with customers helps a salesperson find a satisfying self-defining
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 relationship with the customers who purchase the products they sell. This self-expansion,
5
6 associated with identification, drives extra service-related behaviors as frontline employees
7
8 become like the customers that they serve (Cardador and Pratt 2018). In their study, Johnson and
9
10 Ashforth (2008) surveyed employees with work responsibilities that require direct interaction
11
12 with customers and found that employee-customer identification increases customer-oriented
13
14 service behaviors. This is important for sales success since social identity theory suggests that
15
16 social identification directs people to look for unanimity and solidarity with customers by
17
18 helping and serving them (e.g., Levine et al. 2005). As belonging to a customer circle, the
19
20 salesperson is inspired to collaborate and engage with the customer in order to overcome any
21
22 obstacles and achieve collective goals (Reicher et al. 2008). In sum, moral identity has to do with
23
24 increased levels of bonding, closeness, and feeling of oneness between salespeople and their
25
26 customers, which, in turn, is used to drive enhanced customer service provision behaviors. Thus:
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **H3:** The positive relationship between salesperson moral identity and customer service
34 provision behaviors is mediated by salesperson-customer identification
35
36

37 *The Mediating Role of Salesperson-Organization Identification*

38
39 Individuals “classify themselves and others into various social categories, such as organizational
40
41 membership” (Ashforth and Mael 1989, p. 20), leading to the formation of organizational
42
43 identification that relates to “more fundamental concerns regarding identity–psychological
44
45 oneness between the individual and the organization” (Lee et al. 2015, p. 1062). Organizational
46
47 identification is important for employees as it has been found to influence work-related attitudes,
48
49 behaviors, and other contextual variables (see meta-analysis by Riketta 2005). It also has the
50
51 power to align salespeople’s principles and objectives with those of the firm and drive a sense of
52
53 belongingness with other team members (Kalra et al. 2017). Extant sales research has
54
55 demonstrated that salesperson-organizational identification has a positive impact on adaptive
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 selling (Rapp et al. 2015), brand effort and brand extra-role behaviors (Hughes and Ahearne
5
6 2010), creative performance (Kalra et al. 2017), organizational commitment (Mallin et al. 2017),
7
8 salesperson customer orientation (Thakor and Joshi 2005), job participation (Gabler et al. 2014),
9
10 and sales performance (Wieseke et al. 2009). As such, we posit that salesperson-organizational
11
12 identification could be a process in which salesperson moral identity influences teamwork.
13
14

15
16 Organizational identification is associated with the intraorganizational relationships
17
18 salespeople have with their coworkers. These relationships are vital for individuals who center
19
20 one's self on moral identity (Youniss and Yates 1999). Identification helps salespeople maintain
21
22 satisfying self-defining relationships with their organizations (Ricketta et al. 2005). Moreover, this
23
24 identification has the power to support the individuals' objective of possessing a moral identity
25
26 by reducing the psychological distance between individuals who work in the same organization
27
28 (Hardy et al. 2010). Smith et al. (2014) empirically demonstrate that moral identity has the power
29
30 of bringing and binding individuals together, even those that are deemed to be members of an
31
32 out-group. Similarly, Sachdeva et al. (2009) show that moral identity increases cooperative
33
34 decision-making behaviors among individuals. Furthermore, prior studies have found significant
35
36 positive correlation between an employee's moral identity and organizational identification (e.g.,
37
38 Wang et al. 2019). Hence, we suggest that moral identity, through organizational identification,
39
40 makes salespeople incorporate their organizations and coworkers in their self-definition,
41
42 motivating salespeople to perform selfless and group promoting activities – namely, teamwork.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Indeed, employees who strongly identify with their organizations are more
52
53 psychologically connected to their organizations as well as their coworkers, and will be even
54
55 more engaged in their jobs for the purpose of contributing to the company's mission and
56
57 objectives (Lee et al. 2015). The more coworkers are included in the salesperson's self-
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 definition, the less selfish behaviors will be exhibited (Bandura 1999). In sum, we conjecture that
5
6 moral identity motivates salespeople to behave cooperatively and “team up” with their coworkers
7
8 because of the identification, or oneness, they form with the organization they each share, as
9
10 salespeople are generally concerned about the welfare and best interests of their organizations
11
12 and coworkers. More formally:
13
14

15
16 **H4:** The positive relationship between salesperson moral identity and teamwork is
17 mediated by salesperson-organization identification
18

19 20 *The Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate* 21

22 In consonance with social identity theory, organizational and contextual environments, such as
23
24 group climate (e.g., Chen et al. 2015), create conditions that drive employees’ tendency to align
25
26 or vary their identities and behaviors across different contexts (Hogg and Terry 2000). Based on
27
28 the social-cognitive framework of moral identity advanced by Aquino et al. (2009), situational
29
30 factors that stimulate the moral self-schema may increase or decrease the accessibility of moral
31
32 identity within an individual’s working self-concept. According to the framework, moral
33
34 identity, a relatively stable individual characteristic, and situational factors jointly influence the
35
36 activities that determine social responsiveness to the needs and welfare of others. In essence,
37
38 self-schema is activated through a dynamic interaction with contextual cues (Lapsley and
39
40 Narvaez 2005). Additionally, an interactionist perspective suggests that organizational factors
41
42 interact with individual employee characteristics to influence job-related attitudes and behaviors
43
44 (Barrick et al. 2013; Fletcher et al. 2008; Mulki and Lassar 2019).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 This is in line with trait activation theory (Tett and Burnett 2003), which suggests that
52
53 salespeople’s personal characteristics and environment factors interact with each other to impact
54
55 work-related attitudes and behaviors. According to this theory, task, social, and organizational
56
57 sources of trait-relevant cues help explicate the activation of trait-based behavior at work (Tett
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and Burnett 2003). Organizational sources of trait-activation-cues embody the makeup of the
5
6 organization, such as organizational culture and climate (Mullins et al. 2020). This interactionist
7
8 perspective is further supported in recent research by To et al. (2020) who indicate that “the
9
10 competitive climate approach has often been used in combination with trait-based approaches”
11
12 (p. 7). Along these lines, prior sales studies have tested the moderating role of organizational
13
14 competitive climate on salesperson work-related attitudes and performances (e.g., Brown et al.
15
16 1998; Plouffe et al. 2010; Schrock et al. 2016).
17
18
19
20

21 As such, it can be inferred that the effects of salesperson identity depend on the social-
22
23 contextual factors found in the workplace. More specifically, we posit that an internal
24
25 competitive climate (a group climate factor) moderates the relationships between moral identity
26
27 (an employee characteristic) and salesperson-customer and -organization identification as well as
28
29 customer- and coworker-directed outcomes. That is, we posit that the interaction between
30
31 salesperson moral identity and internal competitive climate can explain more variance in
32
33 salesperson work-related attitudes and behaviors than any one of the factors alone.
34
35
36
37

38 *Internal competitive climate* refers to the level of rivalry that exists in a salesforce due to
39
40 perceptions of individual salespeople experiencing better selling outcomes, enjoying more job-
41
42 related advantages, having better relationships with management, and obtaining higher
43
44 commissions (Anaza and Nowlin 2017). Salespeople working in organizations with highly
45
46 competitive climates recognize that their performance is dependent on the comparative standing
47
48 among their coworkers (Brown et al. 1998). Attuned to these comparisons, a salesperson may
49
50 become more sensitive and concerned about her or his contributions (Schrock et al. 2016).
51
52 Internal competitive climate is part of the organizational psychological climate and includes the
53
54 “felt sense of inherent competition in the organization” (Plouffe et al. 2010, p. 541). While
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 management's intention is to foster a healthy level of workplace competition that results in
5
6 favorable organizational and individual outcomes, the use of recognition and other internal
7
8 rewards can lead to unhealthy competition, poor communication, and a lack of collaboration
9
10 (Chandrasekar 2011). As a result, in these competitive climates, salespeople often engage in
11
12 continuous social comparisons with their coworkers (Sunder et al. 2017).
13
14

15
16 Despite reported advantages of social comparisons for salespeople (e.g., motivation to
17
18 work harder towards objectives, see Suls and Wills (1991)), unfavorable comparisons arise when
19
20 other individuals are perceived to be competitors (Arnold et al. 2009). Salespeople who work in
21
22 highly competitive environments will actively look for new ways to gain advantages over their
23
24 peers (Martin and Bush 2006). In these situations, social comparisons may become a hindrance
25
26 for an individual salesperson. For example, in a general sense, competition among individuals
27
28 may result in increased uncertainty and feelings of stress (Beehr 1998), which leads to adverse
29
30 consequences in sales (Itani and Inyang 2015; Jaramillo et al. 2006). Salespeople may also
31
32 withhold knowledge from others as a result of internal competition, viewing coworkers as
33
34 challengers and rivals (Anaza and Nowlin 2017). Research has shown that a competitive climate
35
36 leads to lower levels of work satisfaction and firm commitment (Fletcher et al. 2008).
37
38

39
40 Competitive climate was also found to increase salesperson interpersonal deviance directed
41
42 toward coworkers (Jelinek and Ahearne 2006). In a similar vein, internal competitive climate
43
44 was shown to negatively moderate the relationship between salesperson exploratory navigation
45
46 behavior and sales performance (Plouffe et al. 2010).
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Contextual and situational factors can activate or suppress the influence of moral identity
54
55 (Forehand et al. 2002). Along these lines, the working self-concept is an interactive function of
56
57 the self-interest promoting situational factor and moral identity (Aquino et al. 2009). From a
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 social identity theory, an internal competitive climate can weaken the alignment between an
5
6 individual's identity and behavior (Hogg and Terry 2000). In addition, the social-cognitive
7
8 framework suggests that situational factors such as internal competitive climate do activate a
9
10 self-interested facet of identity and results in a psychological tension with moral identity, thereby
11
12 reducing the accessibility of the moral self-schema (Aquino et al. 2009). Stated simply, the effect
13
14 of moral self-schema is dependent on various situational cues (Stets 2010). Accordingly, we
15
16 argue that higher levels of internal competitive climate will hamper the relationships between
17
18 salesperson moral identity and other work-related identification (customer and organization), and
19
20 job-directed outcomes (customer service provision behaviors and teamwork). An internal
21
22 competitive climate with higher levels of internal competition does not "fit" the values of
23
24 salespeople with higher moral identity due to how competition can deteriorate the interpersonal
25
26 relationships between salespeople engaging in unhealthy social comparisons with perceived
27
28 rivals (e.g., Anaza and Nowlin 2017). Therefore, we advance the following:
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 H_{5a}: Internal competitive climate weakens the positive relationship between salesperson
37 moral identity and salesperson-customer identification
38

39 H_{5b}: Internal competitive climate weakens the positive relationship between salesperson
40 moral identity and customer service provision behaviors
41

42 H_{5c}: Internal competitive climate weakens the positive relationship between salesperson
43 moral identity and salesperson-organization identification
44

45 H_{5d}: Internal competitive climate weakens the positive relationship between salesperson
46 moral identity and teamwork
47
48
49

50 **Methodology**

51 *Sample*

52
53 A web-based survey was developed and shared online through a reputable market research
54
55 company that offers business data sourcing services in the United States. In B2B relationships,
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 salespeople represent the sellers and are responsible for interactions and encounters with buyers.
5
6 As such, the B2B market was deemed to be an appropriate context to test our conceptual model.
7
8 Potential respondents were contacted by email. Two additional reminders were also sent to them
9
10 during a one-month period. Incentives were provided to enhance participation. The survey was
11
12 accessed by 642 respondents (response rate 19.1%), but since only B2B salespeople were
13
14 allowed to participate in the study, salespeople working in business-to-consumer (B2C) markets
15
16 were filtered out. In total, 322 B2B salespeople participated in the study but only 313 responses
17
18 gathered were included in the final sample after eliminating nine incomplete responses (9.3%
19
20 effective response rate)².
21
22
23
24

25
26 We compared early respondents with late ones across demographic and study variables to
27
28 check for nonresponse bias (Armstrong and Overton 1977). The comparison shows
29
30 nonsignificant difference between the two groups. Females accounted for 27.5% of the sample,
31
32 which is reasonable in a B2B sales context. The gender distribution of the sample is similar to
33
34 those reported in previous B2B sales and ethics studies in which males constituted the majority
35
36 of the samples utilized (e.g., Badrinarayanan et al. 2019; Bill et al. 2020; Lussier et al. 2019).
37
38
39
40

41 Salespeople participating in the study had an average of 10.05 years of sales experience
42
43 (Standard deviation = 7.79) and the majority held a college degree or more (85.3%). The average
44
45 age was equal to 33.3 years (Standard deviation = 8.75). Within the sample, salespeople
46
47 represented a wide range of company sizes based on yearly revenues, including less than \$1
48
49 million (20.8%), \$1-10 million (38.3%), \$11-50 million (19.2%), \$51-100 million (12.8%), and
50
51 greater than \$100 million (8.9%). The sample characteristics are summarized in Appendix A.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ² This response rate is in line with what is reported in other similar studies in the context of B2B sales (e.g.,
59 Chakrabarty et al. 2008; Zhang et al. 2013) and business ethics (e.g., Bacha and Walker 2013; Brik et al. 2011;
60 Schwepker and Good 2011).
61

Measures

A survey was developed based on valid and reliable multi-item measures that were adapted from previous studies. The scale of moral identity self-importance – internalization – developed by Aquino and Reed (2002) was utilized to measure salesperson moral identity (Cronbach’s alpha = .82). The higher the level of internalization, the more moral identity is rooted at the core of one’s self and reflected in one’s beliefs and behaviors (Aquino and Reed 2002). The moral identity internalization scale represents the self-importance of moral traits (“having”) to an individual and is highly used in previous studies (e.g., Shao et al. 2008; Jennings et al. 2015) for its positive psychometrics properties and robustness in predicting moral outcomes and concern for others (e.g., Aquino et al. 2009; Hannah et al. 2020; Skarlicki et al. 2016). A sample item from this scale is: “*It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.*” Moral identity internalization is consistent with conceptualizations of moral identity in the literature and has been found to be a significant predictor of moral outcomes (Hardy et al. 2014). The internalization dimension has been utilized by researchers to represent moral identification (e.g., Aquino et al. 2009; Skarlicki et al. 2016; Hannah et al. 2020). The scale has been shown to be both reliable and valid across numerous studies in different research domains. For example, the scale reliability was found to have a higher Cronbach’s alpha than the recommended cutoff level (.7) in multiple research studies (Aquino et al. 2009; Johnson and Umphress 2019; Skarlicki et al. 2016). In addition, empirical evidence for distinct aspects of validity using this same scale exists in different studies (Shao et al. 2008, Jennings et al. 2015, Hertz and Krettenauer 2016).

To measure salesperson-customer identification and salesperson-organizational identification, we adapted the scale developed by Ashforth and Mael (1989). These scales measure the “oneness” salespeople have with their customers (Cronbach’s alpha = .85) and

1
2
3
4 organizations (Cronbach's alpha = .91), respectively. An example item reads: "*My customers'*
5
6 *(company's) success is my success.*" This measure of organizational identification is well utilized
7
8 in prior research due to its reliability and validity. In a sales context, for example, the scale is
9
10 used to measure salesperson identification with organizations, manufacturer's brands,
11
12 distributors, and sales units (Beeler et al. 2020; Badrinarayanan and Laverie 2011). This
13
14 measure, and our conceptualization, does not necessarily explicitly mention any specific or direct
15
16 team members or coworkers. Rather, "organization" in this case is an abstract representation of
17
18 the company itself that does not necessarily include specific members into an in-group. The
19
20 "organization" is stable over time and, as long as a salesperson doesn't change jobs, he or she
21
22 will only have "one" organization that they work for and can identify with. Organization
23
24 identification keeps the focus on a salesperson's sense of belongingness with his or her
25
26 organization, going beyond any specific team members and coworkers. Prior studies provide
27
28 evidence of reliability (e.g., composite reliability = 0.89 and Cronbach's alpha = .88), convergent
29
30 and discriminant validity, and adequate levels of average variance extracted (Menguc and
31
32 Boichuk 2012). In another study, Kalra et al. (2017) reported the following regarding the
33
34 salesperson-organizational identification scale (composite reliability = .89 and Cronbach's alpha
35
36 = .84).

37
38 The scale advanced by Jasmand et al. (2012) was adapted to capture salesperson
39
40 customer service provision behaviors (Cronbach's alpha = .89). The scale captures salesperson
41
42 activities to serve customers in the best way. One of the items states: "*During conversation with*
43
44 *customers I usually try to calm complaining customers, so that we can jointly handle their needs/*
45
46 *complaints about their products.*" In their study, Jasmand et al. (2012) provide details in support
47
48 of construct, convergent, and discriminant validity of the scale and report adequate reliability
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (e.g., composite reliability = 0.9). Further evidence reliability and validity of this scale is
5
6
7 provided in more recent studies that have adapted it (e.g., Agnihotri et al. 2017; Mullins et al.
8
9 2020). Agnihotri et al. (2017) show that the scale is reliable and valid (composite reliability =
10
11 0.8), while Mullins et al. (2020) also report satisfactory reliability levels of the scale, adequate
12
13 factor loadings, and discriminant and convergent validity.
14
15

16 To measure teamwork (Cronbach's alpha = .86), a measure with a four-item scale was
17
18 adapted from Oliver and Anderson (1994). The scale captures a salesperson's tendency to
19
20 effectively work in a team with others in the same organization. One of the items states: "*I am*
21
22 *willing to do my part for the good of the team.*" The scale does not focus only on "direct" team
23
24 members or colleagues but instead on "general" team members, which may sometimes include
25
26 other coworkers and employees. In one study, Itani et al. (2019) find that the measures possess
27
28 feasible levels of reliability (e.g., Cronbach's alpha = .78, composite reliability = 0.8) and
29
30 convergent as well as discriminant validity.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Internal competitive climate (Cronbach's alpha = .95) was measured using a four-item
37
38 scale from Anaza and Nowlin (2017). This scale captures salesperson's perceived sense of
39
40 internal competition in the organization and the rivalry and hostility between coworkers. As an
41
42 illustrative item: "*Some of my coworkers are hostile to one another when one coworker*
43
44 *outperforms the rest.*" Anaza and Nowlin (2017) report a satisfactory Cronbach Alpha (>.83),
45
46 and composite reliability (.95) of the scale. They also confirm construct discriminant and
47
48 convergent reliability.
49
50
51
52

53 In terms of covariate variables, a general measure of job satisfaction (Cronbach's alpha =
54
55 .94) was added to the model to control for its effects on salesperson's attitudes and behaviors
56
57 (e.g., Alnakhli et al. 2020; Brown and Peterson 1993; Valentine et al. 2011). In addition,
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 salesperson experience, age, education level as well as company size (i.e., yearly average
5
6 revenue level) were included as covariates (e.g., Gabler et al. 2017). Finally, to account for the
7
8 potential effects of social desirability, we adapted a shortened scale to measure social desirability
9
10 (Reynolds 1982). Socially desirable responding was checked by controlling the possible effect of
11
12 social desirability bias on the endogenous factors³. Table 1 includes the inter-factor correlations,
13
14 constructs descriptive statistics, and square root of the average variance extracted of the
15
16 constructs in the model. All items were measured using a Likert-type 7-point scale ranging from
17
18 strongly disagree to strongly agree, except for the job satisfaction measure which also included
19
20 an item that utilized a Likert-type 7-point scale (1= extremely dissatisfied; 7 = extremely
21
22 satisfied).

23
24
25
26
27
28 -- Insert Table 1 about here --
29
30

31 **Results**

32 *Measurement Model*

33
34
35 Partial least squares-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was applied to test the
36
37 relationships postulated in our model. PLS-SEM is appropriate for testing non-normal data and
38
39 complex models with a large number of factors and items used as well as multiple interaction
40
41 effects using a product indicator approach (Chin et al. 2003; Hair et al. 2012).
42
43

44
45 The psychometric properties of the measures were examined by checking internal-
46
47 consistency, reliability, and validity. Internal consistency was evidenced with the lowest
48
49 Cronbach's alpha (α) equals to (.82). Furthermore, reliability of the scales is achieved with
50
51 composite reliability (CR) equals to (.88). Average variance extracted (AVE) of the measures as
52
53 well as the owere above the cutoff level (.5) with the lowest AVE equals to (.63). To check for
54
55
56
57

58
59 ³ Findings show that social desirability has a nonsignificant effect on the results found. Moreover, a nonsignificant
60
61 correlation was found between salesperson moral identity and the social desirability construct ($r = .08, p > .1$).
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 convergent validity, the outer loadings of all the items were found to load significantly ($p < .01$)
5
6 on their respective factors except for one item in the moral identity scale that loaded poorly. This
7
8 item was dropped from the analysis. No problematic cross loadings were found. Additionally, we
9
10 conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) that shows support for a multi-factor model
11
12 providing evidence of convergent validity. Discriminant validity was first checked using the
13
14 Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion. In all comparisons, the inter-factor correlations examined
15
16 were lower than the square root AVE. Secondly, the heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) criterion was
17
18 assessed. The HTMT ratio between pairs were below (.85), providing further proof of
19
20 discriminant validity (Henseler et al. 2015). Finally, no evidence of multicollinearity was found
21
22 (variance inflation factor $VIF < 3.5$). These results as well as the measurement items and
23
24 respective factor loadings are summarized in Table 2.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 -- Insert Table 2 about here --
32

33
34 Procedural remedies, such as measures and items separation as well as different scale
35
36 points were utilized when possible to avoid common method bias (CMB). Based on the
37
38 suggestions provided by Podsakoff et al. (2003), we physically separated the measurement of the
39
40 predictor and criterion variables. The measures were provided on different survey pages with
41
42 multiple page breaks in between in order to provide an additional layer of measurement
43
44 separation. Furthermore, some of the items were scrambled on different survey pages. We also
45
46 notified respondents that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Finally, we
47
48 included a different response format in the job satisfaction measure.
49
50
51

52
53 Statistical remedies were also used to check for CMB. The Harman’s single factor
54
55 criterion was conducted by testing a one factor model using an exploratory factor analysis
56
57 (EFA). The one factor model explained only 25.6% of the variance. In addition, the marker
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 variable criterion was utilized (Lindell and Whitney 2001). The results didn't differ between the
5
6 original model and the model with the marker variable. Altogether, our tests and analyses show
7
8 no evidence of CMB.
9

10 11 ***Structural Model*** 12

13
14 Multiple models were tested to assess the relationships hypothesized. The analyses in SmartPLS
15
16 were based on structural equation modeling. First, to examine H₁ and H₂, a direct effects model
17
18 was tested. In this model the direct effects of salesperson moral identity were examined as well
19
20 as the effects of the control variables. Findings show support for both hypotheses with
21
22 salesperson moral identity positively influencing customer service provision behaviors ($\beta = .68$,
23
24 $p < .001$) and teamwork ($\beta = .66$, $p < .001$). Moreover, the model demonstrates positive effects of
25
26 salesperson moral identity on salesperson-customer identification ($\beta = .57$, $p < .001$) and
27
28 salesperson-organizational identification ($\beta = .46$, $p < .001$).
29
30
31
32

33
34 Next, a mediated effects model was tested. The mediation tests were conducted by adding
35
36 additional links in the model (a link between salesperson-customer identification and customer
37
38 service provision behaviors; and a link between salesperson-organizational identification and
39
40 teamwork). The mediated effects model was then compared with direct effects model (Table 3)
41
42 to access the changes in the direct effects of salesperson moral identity on teamwork and
43
44 customer service provision behavior. This allowed us to examine the mediated relationships
45
46 hypothesized in H₃ and H₄. Here, two more links were included in the model: (1) a link between
47
48 salesperson-customer identification and customer service provision behaviors and (2) a link
49
50 between salesperson-organizational identification and teamwork. Findings indicate that the link
51
52 between salesperson-customer identification and customer service provision behaviors is positive
53
54 ($\beta = .29$, $p < .001$) and that, after adding this link, the relationship between salesperson moral
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 identity and customer-service provision behaviors is weaker ($\beta = .52, p < .001$). The change in
5
6 the coefficient is significant ($\Delta\beta = .16, p < .01$). The results suggest that the relationship between
7
8 salesperson moral identity and customer service provision behaviors is partially mediated by
9
10 salesperson-customer identification, supporting H₃.
11
12
13

14 Findings also demonstrate that the link between salesperson-organization identification
15
16 and teamwork is positive ($\beta = .39, p < .001$). After adding this link, the relationship between
17
18 salesperson moral identity and teamwork decreases ($\Delta\beta = .18, p < .01$) from ($\beta = .66, p < .001$) to
19
20 ($\beta = .48, p < .001$). Thus, findings show that the relationship between salesperson moral identity
21
22 and teamwork is partially mediated by salesperson-organization identification, in support of H₄.
23
24 Further examination of the mediated relationships was conducted. The indirect effects results
25
26 provide additional support to the partial mediations found with significant indirect effect of
27
28 salesperson moral identity on customer-service provision behaviors through salesperson-
29
30 customer identification as well as the indirect effect of salesperson moral identity on teamwork
31
32 through salesperson-organization identification. According to the results, the two mediated
33
34 relationships can be described as complementary mediation (Zhao et al. 2010).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Finally, a full (hypothesized) model including internal competitive climate and the
42
43 interaction term between moral identity and internal competitive climate was tested. In this
44
45 model, H₁ – H₄ are supported (see Table 3). In terms of the hypothesized interactions, the results
46
47 indicate that the interaction between internal competitive climate and salesperson moral identity
48
49 has no effect on salesperson-customer identification ($\beta = .12, p > .1$) and salesperson-customer
50
51 identification ($\beta = -.06, p > .1$). However, there is a negative effect on customer service provision
52
53 behaviors ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) and teamwork ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$), offering support for H_{5b} and H_{5d}.
54
55
56
57 While not hypothesized, internal competitive climate holds a positive influence on salesperson-
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 customer identification ($\beta = .14, p < .01$) and customer service provision behaviors ($\beta = .1, p <$
5
6
7 $.05$). Further analysis shows that the indirect effect of salesperson moral identity on teamwork
8
9 through salesperson-organizational identification is significant ($\beta = .09, p < .05$). Similarly, the
10
11 indirect effect of moral identity on customer service provision behaviors through salesperson-
12
13 customer identification is significant ($\beta = .12, p < .05$). These results are in support of the
14
15 mediated relationships hypothesized.
16
17

18
19 -- Insert Table 3 about here --
20

21 Post-hoc analysis using PROCESS regression path modeling was also conducted to check
22
23 the possibility of any moderated-mediation relationships in our model (Preacher and Hayes
24
25 2008). Specifically, we tested if competitive climate moderates the relationships between moral
26
27 identity and customer service provision behavior, and teamwork. Thus, the overall model was
28
29 tested in PROCESS by testing first, the moral identity-external customer-related path and then,
30
31 the moral identity-internal organization-related path taking into consideration the moderating
32
33 effect of internal competitive climate in both paths. Both models analyzed using PROCESS
34
35 included the covariates. The PROCESS regression path modeling was also used as a robustness
36
37 check to confirm the results found in the PLS-SEM analyses. While the findings provide no
38
39 evidence for moderated-mediated relationships, further support was provided in favor of the
40
41 mediated relationships hypothesized in H₃ and H₄. In addition, the post-hoc analysis shows that
42
43 the R²-change in both significant moderated relationships is significant (H_{5b}: $\Delta R^2 = .03, F_{(1,303)} =$
44
45 $19.9, p < .001$) and (H_{5d}: $\Delta R^2 = .02, F_{(1,303)} = 6.99, p < .05$). Following Aiken et al. (1991), the
46
47 moderating effects can also be analyzed using simple slopes (see Figure 2 and Figure 3).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 -- Insert Figure 2 and Figure 3 about here --
56

57 The slope analyses show internal competitive climate to weaken the positive effect of
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 moral identity on customer service provision behavior. Salespeople who consider moral identity
5
6 as central to their self-concepts will not be able to serve customers in an optimal way when faced
7
8 with intense internal competitive climate (see Figure 2). Alternatively, a salesperson who doesn't
9
10 consider moral identity as central to oneself is likely to serve customers better when internal
11
12 competition is intense, suggesting that such competition can motivate salespeople who don't
13
14 centralize their self-concepts around moral identity. The positive relationship between moral
15
16 identity and teamwork is deteriorated when internal competition increases at work. Thus, internal
17
18 competitive climate also holds a negative moderating effect on moral identity-teamwork
19
20 relationship. The highest level of teamwork is evidenced in the workplace when salespeople with
21
22 high moral identity are operating under low internal competitive climate (see Figure 3).
23
24 Accordingly, intense competitive climate will hinder salespeople with central moral identities to
25
26 execute their best teamwork skills in the workplace.
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **Discussion**

34
35 In this study, we sought to explore salesperson moral identity, which has not been previously
36
37 examined in the sales literature. Grounded in social identity theory and applying a social-
38
39 cognitive approach, we developed a model that includes consequences and underlying
40
41 mechanisms associated with salesperson moral identity. Our empirical investigation of B2B sales
42
43 professionals reveals that moral identity has both direct and indirect effects on customer- and
44
45 coworker-directed outcomes. Specifically, our results show that salesperson moral identity
46
47 positively affects both customer-identification and organizational-identification, which, in turn,
48
49 impact customer service provision and teamwork. We also find that internal competitive climate
50
51 moderates the relationships between salesperson moral identity and important job-directed
52
53 outcomes. Specifically, we find that salespeople whose moral identity is central to their self-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 concepts are affected by the intense internal competitive climate at work as their ability to serve
5
6 their customers in the optimum way possible is hindered. This in line with prior research findings
7
8 that show how competitive climate creates pressure for salespeople, driving them to decrease
9
10 their cooperation with others (Brown et al. 1998) and feel dissatisfaction at work (Schrock et al.
11
12 2016). Therefore, we think it would be better for salespeople with strong moral identity to work
13
14 under lower levels of internal competitive climate. On the other hand, salespeople with weak
15
16 moral identity will serve customers better when competition is higher.
17
18
19
20

21 These results demonstrate the intrinsic motive of moral identity in driving salespeople to
22
23 serve customers and protect their welfare, despite the challenging conditions salespeople might
24
25 experience as a result of internal competition. Regarding teamwork, the higher moral identity is
26
27 to the salesperson, the higher teamwork will take place. This positive relationship is deteriorated
28
29 when internal competition increases at work. Teamwork is the highest for salespeople with high
30
31 moral identity operating under a lower internal competitive climate. The insights from our study
32
33 have theoretical and managerial implications, which we discuss next.
34
35
36
37

38 *Theoretical Implications*

39

40 Our study is the first in the sales literature to introduce the notion of salesperson moral identity.
41
42 Indeed, moral identity is an essential element of the actual nature of morality (Reed et al. 2007;
43
44 Weaver 2006). Building on past research on social identity theory and moral identity research
45
46 (e.g., Aquino and Reed 2002; Hardy and Carlo 2011), we underscore the application and
47
48 significance of this concept in sales settings. While past research has examined the role of
49
50 salesperson identification (e.g., Ahearne et al. 2005), it has largely focused on “outward” related
51
52 entities and targets that salespeople identify with. That is, research has primarily focused on
53
54 customers and organizations as external entities in which a salesperson may identify with (e.g.,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Kalra et al. 2017). In this regard, research has shown the positive impact of salesperson
5
6 “external” identification. Much of the sales research on external identification has emphasized a
7
8 sense of belongingness with others and taken more of a situational perspective. However,
9
10 scholars have not previously fully examined “inward” related sources of identification that are
11
12 “internal” to a salesperson. That is, by introducing the trait-based conceptualization of moral
13
14 identity, we not only fill this gap in the literature but also demonstrate the worthiness of
15
16 salesperson moral identity as an important theoretical and personal identity construct.
17
18
19
20

21
22 More so, our research “peels off” a layer from the literature on salesperson ethics by
23
24 focusing on *why* salespeople behave morally, as opposed to past research which has primarily
25
26 focused on *what* salespeople do or don’t do ethically. With salesperson moral identity, scholars
27
28 should further incorporate the fact that salesperson moral “make-up” and trait-like tendencies can
29
30 be used to help explain why salespeople “behave good” as opposed to why they “ought to.” This
31
32 goes beyond just the academic discussion around what is morally right or wrong for a
33
34 salesperson to do, to one that describes that doing the right thing is an integral part of an
35
36 individual’s identity (Hardy et al. 2014). In other words, by taking a moral agency perspective
37
38 and introducing moral identity to the sales literature, we stress the importance of researchers not
39
40 only asking on behalf of salespeople, “what should I do?” and “what principles should I follow”
41
42 but to also asking, “who am I?” (Weaver 2006). Researchers should therefore take into account a
43
44 moral agency perspective in sales settings and keep in mind any moral schemas that a
45
46 salesperson might possess rather than only keeping a focus on specific ethical behaviors.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Salesperson moral identity is important when it comes to ethical and moral decision
54
55 making. The dominant paradigm in the sales ethics literature is the ethical decision making
56
57 (EDM) model (e.g., Schwepker 2019; Rousselet et al. 2020). The premise of EDM theory (see
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Schwartz 2016) is that, when it comes to ethical decision making, a salesperson cognitively
5
6 progresses through four consecutive stages: 1) recognizing a moral issue, 2) making a moral
7
8 judgement, 3) establishing moral intent, and 4) engaging in moral behavior. Numerous factors
9
10 affect this process, including characteristics of the decision-maker (McClaren 2000). The EDM
11
12 process is also categorized by moral issues and moral agents (Zollo et al. 2017). By viewing the
13
14 salesperson as a moral agent, we further bring to light the unique characteristics (i.e., moral
15
16 identity) of the decision maker. Based on EDM, salespeople with high moral identity are more
17
18 morally attentive and sensitive, as they possess automatic moral awareness, which is a major
19
20 driver of ethical decision making (Kim and Loewenstein 2020; Reynolds and Miller 2015). So,
21
22 while past research on sales ethics has primarily focused on individual factors and variables such
23
24 as gender, age, education level, and individual values (e.g., Ferrell et al. 2019; McClaren 2013;
25
26 Ross and Robertson 2003), we go beyond demographic and descriptive variables to spotlight the
27
28 significance of moral identity, a trait-like factor, of a salesperson who is also a moral agent.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In addition, our research sheds light on the consequences of salesperson moral identity as
37
38 an individual difference variable. Existing research shows that there are a number of general
39
40 benefits to moral identity. For example, research has shown that moral identity is linked to
41
42 prosocial behaviors (e.g., volunteerism) as well as moral evaluations, emotions, and judgements
43
44 (Aquino and Reed 2002; Shao et al. 2008). Indeed, individuals with higher moral identity are
45
46 more likely to engage in moral action (see meta-analysis by Hertz and Krettenauer 2016). For
47
48 salespeople, we suggest that moral identity is advantageous as it may be used to guide prosocial
49
50 interactions and actions with those partners whom they are responsible for interacting with on a
51
52 regular basis. That is, we demonstrate how an ethics-based construct affects the interpersonal
53
54 work relationships – both internal and external to the organization – found in contemporary sales
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 environments.

5
6 In particular, considering salespeople with identities that revolve around morality-based
7 traits (e.g., compassion, generosity) are concerned about the general welfare and well-being of
8 others (Hart et al. 1998), there are positive benefits for both customers and coworkers. Since
9 salespeople with high moral identity behave in ways that are coherent with their self-concept of
10 being virtuous (Aquino et al. 2009), we show that customers will experience higher levels of
11 customer service provision, while coworkers will enjoy more teamwork from salespeople with
12 high moral identity. In this way, we illustrate how, in a sales setting, the effects of a circle of
13 moral regard associated with moral identity (Reed and Aquino 2003) extends out to how
14 salespeople interact and engage with both internal members of the organization as well as
15 external customers. Indeed, moral identity is better for individual well-being and relationships
16 (Hardy et al. 2014). Salespeople with high moral identity strictly consider matters of morality, so
17 they will consciously behave in the best interests of both their customers and coworkers. For
18 instance, salespeople with higher moral identity are less likely to engage in customer-directed
19 sabotage in response to lower levels of customer justice, as they intrinsically follow the mantra
20 “treat the customer as you would want to be treated” (Skarlick et al. 2016, p. 111). With regards
21 to coworkers, research shows that an ethical and moral work environment leads to the formation
22 of internal social capital, where team members sincerely work together and share a mutual
23 commitment towards organizational goals (Pastoriza et al. 2015).

24
25 Our research also elucidates a dual process by which salesperson moral identity impacts
26 behaviors and interactions with customers and coworkers. Literature on moral identity has
27 identified a number of behavioral mediators, such as moral disengagement (Detert et al. 2008).
28 We add to the literature by offering two social and cognitive-type mediators, which relate to
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 perceptions of “oneness” with both internal and external salesperson constituents. Salespeople
5
6 with moral identity have a high standard of moral beliefs, which makes up their self-conception
7
8 (Blasi 2004) and is used to foster a sense of belongingness with those key stakeholders whom
9
10 they interact with. Moral identity has been described as a self-regulating construct that connects
11
12 an individual (personal identity) to others (social identity) (Aquino and Reed 2002). In particular,
13
14 a salesperson’s moral motivation will trigger a sense of belongingness with key members in the
15
16 salesperson’s social sphere and circle of moral regard (e.g., Reed and Aquino 2003). In this
17
18 study, we show that the effects of salesperson moral identity are simultaneously mediated
19
20 through intraorganizational and interorganizational mechanisms. Specifically, considering that
21
22 customers and coworkers are important constituents that a salesperson must serve (e.g., Plouffe
23
24 et al. 2016), we uncover customer- and organizational-identification as critical intervening
25
26 variables between salesperson moral identity and customer service provision and teamwork.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 By emphasizing the dual mechanisms and social context related to salesperson moral
35
36 identity, we reinforce recent sales ethics research that has advocated for a practice-based view of
37
38 salesperson unethical behavior (Ameer and Halinen 2019). With this perspective, when it comes
39
40 to unethical salesperson behavior, the focus is on the activities that socially construct and
41
42 maintain practices as “the social context of sales is described as a constellation of actors who
43
44 interact with each other and thereby affect the formation, maintenance, and change of unethical
45
46 sales practices” (Ameer and Halinen 2019, p. 104). Our theoretical model expands on this view
47
48 by incorporating two distinct social identification-based factors. As we further demonstrate,
49
50 salespeople are connected to other actors both internally and externally in socially connected
51
52 interdependent relationships (e.g., SeEVERS et al. 2007).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Lastly, given that moral identity is subject to contextual influences (Weaver 2006), we
5
6 advance and find support for a sales-related environmental contextual variable that negatively
7
8 influences the impact of salesperson moral identity. Specifically, we find that the effects of
9
10 salesperson moral identity are contingent on the internal competitive climate, a situational factor,
11
12 in which the salesperson operates. Situational factors are characteristics of the decision setting
13
14 that go beyond those related to the individual decision-maker and influence the decision-making
15
16 process as well as relevant outcomes (Ross and Robertson 2003). Internal competitive climate
17
18 takes a much narrower view on the environment in which a salesperson operates in a day-to-day
19
20 basis, unlike the broader view found in current research on ethical climates in the sales ethics
21
22 literature (Martin and Cullen 2006; Itani et al. 2019). Ethical climate looks at employee's
23
24 perceptions of the work environment that sets guidelines for organizational procedures, policies,
25
26 and practices with moral consequences. Due to the predictability and controllability inherent in
27
28 an ethical climate, it creates norms of behavior (Jaramillo et al. 2013). That is, ethical climate
29
30 provides structure and guidance for salespeople, whereas an internal competitive climate does
31
32 not, instead, it considers the hostility found between coworkers and does not offer prescriptions
33
34 for salespeople to follow. Meaning, internal competitive climate is more about how members on
35
36 a team behave and interact with each other. We show that research should not just be limited to
37
38 examining the policies and procedures that are set by organizations and the broader ethical
39
40 climate in an organization, but also expanded to account for the way members of sales teams
41
42 engage and interact with each other.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 While organizations use internal competition with the hopes of creating a healthy
53
54 competitive environment in which productive and unproductive salespeople may be identified
55
56 (Anaza and Nowlin 2017; To et al. 2020), our study shows that an internal competitive climate
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 may inadvertently hinder the motivational effects of moral identity. When there is high
5
6 competition among coworkers, the advantages associated with moral identity on a salesperson's
7
8 job-directed outcomes (i.e., customer service provision behaviors and teamwork) will be
9
10 hampered. In the integrated EDM framework offered by Schwartz (2016), internal competitive
11
12 climate would most closely be considered to be an organizational environmental factor, as it
13
14 weakens the effects of moral identity on customer service provision behaviors and teamwork.
15
16 Our research therefore provides additional support for the significant interaction between
17
18 personal factors and environmental factors (e.g., Domino et al. 2015) on individual outcomes in
19
20 sales and ethics settings.
21
22
23
24
25

26 ***Managerial Implications***

27
28 Managers have a significant role (Wang et al. 2019) and should look for ways to bolster the
29
30 moral identity of salespeople on their teams, especially those that might not be naturally inclined
31
32 to have their identities centralized around morality. For managers, the notion of salesperson
33
34 moral identity is especially important in today's dynamic sales world, which requires salespeople
35
36 to be even more involved with both their external and internal customers. Managers must
37
38 recognize that moral identity serves as a source of moral motivation and behavior (Shao et al.
39
40 2008), which can be an enabling factor in how salespeople effectively interact with their
41
42 customers and coworkers. Managers who understand that moral identity serves as the moral
43
44 agent that guides valued salesperson behaviors will be able to be on the active lookout for
45
46 salespeople who exhibit traits associated with moral identity, such as being fair, generous,
47
48 helpful, and honest (e.g., Aquino and Reed 2002). For example, managers can pay special
49
50 attention to see which members of their sales team volunteer to help their coworkers and go
51
52 above and beyond with their empathetic concern for others.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Recognizing which salespeople have higher levels of moral identity can assist managers
5
6 properly and effectively align their salespeople with certain customers and coworkers. Sales
7
8 managers can assign these salespeople challenging and difficult customer accounts, especially
9
10 those that require high customer service levels, with the confidence that these salespeople will
11
12 deliver exceptional customer service. Even in situations where there might be concerns with
13
14 ethical dilemmas and temptations to behave unethically (e.g., McClaren 2000) with demanding
15
16 customers, managers can rest assured once they have properly assigned salespeople with moral
17
18 identity, who are able to automatically internalize what is right for the customer. By having an
19
20 “other-person” oriented morality perspective, salespeople with high moral identity are always
21
22 able to focus on customer goals in the most moral way. Managers are able to then worry less
23
24 about salespeople’s unethical actions, especially since those actions are hard to monitor (Tseng
25
26 2019).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Managers could also appoint salespeople with high moral identity as moral exemplars
34
35 and as team leaders within the organization, as they openly display to others what matters most
36
37 to them is what they see as morally right (Hardy and Carlo 2011). These salespeople could then
38
39 lead the charge with regards to ensuring that effective teamwork exists. In an ethical/moral work
40
41 climate, research has revealed that salespeople are more willing to cooperate and help their
42
43 coworkers (Jaramillo et al. 2015). When the team is selling ethically, managers can expect that
44
45 employee performance and customer satisfaction will improve (Jaramillo et al. 2006). Managers
46
47 should therefore strategically assign sales team members with high moral identity to areas and
48
49 teams that could benefit the most from teamwork.
50
51
52

53
54
55 In addition, managers need to engender customer-identification and organizational-
56
57 identification by further indoctrinating salespeople with the relevance and significance of
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 belonging to the “same team.” This can be done, for example, by deliberately creating ways for
5
6 salespeople to engage in activities that make them feel that they are truly part of the company
7
8 “brand” and that their success should mirror the success of the organization and its customers. In
9
10 order to do so, managers should highly encourage rich social interactions and gatherings for
11
12 salespeople with high moral identity, especially in B2B sales where many salespeople tend to
13
14 work in the field and remotely. This is particularly the case when it comes to fostering a sense of
15
16 belongingness and connectedness with other members of the organization (Nowlin et al. 2018).
17
18
19
20

21 By scheduling a number of face-to-face meetings and specific fun activities (e.g., team
22
23 building) between salespeople, managers can induce a sense of oneness between salespeople and
24
25 the organization. This should not be limited to only social events within the organization, as sales
26
27 managers should offer approval and support for salespeople to regularly meet with their
28
29 customers with the sole purpose of developing a sense of belongingness. To get the most out of
30
31 these interactions, managers should encourage these internal and external meetings to revolve
32
33 around key themes related to the traits (e.g., compassion, friendliness, generosity) that
34
35 salespeople with moral identity hold dearly. As part of this, sales managers should underscore
36
37 the specific role of salespeople with moral identity in a sales ethics subculture (Bush et al. 2017;
38
39 Ferrell et al. 2019; Merkle et al. 2020). By placing salespeople with moral identity in a pivotal
40
41 role within the sales force, perhaps as peer-trainers sharing best practices related to sales ethics,
42
43 managers can ensure that the sales ethics subculture is grounded in high morals and one that
44
45 permeates a culture of superior customer service and teamwork. For sales teams, “doing the right
46
47 thing” fosters teamwork among the team and benefits the firm customers (Itani et al. 2019).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Lastly, managers need to be aware of situational factors that trigger the effects of moral
56
57 identity. Managers should recognize that their actions may have inadvertent effects on
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 salespeople with higher extents of moral identity. Specifically, managers should be cautious
5
6 when it comes to fostering an internal competitive climate as there may be unintended
7
8 consequences. While internal competition might appear to be good for sales teams and is well-
9
10 intended, it actually diminishes the positive effects for salespeople with high moral identity when
11
12 it comes to customer service and teamwork. So, managers should ensure that there is no
13
14 resentment between team members and there is no hostility due to any perceived disadvantage.
15
16 In specific, managers should ensure fairness and equity in how they assign accounts, compensate
17
18 salespeople, and announce the results of individual salespeople to the team. In other words, for
19
20 salespeople with moral identity, managers should avoid enabling a “vicious circle of virtue
21
22 destruction” or “demoralization of the self” (Weaver 2006) with their actions. Instead, managers
23
24 should look for ways to prime the positive effects of moral identity by providing resources and
25
26 opportunities for salespeople to exercise their moral agency. They can do this through ethical
27
28 leadership (e.g., Gerpott et al. 2019), making salespeople aware of morality-related factors, and
29
30 by offering pinpointed training that can enhance the saliency of moral identity traits.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ***Limitations and Future Research***

39
40 This study is not without its limitations, which also serve as opportunities for future research.
41
42 First, while the intention of this study was to take an initial step in establishing the notion of
43
44 salesperson moral identity, it relies on a cross-sectional sample. Given that identities evolve and
45
46 are subject to change over time, it would be interesting to capture the longitudinal nature and
47
48 consequences of salesperson moral identity. Although it is not uncommon for lower response
49
50 rates in studies that sample B2B salespeople, it would have obviously been more ideal to obtain a
51
52 higher number of responses. While we did have a representative sample of B2B salespeople to
53
54 draw statistical inferences, future studies can look to increase response rates by specifically
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 targeting B2B salespeople and forgoing any pre-notifications, leveraging personalized email
5 solicitations, and sending between one to two follow-up attempts (Daikeler et al. 2020). Our
6
7 research also takes a one-sided perspective by sampling only sales professionals. Since the
8
9 benefits of salesperson moral identity are also experienced by other members in the salesperson's
10
11 social sphere, it would be insightful to capture perspectives from customers and coworkers. This
12
13 would also help control the limitations of using single source data (e.g., Podsakoff et al. 2012).
14
15
16
17
18

19 Our study focuses on identification as mediators of the impacts of moral identity on job-
20
21 directed outcomes. While the theoretical lens utilized in this study insinuates identification-based
22
23 underlying mechanisms, other studies have suggested additional mediators for the effects of
24
25 moral identity, such as social approval and self-consistency (van Gils and Horton 2019), moral
26
27 disengagement (Chowdhury and Fernando 2014), guilt and shame (Stets and Carter 2006), and
28
29 social responsibility (Hardy et al. 2013). As such, given that emotional traits are interpersonal
30
31 and thus impact social exchanges and sales relationships (Verbeke and Bagozzi 2000), future
32
33 research can examine the emotional side of ethical decision making (Agnihotri et al. 2012) and
34
35 what feelings and emotional processes are invoked when it comes to salesperson moral identity.
36
37 For instance, scholars can investigate the role of emotional intelligence (e.g., Chowdhury 2017)
38
39 in connection to salesperson moral identity, ethical decision-making, and unethical behaviors.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Given the infancy of salesperson moral identity, there are additional fruitful avenues for
46
47 future research. As a next logical step to the findings of our study, researchers should look to
48
49 show the relationship between salesperson moral identity and job-related outcomes, such as sales
50
51 performance and turnover intentions. Future studies could also explore the potential "dark side"
52
53 of salesperson moral identity, that is when an individual is mistaken by what really matters to
54
55 them or their motivation is driven by trying to deceptively please others and leave a good
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 impression (Hertz and Krettenauer 2016). Our research shows that moral identity is largely
5
6 beneficial for salespeople when it comes to their interactions with customers and coworkers, but,
7
8 for instance, what happens when their efforts are perceived by others as being inauthentic?
9

10
11 Other research can begin to detect what drives salesperson moral identity. Research
12
13 suggests that morality is inherently social, so it is possibly that interactions with others play a
14
15 key role in the formation of moral identity (Shao et al. 2008). So, researchers can explore the
16
17 nature and types of interactions that are distinct to sales settings. Additional research can also
18
19 look at the role of moral identity in a non-Western context to see if there are any cultural
20
21 nuances. The majority of the extant research, including our study, focuses on Western settings,
22
23 where individualism and independence are part of the fabric of these cultures (Hertz and
24
25 Krettenauer 2016). For instance, in Eastern contexts, how would “saving face” (e.g., Richard and
26
27 McFadden 2016) relate to salesperson moral identity?
28
29
30
31

32
33 As another research opportunity, researchers can expand on our study’s findings by
34
35 discovering important boundary conditions on the relationships between salesperson moral
36
37 identity, salesperson-customer identification, salesperson-organizational identification, customer
38
39 service provision behaviors, and teamwork. Finally, future research can consider what behaviors
40
41 by other salesperson constituents activates the effects of moral identity – both positively and
42
43 negatively. For example, scholars can explore the managerial levers that may be used to readily
44
45 prime the positive effects of salesperson moral identity.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). Social identification, self-categorization and social influence. *European Review of Social Psychology, 1*(1), 195–228.
- Agnihotri, R., Yang, Z., & Briggs, E. (2019). Salesperson time perspectives and customer willingness to pay more: Roles of intraorganizational employee navigation, customer satisfaction, and firm innovation climate. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 39*(2), 138–158.
- Agnihotri, R., Gabler, C. B., Itani, O. S., Jaramillo, F., & Krush, M. T. (2017). Salesperson ambidexterity and customer satisfaction: Examining the role of customer demandingness, adaptive selling, and role conflict. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 37*(1), 27–41.
- Agnihotri, R., Rapp, A., Kothandaraman, P., & Singh, R. (2012). An emotion-based model of salesperson ethical behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 109*(2), 243–257.
- Ahearne, M., Haumann, T., Kraus, F., & Wieseke, J. (2013). It's a matter of congruence: How interpersonal identification between sales managers and salespersons shapes sales success. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 41*(6), 625–648.
- Ahearne, M., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Gruen, T. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of customer-company identification: Expanding the role of relationship marketing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 574–585.
- Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Reno, R. R. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.
- Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of Marketing, 69*(3), 19–34.
- Alnakhli, H., Singh, R., Agnihotri, R., & Itani, O. S. (2020). From cognition to action: the effect of thought self-leadership strategies and self-monitoring on adaptive selling behavior. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*. DOI 10.1108/JBIM-06-2019-0302
- Ameer, I., & Halinen, A. (2019). Moving beyond ethical decision-making: A practice-based view to study unethical sales behavior. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 39*(2), 103–122.
- Anaza, N. A., & Nowlin, E. L. (2017). What's mine is mine: A study of salesperson knowledge withholding & hoarding behavior. *Industrial Marketing Management, 64*, 14–24.
- Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A., Lim, V. K., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: the interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 97*(1), 123–141.
- Aquino, K., & Reed, I. I. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 83*(6), 1423–1440.
- Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research, 14*(3), 396–402.
- Arnold, T., Flaherty, K. E., Voss, K. E., & Mowen, J. C. (2009). Role stressors and retail performance: The role of perceived competitive climate. *Journal of Retailing, 85*(2), 194–205.
- Ashforth, B. E., Schinoff, B. S., & Rogers, K. M. (2016). “I identify with her,” “I identify with him”: Unpacking the dynamics of personal identification in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 41*(1), 28–60.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of*

- 1
2
3
4 *Management Review*, 14(1), 20–39.
- 5 Bacha, E., & Walker, S. (2013). The relationship between transformational leadership and
6 followers' perceptions of fairness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(3), 667–680.
- 7 Badrinarayanan, V., Ramachandran, I., & Sreedhar, M. (2019). Mirroring the boss: Ethical
8 leadership, emulation intentions, and salesperson performance. *Journal of Business
9 Ethics*, 159(3), 897–912.
- 10 Badrinarayanan, V., & Laverie, D. A. (2011). Brand advocacy and sales effort by retail
11 salespeople: Antecedents and influence of identification with manufacturers' brands.
12 *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 31(2), 123–140.
- 13 Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (2006). Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer
14 participation in small group brand communities. *International Journal of Research in
15 Marketing*, 23(1), 45–61.
- 16 Bahrami, H., & Evans, S. (1997). Human resource leadership in knowledge-based entities:
17 shaping the context of work. *Human Resource Management*, 36, 23–28.
- 18 Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and
19 Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193–209.
- 20 Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The
21 role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management
22 Review*, 38(1), 132–153.
- 23 Beehr, T. (1998). An organizational psychology meta-model of occupational stress. *Theories of
24 Organizational Stress*. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of organizational stress*, 6–27.
25 Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 26 Beeler, L. L., Chaker, N. N., Gala, P., & Zablah, A. R. (2020). The divergent effects of
27 organizational identification on salesperson and customer outcomes in a friend-selling
28 context. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 40(2), 95–113.
- 29 Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-
30 esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *The British Journal of
31 Social Psychology*, 39, 555–77.
- 32 Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer-company identification: A framework for
33 understanding consumers' relationships with companies. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(2),
34 76–88.
- 35 Bill, F., Feurer, S., & Klarmann, M. (2020). Salesperson social media use in business-to-business
36 relationships: An empirical test of an integrative framework linking antecedents and
37 consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48(4), 734–752.
- 38 Blasi, A. (1995). Moral understanding and the moral personality: the process of moral
39 integration. In W. M. Kurtines, & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An
40 introduction*, 229–253. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- 41 Blasi, A. (2004). Moral functioning: moral understanding and personality. In D. K. Lapsley, &
42 D. Navaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity*, 335–347. Mahwah, NJ:
43 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 44 Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. *Developmental
45 Review*, 3(2), 178–210.
- 46 Brik, A. B., Rettab, B., & Mellahi, K. (2011). Market orientation, corporate social
47 responsibility, and business performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(3), 307–324.
- 48 Brown, S. P., Cron, W. L., & Slocum, Jr., J. W. (1998). Effects of trait competitiveness and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- perceived intraorganizational competition on salesperson goal setting and performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(4), 88–98.
- Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(1), 63–77.
- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44(2), 83–92.
- Bush, V., Bush, A., Oakley, J., & Cicala, J. (2017). The sales profession as a subculture: Implications for ethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(3), 549–565.
- Cardador, M. T., & Pratt, M. G. (2018). Becoming who we serve: A model of multi-layered employee–customer identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2053–2080.
- Chakrabarty, S., Oubre, D. T., & Brown, G. (2008). The impact of supervisory adaptive selling and supervisory feedback on salesperson performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(4), 447–454.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing & Business Systems*, 1(1), 1–19.
- Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self-identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 511–521.
- Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., & Newsted, P. R. (2003). A partial least squares latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects: Results from a Monte Carlo simulation study and an electronic-mail emotion/adoption study. *Information Systems Research*, 14(2), 189–217.
- Choi, W. J., & Winterich, K. P. (2013). Can brands move in from the outside? How moral identity enhances out-group brand attitudes. *Journal of Marketing*, 77(2), 96–111.
- Chowdhury, R. (2017). Emotional intelligence and consumer ethics: the mediating role of personal moral philosophies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(3), 527–548.
- Chowdhury, R., & Fernando, M. (2014). The relationships of empathy, moral identity and cynicism with consumers' ethical beliefs: The mediating role of moral disengagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124, 677–694.
- Daikeler, J., Bošnjak, M., & Manfreda, K. L. (2020). Web versus other survey modes: An updated and extended meta-analysis comparing response rates. *Journal of Survey Statistics & Methodology*, 8, 513–539.
- DeCelles, K. A., DeRue, D. S., Margolis, J. D., & Ceranic, T. L. (2012). Does power corrupt or enable? When and why power facilitates self-interested behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 681–689.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2011). The effects of ethical climate on organizational identification, supervisory trust, and turnover among salespeople. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(6), 617–624.
- Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Sweitzer, V. L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: a study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 374–391.
- Domino, M., Wingreen, S., & Blanton, J. (2015). Social cognitive theory: The antecedents

- 1
2
3
4 and effects of ethical climate fit on organizational attitudes of corporate accounting
5 professionals: A reflection of client narcissism and fraud attitude risk. *Journal of*
6 *Business Ethics*, 131(2), 453–467.
- 7
8 Ebaugh, H. R. (1988). *Becoming an ex: The process of role exit*. University of Chicago Press.
- 9 Evans, K. R., McFarland, R. G., Dietz, B., & Jaramillo, F. (2012). Advancing sales performance
10 research: A focus on five under researcher topic areas. *Journal of Personal Selling &*
11 *Sales Management*, 32(1), 89-105.
- 12 Fajardo, T. M., Townsend, C., & Bolander, W. (2018). Toward an optimal donation solicitation:
13 Evidence from the field of the differential influence of donor-related and organization-
14 related information on donation choice and amount. *Journal of Marketing*, 82(2), 142-
15 152.
- 16
17 Ferrell, O. C., Johnston, M. W., Marshall, G. W., & Ferrell, L. (2019). A new direction for sales
18 ethics research: The sales ethics subculture. *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*,
19 27(3), 282–297
- 20
21 Fletcher, T. D., Major, D. A., & Davis, D. D. (2008). The interactive relationship of competitive
22 climate and trait competitiveness with workplace attitudes, stress, and performance.
23 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 899–922.
- 24 Fombelle, P. W., Jarvis, C. B., Ward, J., & Ostrom, L. (2012). Leveraging customers' multiple
25 identities: identity synergy as a driver of organizational identification. *Journal of the*
26 *Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(4), 587–604.
- 27
28 Forehand, M. R., Desphande, R., & Reed II, A. (2002). Identity salience and the influence of
29 differential activation of the social self-schema on advertising response. *Journal of*
30 *Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1086–1099.
- 31
32 Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable
33 variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
- 34
35 Gabler, C. B., Agnihotri, R., & Itani, O. S. (2017). Can salesperson guilt lead to more satisfied
36 customers? Findings from India. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32(7), 951–
37 961.
- 38
39 Gabler, C. B., Rapp, A., & Richey, R. G. (2014). The effect of environmental orientation on
40 salesperson effort and participation: the moderating role of organizational identification.
41 *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 34(3), 173–187.
- 42 Gerpott, F. H., Van Quaquebeke, N., Schlamp, S., & Voelpel, S. C. (2019). An identity
43 perspective on ethical leadership to explain organizational citizenship behavior: the
44 interplay of follower moral identity and leader group prototypicality. *Journal of Business*
45 *Ethics*, 156(4), 1063-1078.
- 46
47 Guenzi, P., Rangarajan, D., Chaker, N. N., & Sajtos, L. (2019). It is all in good humor?
48 Examining the impact of salesperson evaluations of leader humor on salesperson job
49 satisfaction and job stress. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 39(4), 352-
50 369.
- 51
52 Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal of*
53 *Marketing Theory & Practice*, 19(2), 139–152.
- 54
55 Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial
56 least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy*
57 *of Marketing Sciences*, 40, 414–433.
- 58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Hannah, S. T., Thompson, R. L., & Herbst, K. C. (2020). Moral identity complexity: Situated
5 morality within and across work and social roles. *Journal of Management*, 46(5), 726–
6 757.
7
8 Hardy, S. A. (2006). Identity, reasoning, and emotion: An empirical comparison of three sources
9 of moral motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30(3), 205–213.
10 Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2011). Moral identity. In *Handbook of identity theory & research* (p.
11 495–513). NY, US: Springer.
12
13 Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Religiosity and prosocial behaviours in adolescence: The
14 mediating role of prosocial values. *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(2), 231–249.
15
16 Hardy, S. A., Krettenauer, T., & Hunt, N. (2020). Moral identity formation. In L. A. Jensen
17 (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of moral development: An interdisciplinary perspective*. New
18 York, NY: Oxford University Press.
19
20 Hardy, S. A., Bean, D. S., & Olsen, J. A. (2015). Moral identity and adolescent prosocial and
21 antisocial behaviors: Interactions with moral disengagement and self-regulation. *Journal*
22 *of Youth and Adolescence*, 44(8), 1542–1554.
23
24 Hardy, S. A., Bhattacharjee, A., Reed II, A., & Aquino, K. (2010). Moral identity and
25 psychological distance: The case of adolescent parental socialization. *Journal of*
26 *Adolescence*, 33(1), 111–123.
27
28 Hardy, S. A., Walker, L. J., Olsen, J. A., Woodbury, R. D., & Hickman, J. R. (2014). Moral
29 identity as moral ideal self: Links to adolescent outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*,
30 50(1), 45–57.
31
32 Hart, D., Atkins, R., & Ford, D. (1998). Urban America as a context for the development of
33 moral identity in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 513–530.
34
35 Hartmann, N. N., Wieland, H., & Vargo, S. L. (2018). Converging on a new theoretical
36 foundation for selling. *Journal of Marketing*, 82(2), 1–18.
37
38 He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural justice and employee engagement: Roles of
39 organizational identification and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Business Ethics*,
40 122(4), 681–695.
41
42 Hegtvedt, K. A., & Scheuerman, H. L. (2010). The justice/morality link. In S. Hitlin and S.
43 Vaisey (Eds.). *Handbook of the Sociology of Morality* (p. 331–360). New York, NY:
44 Springer.
45
46 Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant
47 validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of*
48 *Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135.
49
50 Hertz, S. G., & Krettenauer, T. (2016). Does moral identity effectively predict moral behavior?
51 A meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 20(2), 129–140.
52
53 Hoffman, K. D., Howe, V., & Hardigree, D. W. (1991). Ethical dilemmas faced in the selling of
54 complex services: Significant others and competitive pressures. *Journal of Personal*
55 *Selling & Sales Management*, 4(11), 13–25.
56
57 Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. I. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in
58 organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121–140.
59
60 Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. I., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison
61 of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4), 255–
62 269.
63
64 Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification and
65 psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 51–66.

- 1
2
3
4 Hu, X., & Jiang, Z. (2018). Employee-oriented HRM and voice behavior: A moderated
5 mediation model of moral identity and trust in management. *The International Journal of*
6 *Human Resource Management*, 29(5), 746–771.
- 7
8 Hughes, D. E., & Ahearne, M. (2010). Energizing the reseller's sales force: The power of brand
9 identification. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(4), 81–96.
- 10 Itani, O. S., Jaramillo, F., & Chonko, L. (2019). Achieving top performance while building
11 collegiality in sales: It all starts with ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(2), 417–438.
- 12 Itani, O. S., Jaramillo, F., & Paesbrugge, B. (2020). Between a rock and a hard place: Seizing
13 the opportunity of demanding customers by means of frontline service behaviors. *Journal*
14 *of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 53, 101978.
- 15
16 Itani, O. S., & Inyang, A. E. (2015). The effects of empathy and listening of salespeople on
17 relationship quality in the retail banking industry. *International Journal of Bank*
18 *Marketing*,
- 19
20 Jaramillo, F., Bande, B., & Varela, J. (2015). Servant leadership and ethics: A dyadic
21 examination of supervisor behaviors and salesperson perceptions. *Journal of Personal*
22 *Selling & Sales Management*, 35(2), 108–124.
- 23
24 Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Boles, J. S. (2013). Bringing meaning to the sales job: The effect of
25 ethical climate and customer demandingness. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(11),
26 2301–2307.
- 27
28 Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Solomon, P. (2006). The role of ethical climate on salesperson's
29 role stress, job attitudes, turnover intention, and job performance. *Journal of Personal*
30 *Selling & Sales Management*, 26(3), 271–282.
- 31
32 Jasmand, C., Blazeovic, V., & de Ruyter, K. (2012). Generating Sales While Providing Service: A
33 Study of Customer Service Representatives' Ambidextrous Behavior. *Journal of*
34 *Marketing*, 76(1), 20–37.
- 35
36 Jelinek, R., & Ahearne, M. (2006). The enemy within: Examining salesperson deviance and its
37 determinants. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 26(4), 327–344.
- 38
39 Jennings, P. L., Mitchell, M. S., & Hannah, S. T. (2015). The moral self: A review and
40 integration of the literature. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(51), 104–168.
- 41
42 Johnson, S. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (2008). Externalization of employment in a service
43 environment: The role of organizational and customer identification. *Journal of*
44 *Organizational Behavior*, 29(3), 287–309.
- 45
46 Johnson, H. H., & Umphress, E. E. (2019). To help my supervisor: Identification, moral identity,
47 and unethical pro-supervisor behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(2), 519–534.
- 48
49 Kalra, A., Agnihotri, R., Chaker, N. N., Singh, R. K., & Das, B. K. (2017). Connect within to
50 connect outside: effect of salespeople's political skill on relationship performance.
51 *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 37(4), 332–348.
- 52
53 Kalra, A., Agnihotri, R., Talwar, S., Rostami, A., & Dwivedi, P. K. (2020). Effect of internal
54 competitive work environment on working smart and emotional exhaustion: the
55 moderating role of time management. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*. DOI
56 10.1108/JBIM-02-2019-0094
- 57
58 Kim, J., & Loewenstein, J. (2020). Analogical encoding fosters ethical decision making because
59 improved knowledge of ethical principles increases moral awareness. *Journal of Business*
60 *Ethics*. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-020-04457-w.
- 61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Lapsley, D. K., & Narvaez, D. (2005). Moral Psychology at the Crossroads. In D. K. Lapsley &
5 F. C. Power (Eds.), *Character psychology and character education* (p. 18–35). University
6 of Notre Dame Press.
- 7
8 Lee, E.-S., Park, T.-Y., & Koo, B. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a basis for
9 attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*(5), 1049–
10 1080.
- 11
12 Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention:
13 How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping
14 behavior. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4), 443–453.
- 15
16 Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-
17 sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 114–121.
- 18
19 Loveland, J. M., Lounsbury, J. W., Park, S.-H., & Jackson, D. W. (2015). Are salespeople born
20 or made? Biology, personality, and the career satisfaction of salespeople. *Journal of
21 Business & Industrial Marketing*, *30*(2), 233–240.
- 22
23 Lussier, B., Hartmann, N. N., & Bolander, W. (2019). Curbing the undesirable effects of
24 emotional exhaustion on ethical behaviors and performance: A salesperson-manager
25 dyadic approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-019-04271-z.
- 26
27 Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the
28 reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
29 *13*(2), 103–123.
- 30
31 Mallin, M. L., Gammoh, B. S., Pullins, E. B., & Johnson, C. M. (2017). A New Perspective of
32 Salesperson Motivation and Salesforce Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Salesperson-
33 Brand Identification. *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, *25*(4), 357–374.
- 34
35 Martin, C. A., & Bush, A. J. (2006). Psychological climate, empowerment, leadership style, and
36 customer-oriented selling: An analysis of the sales manager-salesperson dyad. *Journal of
37 the Academy of Marketing Science*, *34*(3), 419–438.
- 38
39 Martin, K. D., & Cullen, J. B. (2006). Continuities and extensions of ethical climate theory: A
40 meta-analytic review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *69*, 175–194.
- 41
42 McClaren, N. (2013). The personal selling and sales management ethics research: Managerial
43 implications and research directions from a comprehensive review of the empirical
44 literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *112*, 101–125.
- 45
46 McClaren, N. (2000). Ethics in personal selling and sales management: A review of the literature
47 focusing on empirical findings and conceptual foundations. *Journal of Business Ethics*,
48 *27*, 285–303.
- 49
50 Menguc, B., & Boichuk, J. P. (2012). Customer orientation dissimilarity, sales unit
51 identification, and customer-directed extra-role behaviors: Understanding the
52 contingency role of coworker support. *Journal of Business Research*, *65*(9), 1357-1363.
- 53
54 Merkle, A. C., Hair Jr., J. F., Ferrell, O. C., Ferrell, L. K., & Wood, B. G. (2020). An
55 examination of pro-stakeholder unethical behavior in the sales ethics subculture. *Journal
56 of Marketing Theory & Practice*. DOI: 10.1080/10696679.2020.1777434.
- 57
58 Mulki, J., & Lassk, F. G. (2019). Joint impact of ethical climate and external work locus of
59 control on job meaningfulness. *Journal of Business Research*, *99*, 46–56.
- 60
61 Mullins, R., Agnihotri, R., & Hall, Z. (2020). The ambidextrous sales force: Aligning
62 salesperson polychronicity and selling contexts for sales-service behaviors and customer
63 value. *Journal of Service Research*, *23*(1), 33–52.
- 64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Narvaez, D. (2001). Moral text comprehension: Implications for education and research. *Journal*
5 *of Moral Education*, 30(1), 43–54.
- 6 Nowlin, E. L., Walker, D., & Anaza, N. A. (2018). How does salesperson connectedness impact
7 performance? It depends upon the level of internal volatility. *Industrial Marketing*
8 *Management*, 68, 106–113.
- 9 O’Fallon, M. J., & Butterfield, K. D. (2011). Moral differentiation: Exploring boundaries of the
10 “monkey see, monkey do” perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(3), 379–399.
- 11 Oliver, R. L., & Anderson, E. (1994). An empirical test of the consequences of behavior-and
12 outcome-based sales control systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 53–67.
- 13 Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Organizational citizenship
14 behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 15 Pastoriza, D., Arino, M. A., Ricart, J. E., & Canela, M. A. (2015). Does an ethical work context
16 generate internal social capital? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129, 77–92.
- 17 Plouffe, C. R., Bolander, W., Cote, J. A., & Hochstein, B. (2016). Does the customer matter
18 most? Exploring strategic frontline employees’ influence of customers, the internal
19 business team, and external business partners. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(1), 106–123.
- 20 Plouffe, C. R., Sridharan, S., & Barclay, D. W. (2010). Exploratory navigation and salesperson
21 performance: Investigating selected antecedents and boundary conditions in high-
22 technology and financial services contexts. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(4),
23 538–550.
- 24 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social
25 science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of*
26 *Psychology*, 63, 539–569.
- 27 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method
28 biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended
29 remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
- 30 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and
31 comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*,
32 40(3), 879–891.
- 33 Rapp, A., Agnihotri, R., & Baker, T. L. (2015). Competitive intelligence collection and use by
34 sales and service representatives: how managers’ recognition and autonomy moderate
35 individual performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(3), 357–374.
- 36 Reed, A., & Aquino, K. F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard
37 toward out-groups. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 84(6), 1270–1286.
- 38 Reed, A., Aquino, K., & Levy, E. (2007). Moral identity and judgments of charitable behaviors.
39 *Journal of Marketing*, 71(1), 178–193.
- 40 Reicher, S., Haslam, S. A., & Rath, R. (2008). Making a virtue of evil: A five-step social identity
41 model of the development of collective hate. *Social & Personality Psychology Compass*,
42 2(3), 1313–1344.
- 43 Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the marlowe-crowne
44 social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 119–125.
- 45 Reynolds, S. J., & Miller, J. A. (2015). The recognition of moral issues: Moral awareness, moral
46 sensitivity and moral attentiveness. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 6, 114–117.
- 47 Richard, E. M., & McFadden, M. (2016). Saving face: Reactions to cultural norm violations in
48 business request emails. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 31, 307–321.
- 49 Ricketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 *Behavior*, 66(2), 358–384.
- 5 Ross, W. T., & Robertson, D. C. (2003). A Typology of situational factors: Impact on
6 salesperson decision-making about ethical issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46, 213–
7 234.
- 8
9 Rousselet, E., Brial, B., Cadario, R., & Beji-Becheur, A. (2020). Moral intensity, issue
10 characteristics, and ethical issue recognition in sales situations. *Journal of Business*
11 *Ethics*, 163, 347–363.
- 12 Sachdeva, S., Iliev, R., & Medin, D. L. (2009). Sinning saints and saintly sinners: The paradox of
13 moral self-regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 523–528.
- 14 Schrock, W. A., Hughes, D. E., Fu, F. Q., Richards, K. A., & Jones, E. (2016). Better together:
15 Trait competitiveness and competitive psychological climate as antecedents of
16 salesperson organizational commitment and sales performance. *Marketing Letters*, 27,
17 351–360.
- 18
19 Schwartz, M. S. (2016). Ethical decision-making theory: An integrated approach. *Journal of*
20 *Business Ethics*, 139, 755–776.
- 21
22 Schwepker, C. H. (2019). Strengthening customer value development and ethical intent in the
23 salesforce: The influence of ethical values person-organization fit and trust in manager.
24 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159, 913–925.
- 25
26 Schwepker, C. H., & Good, D. J. (2011). Moral judgment and its impact on business-to-business
27 sales performance and customer relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98, 609–625.
- 28
29 Seevers, M. T., Skinner, S. J., & Kelley, S. W. (2007). A social network perspective on sales
30 force ethics. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 27(4), 341–353.
- 31
32 Serpe, R. T., & Stryker, S. (2011). The symbolic interactionist perspective and identity theory. In
33 *Handbook of Identity Theory & Research* (p. 225–248). Springer.
- 34
35 Shao, R., Aquino, K., & Freeman, D. (2008). Beyond moral reasoning: A review of moral
36 identity research and its implications for business ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly*,
37 18(4), 513–540.
- 38
39 Skarlicki, D. P., van Jaarsveld, D. D., Shao, R., Song, Y. H., & Wang, M. (2016). Extending the
40 multifoci perspective: The role of supervisor justice and moral identity in the relationship
41 between customer justice and customer-directed sabotage. *Journal of Applied*
42 *Psychology*, 101(1), 108–121.
- 43
44 Sparks, J. R. (2015). A social cognitive explanation of situational and individual effects of moral
45 sensitivity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45(1), 45–54.
- 46
47 Sparks, J. R., & Johlke, M. (1996). Factors influencing student perceptions of unethical behavior
48 by personal salespeople: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*,
49 15(8), 871–887.
- 50
51 Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S., & Graham, J. (2014). The moral ties that bind... even to out-
52 groups: The interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations.
53 *Psychological Science*, 25(8), 1554–1562.
- 54
55 Stets, J. E. (2010). The social psychology of the moral identity. In *Handbook of the Sociology of*
56 *Morality*, (p. 385–409). New York: Springer.
- 57
58 Stets, J. E., & Carter, M. J. (2006). The moral identity: A principle level identity. In *Purpose,*
59 *Meaning, & Action*, (p. 293–316). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 60
61 Stets, J. E., & Carter, M. J. (2011). The Moral Self Applying Identity Theory. *Social Psychology*
62 *Quarterly*, 74(2), 192–215.
- 63
64 Steward, M. D., Walker, B. A., Hutt, M. D., & Kumar, A. (2009). The coordination strategies of
65

- 1
2
3
4 high-performing salespeople: Internal working relationships that drive success. *Journal of*
5 *the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38(5), 550-566.
- 6 Suls, J. E., & Wills, T. A. E. (1991). *Social comparison: Contemporary theory and research*.
7 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 8
9 Sunder, S., Kumar, V., Goreczny, A., & Maurer, T. (2017). Why do salespeople quit? An
10 empirical examination of own and peer effects on salesperson turnover behavior. *Journal*
11 *of Marketing Research*, 54(3), 381-397.
- 12
13 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social*
14 *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 33-47. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- 15
16 Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job
17 performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 500-517.
- 18
19 Thakor, M. V., & Joshi, A. W. (2005). Motivating salesperson customer orientation: insights
20 from the job characteristics model. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(5), 584-592.
- 21
22 To, C., Kilduff, G. J., & Rosikiewicz, B. L. (2020). When interpersonal competition helps and
23 when it harms: An integration via challenge and threat. *Academy of Management Annals*.
24 DOI: 10.5465/annals.2016.0145.
- 25
26 Tseng, L.-M. (2019). How implicit ethics institutionalization affects ethical selling intention: The
27 case of Taiwan's life insurance salespeople. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158, 727-742.
- 28
29 Valentine, S., Godkin, L., Fleischman, G. M., & Kidwell, R. (2011). Corporate ethical values,
30 group creativity, job satisfaction and turnover intention: The impact of work context on
31 work response. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(3), 353-372.
- 32
33 van Gils, S., & Horton, K. E. (2019). How can ethical brands respond to service failures?
34 Understanding how moral identity motivates compensation preferences through self-
35 consistency and social approval. *Journal of Business Research*, 95, 455-463.
- 36
37 Verbeke, W., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Sales call anxiety: Exploring what it means when gear
38 rules a sales encounter. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), 88-101.
- 39
40 Walker, L. J., & Frimer, J. A. (2007). Moral personality of brave and caring exemplars. *Journal*
41 *of Personality & Social Psychology*, 93(5), 845-860.
- 42
43 Wang, Z., Xing, L., Xu, H., & Hannah, S. T. (2019). Not All Followers Socially Learn from
44 Ethical Leaders: The Roles of Followers' Moral Identity and Leader Identification in the
45 Ethical Leadership Process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-21. DOI:10.1007/s10551-019-
46 04353-y
- 47
48 Weaver, G. R. (2006). Virtue in organizations: Moral identity as a foundation for moral agency.
49 *Organization Studies*, 27(3), 341-368.
- 50
51 Wieseke, J., Ahearne, M., Lam, S. K., & Dick, R. van. (2009). The Role of Leaders in Internal
52 Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(2), 123-145.
- 53
54 Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (1999). Communication patterns as determinants
55 of organizational identification in a virtual organization. *Organization Science*, 10(6),
56 777-790.
- 57
58 Winterich, K. P., Mittal, V., & Ross Jr, W. T. (2009). Donation behavior toward in-groups and
59 out-groups: The role of gender and moral identity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(2),
60 199-214.
- 61
62 Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1999). Youth service and moral-civic identity: A case for everyday
63 morality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(4), 361-376.
- 64
65 Zhang, A. L., Baxter, R., & Glynn, M. S. (2013). How salespeople facilitate buyers' resource
66 availability to enhance seller outcomes. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(7), 1121-

1
2
3
4 1130.

5 Zhao, X., Lynch Jr, J.G. and Chen, Q. (2010), "Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and
6 truths about mediation analysis", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 197–206.

7 Zheng, X., Qin, X., Liu, X., & Liao, H. (2017). Will creative employees always make trouble?
8 Investigating the roles of moral identity and moral disengagement. *Journal of Business*
9 *Ethics*, 157(3), 653–672.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., Riggio, R. E., & Sosik, J. J. (2011). The effect of authentic
transformational leadership on follower and group ethics. *The Leadership Quarterly*,
22(5), 801–817.

Zollo, L., Pellegrini, M. M., & Ciappei, C. (2017). What sparks ethical decision making? The
interplay between moral intuition and moral reasoning: lessons from the scholastic
doctrine. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 681–700.

Figure 1. Conceptual Model




Figure 2. The Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate on the Salesperson Moral Identity-Customer Service Provision Behaviors Relationship




Figure 3. The Moderating Role of Internal Competitive Climate on the Salesperson Moral Identity-Teamwork Relationship




Table 1. Correlations Matrix and Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Salesperson Moral Identity	5.84	.99	.81								
2. Salesperson-organization Identification	5.53	1.17	.53*	.85							
3. Salesperson-customer Identification	5.31	1.07	.49*	.65*	.79						
4. Customer Service Provision Behaviors	5.62	1.02	.64*	.55*	.60*	.83					
5. Teamwork	5.52	.94	.67*	.61*	.55*	.60*	.84				
6. Internal Competitive Climate	4.19	1.67	-.23*	.07	.18*	.11	.05	.90			
7. Salesperson Job Satisfaction	5.64	1.26	.27*	.54*	.44*	.25*	.34*	-.12	.94		
8. Salesperson Sales Experience	10.05	7.79	-.11	-.03	-.10	-.03	-.02	.02	.01	—	
9. Salesperson Age	33.3	8.75	.13*	.03	.12	.18*	.12	-.09	-.03	—	—
10. Salesperson Educational Level	—	—	-.05	-.06	-.04	-.06	.06	.04	-.04	-.04	-.11
Cronbach's Alpha	—	—	.82	.91	.85	.89	.86	.95	.94	—	—
Composite Reliability	—	—	.88	.93	.89	.92	.90	.96	.96	—	—
Average Variance Extracted	—	—	.65	.73	.63	.69	.70	.82	.89	—	—

N = 313; Numbers added along the diagonal are the square root average variance extracted; SD = Standard deviation; — Not applicable; Significance level: * $p < .05$

Table 2. Constructs, Items, and Measurement Model

Construct/Items	Loading
Salesperson Moral Identity [$\alpha = .82$; CR = .88; AVE = .65] (Aquino and Reed 2002)	
Listed below are some characteristics that may describe a person: <i>Caring, compassionate, fair, friendly, generous, helpful, hardworking, honest, and kind.</i> The person with these characteristics could be you, or it could be someone else. For a moment, visualize in your mind the kind of person who has these characteristics. Imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. When you have a clear image of what this person would be like, answer the following.	
It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.	.80
Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am.	.87
<i>I would be ashamed to be a person who has these characteristics</i> ^(R) .	
Having these characteristics is not really important to me ^(R) .	.62
I strongly desire to have these characteristics.	.90
Salesperson-organization Identification [$\alpha = .91$; CR = .93; AVE = .73] (Ashforth and Mael 1989)	
I identify with my company.	.82
I am very interested in what others think about my company.	.88
When I talk about my company, I usually say "we rather than 'they'".	.85
My company's successes are my successes.	.88
When someone praises my company, it feels like a personal compliment.	.85
Salesperson-customer Identification [$\alpha = .85$; CR = .89; AVE = .63] (Ashforth and Mael 1989)	
I identify with my customers.	.73
I am interested in what others including my coworkers think about my customers.	.76
When I talk about my customers, I usually say "we" instead "they".	.87
My customers' success is my success.	.85
When someone praises my customers, it feels like a personal compliment.	.74
Teamwork [$\alpha = .86$; CR = .90; AVE = .70] (Oliver and Anderson 1994)	
I am known as a team player when performing in groups.	.87
I always fulfill my obligations to others I work with.	.84
I am willing to do my part for the good of the team.	.86
Teamwork is something I've always enjoyed doing.	.79
Customer Service Provision Behaviors [$\alpha = .89$; CR = .92; AVE = .69] (Jasmand et al. 2012)	
During conversation with customers...	
...I usually try to calm complaining customers, so that we can jointly handle their needs/ complaints about their products.	.85
...I usually provide solutions to customers' concerns related to the products they currently own.	.83
...Having identified the customers' exact problem with their products, I solve it in a reliable way.	.86
...I usually listen attentively to customers in order to take appropriate action to handle their concerns regarding their products.	.81
...I usually pay attention to the customers' questions about their products to answer them correctly.	.82
Internal Competitive Climate [$\alpha = .95$; CR = .96; AVE = .82] (Anaza and Nowlin 2017)	
Some of my coworkers are hostile to one another...	
...when one coworker outperforms the rest.	.90
...when one coworker appears to have more advantages.	.93
...when one coworker has a better relationship with the manager.	.91
...when one coworker achieves more with less effort.	.90
...when one coworker gets more bonus.	.90
Job Satisfaction [$\alpha = .94$; CR = .96; AVE = .89] (Brown and Peterson 1993)	
Overall, I am satisfied with my job ^a	.94
I find real enjoyment in my job ^a	.95
How satisfied ae you with your overall job? ^b	.93

α = Cronbach's Alpha; CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted; *The item in italics was dropped*

^a Agreement Scale (1 = strongly disagree vs. 7 = strongly agree)

^b Satisfaction Scale (1 = extremely dissatisfied vs. 7 = extremely satisfied)

Table 3. Parameter Estimates and Hypothesized Effects

	Direct Effects Model	Mediated Effects Model	Hypothesized Model	Hypothesis & Support
SMI → SCI	.57***	.57***	.59***	
SMI → SOI	.46***	.46***	.51***	
SMI → CSPB	.68***	.52***	.48***	H ₁ supported
SMI → TW	.66***	.48***	.36***	H ₂ supported
SCI → CSPB		.29***	.18*	H ₃ supported
SCI → TW			.34***	
SOI → CSPB			.21*	
SOI → TW		.39***	.20*	H ₄ supported
ICC → SCI			.14**	
ICC → SOI			.04	
ICC → CSPB			.10*	
ICC → TW			.05	
SMI x ICC → SCI			.12	H _{5a} not supported
SMI x ICC → CSPB			-.19*	H _{5b} supported
SMI x ICC → SOI			-.06	H _{5c} not supported
SMI x ICC → TW			-.18*	H _{5d} supported
JS → SCI	.28***	.28***	.27***	
JS → SOI	.45***	.45***	.41***	
JS → CSPB	.13*	.05	-.05	
JS → TW	.18**	.01	-.04	
SE → SCI	-.07	-.07	-.06	
SE → SOI	-.02	-.02	.03	
SE → CSPB	.01	.03	.01	
SE → TW	.03	.04	.04	
Age → SCI	.01	.01	.03	
Age → SOI	.11*	.11*	.14	
Age → CSPB	.09	.10*	.10*	
Age → TW	.04	-.01	.03	
EL → SCI	.01	.01	-.01	
EL → SOI	.02	.02	.02	
EL → CSPB	.02	.02	.03	
EL → TW	.11*	.11*	.12*	
CS → SCI	.04	.04	.02	
CS → SOI	-.03	-.03	-.04	
CS → CSPB	-.01	-.02	.01	
CS → TW	.07*	.08*	.08*	

SMI = Salesperson Moral Identity; SCI = Salesperson-customer Identification; SOI = Salesperson-organization Identification; CSPB = Customer Service Provision Behaviors; TW = Teamwork; ICC = Internal Competitive Climate; JS = Job Satisfaction; CS = Company Size; EL = Education Level; SE = Sales Experience
 Significance level: *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Appendix A: Sample Characteristics

<i>Exchange type (%)</i>	
Services	18.8
Products	35.8
Both	45.4
<i>Company Size (yearly revenues) (%)</i>	
Less than \$1 million	20.8
\$1-10 million	38.3
\$11-50 million	19.2
\$51-100 million	12.8
More than \$100 million	8.9
<i>Average age (years) [SD]</i>	33.3 [8.75]
<i>Average sales experience (years) [SD]</i>	10.05 [7.79]
<i>Gender (%)</i>	
Female	27.5%
Male	72.5 %
<i>Education level (%)</i>	
College degree or above	85.3%

| Total Number of Salespeople | 313 |
