TABLE 1
Continued

Construct Name and Items	M	SD	Alpha Reliability	Construct Reliability	Item Reliability
Categories of Sales Technology Use					
Using sales technology to access information[b]	4.80	1.35	.90	.90	
"Routine" to "sporadic"					.86
"Frequent" to "infrequent"					.75
"A major emphasis" to "not a major emphasis"					.73
"Hesitant" to "confident"[c]					.45
Using sales technology to analyze information[b]	4.34	1.42	.93	.93	
"Routine" to "sporadic"					.89
"Frequent" to "infrequent"					.86
"A major emphasis" to "not a major emphasis"					.88
"Hesitant" to "confident"[c]					.42
Using sales technology to communicate information[b]	5.14	1.36	.92	.92	
"Routine" to "sporadic"					.88
"Frequent" to "infrequent"					.88
"A major emphasis" to "not a major emphasis"					.77
"Hesitant" to "confident"[c]					.47

[c]Responses to this item were reverse scored.
[d]The seven-point response cues for each item ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7); note that fit statistics based on chi-square are not applicable for a construct with three indicators. For a more conservative test of convergent and discriminant validity, confirmatory factor analyses results for each of the blocks of constructs in the model appear in Table A1.
Notes: We measured work experience by asking respondents, "How many years of experience do you have at your company and others?" Its mean was 18.2 (SD = 8.6). We measured effort by asking, "On average, approximately how many hours per week do you spend, in total, working in your sales job?" Its mean was 46.0 (SD = 13.3). We calculated alpha reliabilities for the constructs using Cronbach's algorithm for estimating the scales internal consistency, and we estimated the construct reliabilities using Fornell and Larcker's (1981) recommendations.

Hunter, Gary K. and William D. Perreault, Jr. (2007),
"Making Sales Technology Effective,"
Journal of Marketing, 71, 1 (January), pp. 16-34.
2008 Excellence in Research Award