Online-Appendix

„When Does Marketing & Sales Collaboration Affect the Perceived Lead Quality? – The Moderating Effects of IT Systems“

Lukas Hilke

Ruhr University Bochum

Junior Management Science 9(3) (2024) 1681-1699

Appendix

Table 1: Measurement Scales and their Reliability

Collaboration Measures:

Joint Planning (Homburg et al. 2008a; Le Meunier-FitzHugh & Piercy 2011)

Items	Item Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
1. Marketing & Sales work closely together in lead management.	**0.598**	
2. Marketing & Sales jointly determine the goals and processes in lead management.	**0.795**	
3. Marketing & Sales have aligned goals in Lead Management.	**0.711**	**0.924**
4. Marketing & Sales are making lead management decisions together.	**0.670**	
5. Marketing & Sales solve lead management problems together.	**0.728**	

Information Sharing (Homburg et al. 2008a; Biemans et al. 2010)

Items	Item Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
2. Marketing & Sales respond quickly and without a reminder to requests for information on leads.	**0.490**	
3. Marketing & Sales proactively inform the other department about lead information.	**0.700**	**0.835**
4. Marketing & Sales quickly share information on successful and unsuccessful leads.	**0.729**	

IT-System Support Measures:

Quality of Lead Information (Ahearne et al. 2007; Buaprommee & Polyorat 2016; Choe et al. 2009)

Items	Item Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
1. Our systems are an excellent source of information on leads from marketing.	**0.771**	
2. Our systems show me all the relevant information I need to successfully process leads from marketing.	**0.813**	
3. It is easy for me to get an overview of all relevant lead information in the systems.	**0.685**	**0.953**
4. The most relevant information on leads is clearly displayed in the systems.	**0.802**	
5. IT-systems give me quick and easy access to information about leads from marketing.	**0.753**	

6.	I can learn a lot about the leads from marketing in the IT-systems.	**0.755**	

Lead Prioritization & Planning (Homburg et al. 2008b; Panagopoulos & Avlonitis 2010; Terho et al. 2015)

	Items	Item Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	The IT-systems support me in prioritizing leads.	**0.705**	
2.	With the help of the IT-systems, I can better prepare and plan how to approach my leads.	**0.705**	
3.	The IT-systems enable me to assess the likelihood of success for different leads.	**0.767**	**0.94**
4.	The IT-systems help me to focus my activities on the most attractive leads.	**0.805**	
5.	The IT-systems help me to tailor my sales efforts precisely to the leads.	**0.819**	

Lead Management Measures:

Perceived Lead Quality *(Sabnis et al. 2013)*

	Items	Item Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Marketing qualifies leads effectively.	**0.797**	
2.	Marketing is able to filter out leads with low potential.	**0.744**	
3.	Marketing is very good at passing high potential leads to sales.	**0.669**	**0.932**
4.	Marketing does an excellent job in lead pre-qualification.	**0.941**	

Lead Follow-Up *(Ahearne et al. 2007; Schillewaert et al. 2005)*

1.	I frequently follow up marketing-generated leads.	**0.793**	
2.	I make full use of the opportunities offered by marketing-generated leads.	**0.704**	
3.	Compared to other salespeople, I frequently follow up marketing-generated leads.	**0.479**	**0.891**
4.	The follow up of marketing-generated leads is an integral part of my daily sales routine.	**0.742**	

Control Variables used for the Analysis:

IT Usage *(Speier & Venkatesh 2002, Schillewaert et al. 2005, Ahearne et al. 2007)*

1. I consider myself a regular user of the IT systems.

Marketing Lead Volume

1. How many marketing-generated leads do you receive per months?

Managerial Tracking of marketing-generated Leads *(Sabnis et al. 2013)*

1. My manager regularly reviews my progress in following up on leads from marketing.

Gender

Which gender do you feel you belong to?

1. Male
2. Female
3. Diverse

Age

What is your age?

Company Size

How many employees work for your company?

1. 1-50 employees
2. 50-100 employees
3. 100-500 employees
4. 500-1000 employees
5. 1000-5000 employees
6. More than 5000 employees

Company Years & Sales Experience

1. How many years have you been working in your current job?
2. How many years of sales experience do you have?

Table 2: Unstandardized Parameter Estimates for the Models

	Relationship			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
H1:	PLQ	→	MLFU	0.269***	-	-
	JP	→	MLFU	0.09	-	-
	IS	→	MLFU	0.218	-	-
H2	JP	→	PLQ	0.341***	0.266***	0.264***
H3:	IS	→	JP	0.918***	0.582***	0.583***
H4:	IS	→	PLQ	0.308*	0.014	0.032
H5:	LI x JP	→	PLQ	-	-	0.074*
H6:	LI	→	IS	-	0.470***	0.470***
H7:	LPP	→	JP	-	0.212***	0.211***
H8:	LPP x IS	→	PLQ	-	-	0.032
	LI	→	PLQ	-	0.425***	0.408***
	LPP	→	PLQ	-	0.143	0.156*
Control variables:						
	MLV	→	PLQ	-.003	-.002	-.002
	ITU	→	PLQ	0.259**	0.041	0.04
	MT	→	PLQ	0.08	-.01	-.011
	Gender	→	PLQ	0.142	0.274	0.228
	ComSze	→	PLQ	0.089	0.008	-.008
	ComYrs	→	PLQ	0.000	0.011	0.011
	SalYrs	→	PLQ	-.01	-.004	-.005
	Age	→	PLQ	0.009	0.012	0.012

= Significant at p<.10; **= Significant at p<.05; *= Significant at p<0.01*

Table 3: Mediation Analysis – Unstandardized Estimates Model 1

Predictor (X)	Mediator (M)	Outcome (Y)	X → M	M → Y	X → Y	Indirect Effect
JP	PLQ	MLFU	.341***	.269***	.090	.092**
IS	PLQ	MLFU	.308*	.269***	.218	.083*
IS	JP	PLQ	.918***	341***	.308*	.313**

= Significant at p<.10; **= Significant at p<.05; *= Significant at p<0.01*

Table 4: Mediation Analysis – Unstandardized Estimates Model 2

Predictor (X)	Mediator (M)	Outcome (Y)	X → M	M → Y	X → Y	Indirect Effect
LI	IS	PLQ	.470***	.014	.425***	.007
LPP	JP	PLQ	.212***	.266***	.143	.056**
IS	JP	PLQ	.582***	266***	.014	.155**

= Significant at p<.10; **= Significant at p<.05; *= Significant at p<0.01*

Table 5: Robustness Check – Models without Control Variables

	Relationship			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
H1:	PLQ	→	MLFU	0.336***	-	-
	JP	→	MLFU	0.134	-	-
	IS	→	MLFU	0.174	-	-
H2	JP	→	PLQ	0.367***	0.256***	0.261***
H3:	IS	→	JP	0.657***	0.564***	0.564***
H4:	IS	→	PLQ	0.220**	0.009	0.021
H5:	LI x JP	→	PLQ	-	-	0.143**
H6:	LI	→	IS	-	0.518***	0.518***
H7:	LPP	→	JP	-	0.234***	0.234***
H8:	LPP x IS	→	PLQ	-	-	0.024
	LI	→	PLQ	-	0.426***	0.410***
	LPP	→	PLQ	-	0.153	0.162*
CMIN (df)				163.984 (97)	353.653 (219)	397.774 (259)
CMIN/df				1.691	1.615	1.536
RMSEA				.055	.064	.060
SRMR				.048	.048	.049
CFI				.964	.959	.958
TLI				.956	.953	.952

= Significant at p<.10; **= Significant at p<.05; *= Significant at p<0.01*

Table 6: Exploratory Factor Analysis

	Factor					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
JP_1		.804				
JP_2		.889				
JP_3		.827				
JP_4		.871				
JP_5		.879				
IS_1		.416				
IS_2						.474
IS_3						.903
IS_4						.741
LI_1	.676					
LI_2	.988					
LI_3	.932					
LI_4	.980					
LI_5	.674					
LI_6	.821					
LPP_1			.807			
LPP_2			.696			
LPP_3			.938			
LPP_4			.895			
LPP_5			.882			
PLQ_1					.733	
PLQ_2					.873	
PLQ_3					.599	
PLQ_4					1.033	
MLFU_1				.866		
MLFU_2				.840		
MLFU_3				.744		
MLFU_4				.897		

Table 7: Exploratory Factor Analysis – IS_1 removed

	Factor					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
JP_1		.813				
JP_2		.880				
JP_3		.830				
JP_4		.845				
JP_5		.866				
IS_2						.464
IS_3						.913
IS_4						.743
LI_1	.671					
LI_2	.990					
LI_3	.932					
LI_4	.977					
LI_5	.674					
LI_6	.824					
LPP_1			.818			
LPP_2			.699			
LPP_3			.943			
LPP_4			.913			
LPP_5			.886			
PLQ_1					.738	
PLQ_2					.879	
PLQ_3					.611	
PLQ_4					1.032	
MLFU_1				.859		
MLFU_2				.846		
MLFU_3				.743		
MLFU_4				.903		

Table 8: Fornell-Larcker Criterium

	JP	IS	LI	LPP	PLQ	MLFU
JP	**0.700**					
IS	0.430	**0.640**				
LI	0.184	0.275	**0.764**			
LPP	0.202	0.142	0.518	**0.760**		
PLQ	0.266	0.211	0.429	0.338	**0.788**	
MLFU	0.177	0.174	0.275	0.233	0.245	**0.680**

Note: AVE on the diagonal; Squared correlations in the lower matrix