

December 2003

The Role of the Internet in Key Account Management: a Case Study

Val Hooper

Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand

David Colligan

Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aisel.aisnet.org/pacis2003>

Recommended Citation

Hooper, Val and Colligan, David, "The Role of the Internet in Key Account Management: a Case Study" (2003). *PACIS 2003 Proceedings*. 99.

<http://aisel.aisnet.org/pacis2003/99>

This material is brought to you by the Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems (PACIS) at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in PACIS 2003 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

The Role of the Internet in Key Account Management: a Case Study

Val Hooper and David Colligan

School of Marketing and International Business
Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand

Val.hooper@vuw.ac.nz

Abstract

Key account management (KAM) is a potential source of sustainable competitive advantage for both supplier and buyer.

A case study approach was adopted to explore the dyadic relationship between a supplier and buyer to determine the extent of Internet usage in KAM and the perceptions of both parties regarding the usefulness and potential of the Internet in KAM.

The KAM relationship was perceived by both parties to be at an advanced stage. Although the use of the Internet was not seen to hinder the relationship's effectiveness, it was not viewed as an appropriate mechanism for building trust, due to its perceived relatively impersonal nature and its suspect security. The main use of the Internet in KAM was for e-mail - to enhance communication efficiency - and to add value to services provided by the supplier.

Keywords

Key account management (KAM), Internet, buyer perceptions, supplier perceptions, competitive advantage

Introduction

Between 1987 and 1997 Proctor and Gamble (supplier) and Wal-Mart (buyer) were able to cut US\$30 billion in costs from their supply chain and improve profit margins by 11% as a result of key account management (KAM) (Sengupta, Krapfel & Pusateri 1997, p. 28).

KAM can be a rich source of sustainable competitive advantage for both a supplier and a buyer. The extent of the advantage depends on how competent the organisations are with technology, process control and the ability to form relationship networks (Wilson 1997, in Gosselin & Heene 2000). Using Internet technology as a tool, buyers are likely to focus on the enhancement of closer, personal relationships with fewer suppliers over the long term (Porter 2001, Homburg, Workman & Jensen 2002).

This prediction and the sparse state of knowledge on the role of the Internet in KAM provides a strong rationale for this study. Ojasalo (2001, p. 212) lamented “*Indeed it would be fruitful to examine how e-business could be used to facilitate KAM*”.

Using a dyadic case study approach, the extent to which the use of the Internet might impact a KAM relationship was explored. The following sections describe the objectives of the study, the background literature, and the methodology employed. After a discussion of the findings, conclusions are drawn with an indication of areas for future research.

Research Objectives

The research objectives were to:

- determine to what extent the Internet was used in KAM;
- determine the perceptions of key account suppliers of the usefulness and potential of the Internet in KAM; and
- determine the perceptions of key account buyers of the usefulness and potential of the Internet in KAM;

Literature Review

Key Account Management

A key account is a customer that is identified by a business as being strategically important (Millman & Wilson 1995). The implication is that what is regarded as strategically important depends on the organisational context and on the perspectives of those involved (Cheverton 2001). A key account may be a large or particularly profitable customer, one offering future potential or a customer that is leading a business towards where it wants to be (Cheverton 2001).

Key account management (KAM) is a long-term, strategic, supplier initiated process concerned with nurturing an investment, the customer, for short or long-term future gain (Millman & Wilson 1995, Capon 2001). Found predominantly in industrial markets, KAM appears to have been in existence in various forms since the 1960's (Napolitano 1997), when it featured as consultative selling (Hanan, Cribbin & Heiser 1973).

KAM is based on the Pareto principle - 80% of a supplier's revenue is attributable to 20% of that supplier's customers (Capon 2001, Cheverton 2001). It thus makes sense to assign more resources to the more profitable customers so that they are encouraged to strengthen the relationship and move towards a strategic commitment with the supplier. Such an arrangement improves the supplier's long-term profitability prospects. By implication KAM is conceptualised as a business-to-business relationship.

Essentially, there are four elements of successful KAM that will involve the cooperation of the supplier and the buyer:

- Identifying the key account

- Analysing the key account and ensuring common interests, trust and commitment
- Selecting strategies for the key account
- Developing joint capabilities to build, grow and maintain a profitable long-term relationship (Ojasalo 2001, p. 201).

One of the main aspects of KAM is the focus on creating a relationship of mutual trust between the supplier and the buyer, and making the best use of limited business resources.

The most recent literature divides the practice of KAM into four concepts:

- Activities – Especially the differences between key and regular accounts
- Actors - Critical actors are top management since KAM is a strategic exercise (Homburg et al. 2002, Cahill 1998, Millman & Wilson 1999), and account teams.
- Resources – Drawn from all areas of the supplier organisation and reliant on both formal and informal networks (Sengupta et al. 1997).
- Formalisation - Of all relevant procedures and practices. (Homburg et al. 2002)

Key Account Management Models

There are a number of different models which attempt to conceptualise KAM.

Hannan et al. (1973) classified accounts into different types of customers, and later expanded this approach to the “box” approach which classified the levels of the account customers’ actors in order to predict their relationship behaviour.

Krapfel, Salmond and Spekman (1991), Shapiro, Rangan, and Sviokla (1993), Dunn and Thomas (1994) and Kunath (1997) all developed models which classified accounts according to different stages of development or advancement.

However, it was the Millman and Wilson Relational Model (1994) which has emerged as the most significant in this field. They focused on the supplier side of the relationship but drew attention to the different stages of adoption through which the relationship progresses and the need for both parties to progress at a similar pace through those stages (Cheverton 2001).

The stages are:

Stage 1 – Pre-KAM

Potential key accounts are identified. The focus is on gathering intelligence on the buyer and assessing the strategic importance of the buyer (Campbell & Cunningham 1983, in Ojasalo 2001).

Stage 2 – Early KAM

The focus is on finding ways to collaborate more closely with the buyer by understanding their motives, culture and issues while building trust through consistent performance and effective communication

Stage 3 – Mid-KAM

The account becomes more important, trust levels and allocation of resources increase, and senior management become involved. Competitors are closely monitored because the relationship may not yet be exclusive.

Stage 4 – Partnership KAM

The relationship is mature. The supplier is perceived as an “external resource” of the buyer. Sensitive information is shared and problems solved jointly. A paradox occurs between the need to share information to promote innovation for the creation of competitive advantage and the risk that competitive advantage may be lost through the leakage of shared information (Millman & Wilson 1999). Clearly trust is the key issue here.

Stage 5 – Synergistic KAM

The supplier and buyer have had a fundamental change in their perceptions of each other, acting as different business units of one enterprise, creating value together in the marketplace.

Stage 6 – Relationship disbandment

Some relationships are better short-term than long-term, therefore a contingency plan for moving on from the relationship should be in place.

McDonald and Woodburn (1999) expanded further on the model, indicating possible entry or exit at any stage and reformulating the stages as:

- Exploratory KAM
- Basic KAM
- Co-operative KAM
- Interdependent KAM
- Integrated KAM
- Disintegrating KAM

However, the Millman and Wilson Relational Model (1994) appears to remain the most frequently applied.

Relationship between the Key Account Manager and the Key Account

The relationship between a key account manager and the key account is clearly a pivotal point in the key account relationship, yet it does not constitute the entire relationship. Sengupta et al. (1997) found that there was a misconception that the key account manager should be the sole contact for all buyer problems, and that 76% of key account managers had complete responsibility for their key accounts. In fact, KAM involves many more of the resources of both organizations. The role of the key account manager should be that of an information “facilitator” both internally (supplier) and externally (buyer), thus focusing on adding value through relationship management (Pardo 1997, p.282, Pardo 1999).

The development of confidence is absolutely critical to a successful KAM relationship (Barret 1986, Ojasalo 2001, Sengupta, Krapfel & Pusateri 2000) and is as much about

trust in the representative of the supplier as it is about trust in the supplier as an organisation (Sengupta et al. 2000).

The Internet as Enabler

The Internet is “...a network that connects hundreds of thousands of internal organisational computer networks worldwide.” (Turban, McLean & Wetherbe 1999, p. 784)) The fact that organisations permit their internal networks to be connected to the Internet implies a certain degree of trust, particularly regarding security of information. Trust is a critical concept in e-commerce (Boston Consulting Group, 2000, Menasce & Almeida 2001).

Trust issues aside, few companies have found an effective way to manage buyer interactions on the Internet (Drucker 2000). This is despite the fact that by 2005 it is predicted that most purchasing will be done over the Internet (Milligan 2000).

Ways in which technology has influenced business over the Internet include:

- Globalization – the removal of the geographic constraints of traditional business and also of those players who can't cope with the global scope
- New marketing paradigm – greater focus on one-to-one marketing (Sviokla & Shapiro 1993) and on building and maintaining strong, trusting, long term relationships with customers (McDonald & Woodburn, 1999)
- Disintermediation – a move away from the traditional sales intermediary (Evans & Wurster 2000)
- Deconstruction – the disaggregation and re-aggregation of businesses (Tapscott, Ticoll & Lowy 2000)
- Smaller suppliers – the loosening of integration chains, and greater independence (Trites 1999)

Other advantages include an increase in communication speed in terms of quicker response times and decision-making, lower travel costs for meetings and communications audit trails (Capon 2001).

The Internet is thus an “enabling technology” which may be used to complement existing competitive advantage. It is not a competitive advantage in itself (Porter 2001, p. 64). In KAM the competitive advantage would be in the relationship between the supplier and the buyer (Wilson 1997, in Gosselin & Heene 2000). The Internet could thus be used to enable and help grow this relationship.

A potential problem with this is that many suppliers have disparate internal systems that are not conducive to producing a unified external view to the buyer. However, Internet standards such as Extensible Mark-up Language (XML) can be used to integrate dissimilar technology (Herman 2002) at much lower cost than private networks or electronic data interchange but this raises a further concern about security issues which are likely to be more prevalent (Schneider & Perry 2001).

Further limitations of the Internet include the lack of spontaneous interaction, especially with regard to problem solving (Porter 2001, Schneider & Perry 2001). However, a counter argument is that the online automation of routine exchanges frees

up the supplier's staff to offer personalised advice and to cross-sell further services to the buyer (Porter 2001, Boston Consulting Group 2000).

The Internet and KAM

The role of the Internet in KAM is relatively unexplored. KAM in itself is still addressed as a sub-discipline of relationship marketing. However, the importance of the Internet and KAM as enablers of competitive advantage have been indicated, and when linked together, they hold promise of synergistic strength.

Roux (2001) explored the linkage between KAM and the Internet from a dyadic perspective with regard to the impact of the Internet technologies on the migration of key account relationships. Based on the McDonald and Woodburn (1999) adaptation of the Millman and Wilson model (1994), the main findings were:

- There was a positive correlation between application of the Internet facilities and stages of relationships
- The provision of Internet facilities could strengthen relationships between buyers and suppliers
- Buyers regarded transactionally focused facilities as most important, while suppliers felt that information focused facilities were more important
- The application of Internet technologies would not hasten the migration through the relationship stages
- Personal relationships were unlikely to be replaced by the Internet
- The Internet could reduce barriers to forming new supplier relationships but it would not make it easier to replace existing suppliers
- KAM was expected to become a greater source of competitive advantage in the future

Summary

It would thus appear that the key account relationship consists of a variety of activities, players, resources and degree of formalization. Such a relationship progresses through a number of stages and involves not only the key actors but draws on many of the resources of both organizations. The Internet, as an acknowledged enabler of many aspects of business, is seen to hold potential for enhancing KAM through all the stages of development. While unlikely to replace personal relationships, the relationship between buyers and suppliers could be strengthened, and barriers towards relationship building reduced. A common theme emerging from the literature study is the importance of trust in both KAM and in business conducted over the Internet.

Methodology

As this research was exploratory, a qualitative research method was used. This was also prompted by research in KAM undertaken by Pardo (1997) and Spencer (1999).

As Roux (2001) had found that obtaining matching sets of key account managers and key accounts can be very difficult, it was decided to limit the sample to one specially selected dyadic relationship and to apply a case study approach.

The dyad consisted of two large New Zealand organizations – a large IT consultancy as the supplier and a major national bank as the buyer. They were selected as it was assumed that they would be representative of their relevant industries and that these were the types of industries which would be more accustomed to the use of IT.

Interpretivist, semi-structured interviews were conducted with two relevant supplier representatives together and then with two buyer representatives together. The interview guidelines drew as far as possible on the relevant literature. They had undergone a number of iterations before application and were appropriately paired to reflect the dyadic perceptions and opinions on the same concept from both the supplier's and buyer's perspectives. The first author conducted both interviews.

Discussion of Findings

The discussion aims to reflect the findings of the analysis and to relate these back to the literature and the objectives of the study. The discussion is divided into three sections: interaction between buyer and supplier, communication and the Internet, relationship and trust. Subjects B1 and B2 represent the bank (buyer) and Subjects S1 and S2 the IT supplier

Interaction between Buyer and Supplier

Why the Buyer was a Key Account

The perception of Subject B1 was that the IT supplier saw the bank as a key account for status reasons – an indication that they could handle a large corporate account.

This correlates with the notion that profitability, status or size may indicate this value of a key account but what is ultimately seen as strategic depends on organisational context (Millman & Wilson, 1995, Cheverton 2001).

This is strengthened further by the finding that only 2% of the IT supplier's total revenue was generated by the bank. It is thus unlikely that profitability/size was the measure of the account's strategic value.

Purpose of Services Buyer Procures from Supplier

The bank's perception of the IT supplier's role appears to differ from that of the IT supplier's perception.

The IT supplier denoted its role as being one of "*business enabling through IT solutions*". Conversely, the bank itemised each service procured from the IT supplier, suggesting that the bank did not necessarily perceive the IT supplier as a total solutions provider.

A possible strategy for the IT supplier here is the introduction of switching costs (Ojasalo 2001), making it less attractive for the bank to do business with another supplier. It appears that this had been done to some extent, but differences in the

perceptions of the IT supplier and the bank suggest that switching costs were not as powerful as the supplier had assumed. The bank believed it would be *“hard work, but relatively straightforward...[no] more difficult than changing our relationship with other small suppliers”*.

Interestingly the bank perceived the IT supplier as a small supplier which might imply a lack of importance, but still viewed them as a *“business partner”*.

Communication and the Internet

Preferred Personal Communication Channels

The most important personal communication channels in the relationship for both the bank and the IT supplier were telephone and face-to-face communication.

Subject B1 believed that telephone was the best medium because it *“gives better context to what you are talking about...less misinterpretation”*. Subject S2 used telephone and face-to-face communication for *“everything that is not low priority”*.

Sengupta et al. (2000) found that communication quality was a significant determinant of a key account manager's effectiveness. It is therefore essential that the IT supplier shares the same view as the bank regarding the most appropriate means of communication if both parties are to communicate effectively. The responses of Subjects B1 and S2 above clearly indicate that they share the same perception of communication quality and are thus likely to communicate effectively.

Use of E-mail

E-mail was the predominant use of the Internet in the relationship.

According to Subject S2 *“e-mail is huge [in the relationship],”* but Subject S1 felt that it was *“not used for anything urgent”*. In terms of the specific use of e-mail in the relationship, Subject S1 used e-mail for communication audit purposes. Subject S2 used e-mail because *“its more useful than posting a letter...its normally instant”*.

Subject B2 described e-mail as a *“critical tool for delivering information”*, although Subject B1 was not as adamant, believing that the Internet/e-mail was still some way from becoming a mandatory communication channel because the *“older generation will not use [it] as a method of choice...[and] it needs to be more secure”*

Besides general communication, the bank specifically used e-mail for what they termed ‘online procurement’. Subject B1 explained: *“we just e-mail...information across to [IT supplier] for our purchases. There's no other Internet link.”*

E-mail thus appears to be perceived by both the bank and the IT supplier as a tool of convenience rather than a tool for relationship building. Nevertheless, this use of e-mail demonstrates some advantages such as archiving communications for audit

purposes, and faster communication facilitating decision-making through quicker response times as noted by Capon (2001). Interestingly the bank perceived e-mailing purchase orders to the IT supplier as online procurement. While strictly correct, online procurement implies a more involved process linking buyers, suppliers and distributors through a virtual value chain (Porter 2001, S4 Consulting 1999, Schneider & Perry 2001).

An integrated system offering a variety of functionality for both the bank and IT supplier could reduce costs for both parties. Cost savings made by the IT supplier from these measures could then be passed on to the bank, since the bank may require an incentive to adopt new technology (Cahill 1998). However, Internet security issues may pose a barrier to the adoption of this strategy.

Security of the Internet

Neither the bank nor the IT supplier rated the security of the Internet highly for sending sensitive information. This shared perception might inhibit further use of the Internet in the relationship.

In an e-commerce environment the sending and receiving of sensitive information depends on an assurance that the information is secure, particularly in terms of access and use (Menasce & Almeida 2001, Boston Consulting Group 2000). It is intriguing that while the bank's representatives felt that security on the Internet was low, the bank expected its customers to use their Internet banking service.

Use of the Internet for Internal Coordination of Resources

The bank used their intranet rather than the Internet within the organisation to coordinate people and resources that could impact on their relationship with the IT supplier.

Conversely, the IT supplier made extensive use of e-mail to coordinate the tasks it performed for the bank on a nationwide basis. A web-based service management system was also used by the IT supplier whereby an engineer could log on and update information from one of the bank's sites.

Improving Communication Processes

The IT supplier felt that communication processes worked fairly well but would look for ways to improve communication as their relationship with the bank evolved.

The bank, while satisfied with the communication processes, felt that more intelligent systems would be an improvement. They suggested utilising web-based applications for electronic procurement and committing the IT supplier to times/dates for services utilising a web-based diary application.

The IT supplier already had a procurement system operating that was customisable to each buyer, so it might have just been a matter of bringing this to the attention of the bank.

The IT supplier currently had access to the bank's systems through the helpdesk service that they provided. The bank was seeking access to the IT supplier's systems via the bank's intranet. Once this access becomes two-way, the diary application, procurement application, helpdesk service and any subsequent services or applications could be amalgamated into one portal between the bank and IT supplier (Kopf 2000).

Simply utilising the Internet to enhance the efficiency of communication with the bank is not a sustainable source of competitive advantage for the IT supplier in itself. By building a customised portal, the IT supplier would gain a more sustainable source of competitive advantage which was less easy to copy (Porter 2001). Security would also become less of a dilemma. With a portal there would be only one access-way between the bank's and the IT supplier's systems to protect instead of many.

Relationship and Trust

Internet as a "Value Add"

The bank identified 'more intelligent systems' in the section above as an example of how the value of services currently provided could be increased. Building on this, Subject S2 suggested that they (IT supplier) could "*leverage the Internet to provide live reporting to the customer, [where the bank] could go through to the [IT supplier's] web-site and see whatever it is they want to see*". Such live reporting would improve this service by allowing the bank instant access to information. It could also be another function of a customised portal. The IT supplier also suggested using the Internet to provide the bank with links to information on emerging technology services or Gartner reports

Using the Internet as a delivery channel was thus seen by the IT supplier as a means of indirectly enhancing the relationship with the bank by increasing the value of services provided. Subject S1 felt that "[the bank] *might see it as a value-add*", as opposed to directly enhancing the relationship.. Adding value to services provided is critical for the IT supplier because it creates competitive advantage through differentiation (Gronroos, in Ojasalo 2001).

Both the IT supplier and the bank agreed, however, that the Internet would not be useful for enhancing personal communication because telephone and face-to-face communications were seen as the more important.

The finding that the Internet is a 'value-add' in the relationship supports the literature. The Internet may be used to complement existing competitive advantage, but is not a source of competitive advantage in itself (Porter, 2001). The competitive advantage created by KAM lies in the relationship between the supplier and the buyer (Wilson 1997, in Gosselin & Heene 2000). Therefore by adding value to services provided using the Internet, the IT supplier complements its existing competitive advantage.

Internet as a Potential Hindrance to Relationship Effectiveness

Subject B1 did not believe that the Internet hindered the relationship in any way because the telephone was used extensively in the relationship to encourage

spontaneous interaction with the IT supplier, which was useful when solving problems.

Subjects S1 and S2 concurred, stating that *“using e-mail exclusively instead of just picking up the phone”* would definitely have a negative effect on their spontaneous interaction with the bank, although e-mail might be used as a *“follow-up”* to a telephone or face-to-face conversations.

The IT supplier and the bank appeared to share the view that while the Internet did not hinder their relationship. The lack of spontaneous interaction, particularly when discussing problems, was a limitation of communication via the Internet. Porter (2001) and Schneider and Perry (2001) had identified this problem and the perceptions of the IT supplier and the bank clearly ratify their stance.

Strength of the Relationship

All Subjects perceived the relationship between the IT supplier and the bank to be strong.

According to Subject S1 *“the relationship [between] the two organisations is really strong...mature...and there’s a lot of trust”*.

Subject B2 concurred and attributed it to the fact that the bank dealt with the IT supplier on a personal level through telephone and lots of face-to-face contact.

Creating a relationship of mutual trust is a critical component of KAM (Cheverton 2001, Capon 2001). Clearly this type of relationship exists between the bank and the IT supplier.

However, despite asserting that a high level of trust existed due to the personal nature of the relationship, there was no socialising between Subjects S1/S2 and B1/B2 outside of company functions although Subject B1 saw company functions as *“a very important part of the business and the way that our relationship works”*, perceiving the high level of trust to be a result of the socialising at functions.

Subjects S1 and S2 held a similar view that socialising was work related. Subject S1 predicted that *“as the relationship develops [socialising] will become more of a want-to than a have-to”*.

Appropriateness of the Internet for Building Trust

Both the bank and the IT supplier perceived the Internet as inappropriate for building trust.

Subject B1 believed that the Internet was too impersonal and insecure to build trust: *“If you are going to build trust in a relationship that’s a personable trait, and you want to do that face-to-face with the organisation”*. Subject B2 added: *“trust comes over a period of time. It’s not something that you get just through the use of whatever tools you use”*.

Similarly Subjects S1 and S2 preferred face-to-face communication for building trust, seeing the Internet more as a value-add as discussed above. Subject S1 summed it up: *"I think the key is people. People do business with people, they don't do business with equipment, so its very much relationship driven"*.

These comments further substantiate the literature. Pardo (1997 & 1999) stated that the focus of a key account manager should be to add value through relationship management, which is the competitive advantage of KAM (Wilson, in Gosselin & Heene 2000). The Internet and technology should be viewed as an enabler of this advantage (Porter 2001).

Stages in the KAM Model

All the Subjects perceived the relationship to be at stage four, partnership KAM, in Millman and Wilson's (1995) KAM model.

It was interesting that, given the perceived advanced stage of the relationship and the high level of personal communication and trust present, relevant personnel of the bank and IT supplier did not socialise outside of a work setting.

The utilisation of the Internet by the IT supplier, as opposed to intranet only, to coordinate resources internally suggests that they are at a greater stage of readiness to becoming a virtual enterprise than the bank. A virtual enterprise involves a virtual value chain where information can be transferred in real time internally and externally between different activities in the chain (Porter 2001, Cahill 1998).

Although both the bank and the IT supplier perceived their relationship to be at the partnership stage of KAM, Subject S2 indicated that the IT supplier was looking to advance their relationship with the bank to the synergistic stage. This shift would involve both organisations perceiving each other as different business units of one enterprise (Millman & Wilson 1995) - in other words, becoming a virtual enterprise (Porter 2001, Cahill 1998).

It is important that the IT supplier understands what stage the bank perceives the relationship to be at before attempting to upgrade the relationship. This is because if the bank is unready to upgrade and the IT supplier attempts to shift the relationship, the bank might look for a new supplier (Cheverton 2001).

Conclusion

KAM is a potential source of sustainable competitive advantage for both buyer and supplier. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent of Internet usage in KAM and to determine the perceptions of both a buyer and supplier in a dyadic relationship regarding the usefulness and potential of the Internet in KAM.

E-mail was found to be the main use of the Internet in the KAM relationship, but this was for efficiency and adding value to services provided rather than for building and enhancing the relationship itself. Telephone and face-to-face communication were preferred for that task.

Both the supplier and the buyer felt that, although satisfactory, there was room for Internet communications improvement between them. Both perceived the Internet security as untrustworthy.

The Internet was not used by the bank to coordinate internal resources but was used extensively by the IT consultancy for this purpose, indicating a slight disparity in the buyer and supplier's ability to progress to the next stage of KAM.

The KAM relationship was perceived by both parties to be at an advanced stage – partnership – and although the use of the Internet was not seen to hinder the relationship's effectiveness, it was not viewed as an appropriate mechanism for building trust in the relationship.

It thus appears that although the Internet has a definite part to play in KAM, it cannot replace certain interpersonal communications and interaction which are essential to building trust in that relationship.

Future Research

As the study was exploratory, a more comprehensive study across a number of dyads and across different industries would provide greater insights and validation of the findings of this study.

Additional topics for future research include:

- The perceptions of key account managers and purchasing professionals of different ages with regard to the use of e-mail for KAM communication
- The paradox of Internet security where an organisation appears reluctant to use the Internet with its suppliers but expects its own customers to use it with them
- The effect of an Internet portal on the KAM relationship.

Clearly there is still much to discover about the role of the Internet in KAM. Hopefully this study has stimulated further, more extensive exploration.

References

- Barret, J (1986), 'Why major account selling works', *Industrial Marketing Management*, vol. 15, pp. 63-73.
- Benbasat, I, Goldstein, D & Mead, M (1987), 'The case research strategy in studies of information systems', *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 369-389.
- Boston Consulting Group (2000), 'After the land grab: B2B ecommerce in Australia and New Zealand' viewed 20 April 2002.
<<http://www.bcg.com>>
- Cahill, D. (1998), 'Key account management: using key accounts as partners to get to the learning organisation', *International Marketing Review*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp.

205-214.

Campbell, NCG & Cunningham, MT (1983), 'Customer analysis for strategy development in industrial markets', *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 4, pp. 369-380.

Capon, N (2001), *Key account management and planning: the comprehensive handbook for managing your company's most important strategic asset*, The Free Press, New York.

Cannon, J & Perreault, W (1999), 'Buyer-seller relationships in business markets', *Journal of Marketing Research*, pp. 439-460.

Cheverton, P (2001), *Key account management: a complete action kit of tools and techniques for achieving key supplier status*, Kogan Page, London.

Colletti, J & Tubridy, G (1987), 'Effective major account sales management' *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, vol. 7, August, pp. 1-10.

Cooper, J & Gartner, J (1993), 'Building good business relationships: more than just partnering or strategic alliances', *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 14-26.

Drucker, D (2000), 'CRM and e-business still a hard fit', *InternetWeek*, no. 835, pp. 117-120.

Dunn, DT Jr & Thomas, CA (1994), 'Partnering with customers', *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, vol. 9, pp. 34-40.

Evans, P & Wurster, TS (2000), *Blown to bits: how the new economics of information transforms strategy*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Gosselin, D & Heene, A (2000), 'A competence-based analysis of key account management: implications for a customer-focused organisation' in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Competence Based Management*, Helsinki University of Technology, Helsinki.

Gronroos, C (1997), *Relationship marketing: interaction, dialogue and value*, The Swedish School of Economics and business Administration, Helsinki.

Hanan, M, Cribbin, J & Heiser, H (1973), *Consultative selling*, Amacom, New York.

Homburg, C, Workman, J & Jensen, O (2002), 'A configurational perspective on key account management', *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 38-60.

Kopf, D (2000), 'CRM: Who ya gonna call?' *Business Communications Review*, April, pp. 20-21.

Krapfel, RE, Salmond, D & Spekman, R (1991), 'A strategic approach to buyer-seller

- relationships', *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 22-37.
- Krauss, M (2002, 'At many firms, technology obscures CRM', *Marketing News* (American Marketing Association), vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 5-7.
- Kunath, G (1997), 'The need for key accounts' in Conlon, G, Napolitano, L & Pusateri, M (eds), *Unlocking profits: the strategic advantage of key account management*, National Account Management Association, Chicago, IL, pp. 33-45.
- McDonald, M & Woodburn, D (1999), *Key account management: building on supplier and buyer perceptions*, Financial Times, Prentice-Hall & Cranfield School of Management, Bedford.
- Menasce, D & Almeida, V (2001), 'Scaling your e-business', *Software Magazine*, viewed 16 April 2002.
<<http://www.softwaremag.com>>
- Milligan, B (2000), 'Suppliers face a new definition', *Purchasing*, vol. 129, pp. 57-70.
- Millman, A & Wilson, K (1994), 'From key account selling to key account management' in *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference on Industrial Marketing and Purchasing*, University of Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Millman, Tony & Wilson, Kevin (1995), 'From key account selling to key account Management', *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 9-21.
- Millman, Tony & Wilson, Kevin (1999), 'Processual issues in key account management: underpinning the customer facing organisation', *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 328-337.
- Myers, M. (2002), 'Qualitative research in information systems', *IS World*, viewed 25 February 2002,
<<http://www2.auckland.ac.nz/msis/isworld/>>.
- Napolitano, L (1997), 'An overview from NAMA' in Conlon, G, Napolitano, L & Pusateri, M (eds), *Unlocking profits: the strategic advantage of key account management*, National Account Management Association, Chicago, IL, pp. 11-21.
- Ojasalo, J (2001), 'Key account management at company and individual levels in business-to-business relationships', *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 199-218.
- Pardo, C (1999), 'Key account management in the business-to-business field: a French overview', *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 276-290.
- Pardo, C (1997), 'Key account management in the business-to-business field: the key

- account's point of view', *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 17-26.
- Porter, M (2001), 'Strategy and the internet', *Harvard Business Review*, March, pp. 62-78.
- Roux, Karin (2001), *Key account management and the Internet: a dyadic perspective on the impact of Internet technologies on the migration of key account relationships*, Unpublished masters dissertation, The University of Hull, Hull, UK.
- S4 Consulting (1999), 'Strategic account management innovation study', viewed 5 May 2002,
<http://www.s4consulting.com/library/_mainSAML.htm>
- Schneider, G & Perry, J (2001), *Electronic commerce*, 2nd edn, Thomas Learning, Boston, MA:
- Sengupta, S, Krapfel, R & Pusateri, M (2000), 'An empirical investigation of key account salesperson effectiveness', *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 253-261.
- Sengupta, S, Krapfel, R & Pusateri, M (1997), 'The strategic sales force', *Marketing Management*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 26-34.
- Shapiro, B. & Posner, R. (1976). Making the major sale. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1976, 68-78.
- Shapiro, BP, Rangan, VK & Sviokla, JJ (1993), 'Staple yourself to an order' in Sviokla, JJ & Shapiro, BP (eds), *Keeping customers*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, pp. 59-76.
- Spencer, R (1999), 'Key accounts: effectively managing strategic complexity', *The Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 291-309.
- Storbacka, K, Strandvik, T & Gronroos, C (1994), 'Managing customer relations for profit: the dynamics of relationship quality', *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 21-38.
- Sviokla, JJ & Shapiro, BP (eds) (1993), *Keeping customers*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA
- Tapscott, D, Ticoll, D & Lowy, A (2000), *Digital capital: harnessing the power of business webs*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Trites, G (1999), *Strategic Internet commerce*, CA, Toronto, CA.
- Turban, E, McLean, E & Wetherbe, J (1999), *Information technology for management: transforming business in the digital economy*, 2nd edn, John Wiley, USA.

Wilson, KJ (1997), *An interaction approach to key account management*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.