Correction to: Operationalizing salesperson performance with secondary data: aligning practice, scholarship, and theory

Willy Bolander¹ · Nawar N. Chaker² · Alec Pappas¹ · Daniel R. Bradbury¹

Published online: 22 May 2021

© Academy of Marketing Science 2021

Correction to: Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (2021) 49:462–481
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00752-0>

Table 1 in the original version of this article contained typographical errors. The correct data is shown below:

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00752-0>

✉ Willy Bolander
wbolander@business.fsu.edu

Nawar N. Chaker
nawarchaker1@lsu.edu

Alec Pappas
apappas@fsu.edu

Daniel R. Bradbury
db13m@my.fsu.edu

¹ College of Business, Florida State University, 821 Academic Way, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110, USA

² E.J. Ourso College of Business, Louisiana State University, 501 South Quad Drive, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

Table 1 Pros and cons of primary vs. secondary salesperson performance data

	<i>Primary Data</i>		<i>Secondary Data</i>	
	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
<i>Conceptual Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to capture unobservable aspects of performance (e.g., cognitive and emotional) • Ability to capture perspectives of varying groups (salesperson, manager, customer) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual interpretation of survey items may differ by respondent • Questionable face validity that may not always align with practitioners' perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear face validity that aligns with practitioners' perspectives • Less susceptible to invariance due to self-reporting bias 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited in scope to data that is observable and easily recorded • Restricted to examining only variables that are deemed important by the company
<i>Logistical Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple to collect from, and compare across, different organizations and industries • Ease in maintaining anonymity because no connections need to be made with company records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More time and resource intensive to collect • Reduced flexibility with data gathering for time-lagged variables or repeated measures for longitudinal research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data is extant which has a negligible impact on employee, firm, or researcher time to collect • Variety of performance variables available for appropriate DV selection and potential robustness checks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in maintaining anonymity as data matching (i.e., survey data to secondary data) is required • Requires disclosure of private performance data, which may involve approval from legal department or HR
<i>Methodological Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement scales readily available and established (e.g., Behrman & Perreault 1982) • Allows the researcher to control for measurement error via multi-item scales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher participant response rates are a challenge, especially in B2B sales • Susceptible to common method bias, rater biases, survey fatigue, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease in gathering data from multiple time points to track growth trends • Ability to gather data on a larger percentage of a firm's salespeople 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional time and effort required to purify the data and ensure data integrity • Dependent on company's organization, reliability, and presentation of the data

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.