

Chapter 14: Attribution Is a Political Document

Table Reference

Every table from this chapter, with what it's for and how to actually use it.

Attribution Model Comparison

Attribution Model	How Credit Is Assigned	Best Used For	Limitation
First Touch	100% credit to the first marketing touch that created the lead	Understanding awareness-stage channel effectiveness; what brings people in	Ignores all nurture and late-stage acceleration
Last Touch	100% credit to the last marketing touch before opportunity creation	Understanding what converts MQLs to pipeline; bottom-of-funnel efficiency	Ignores all awareness and mid-funnel work – this is the Google Analytics default problem described above, applied to your own CRM
Linear (Equal Weight)	Credit split equally across all touches in the buyer journey	Understanding channel contribution across the full funnel	Treats all touches as equally important (they are not)
W-Shaped	40% first touch, 40% opportunity creation touch, 20% split across middle	Balancing awareness and conversion attribution; most popular B2B model	Requires accurate CRM touch tracking across the full journey
Full Path (U+W)	Adds customer creation milestone; weights key journey inflections	Enterprise deals with long sales cycles and CS handoff	Complexity; requires comprehensive touch data across the full lifecycle
Custom / Revenue-Based	Weights assigned based on your own historical closed-won data	Organizations with sufficient data history to tune the model to actual	Requires data science investment; model can overfit

Attribution Model	How Credit Is Assigned	Best Used For	Limitation
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	------------

outcomes

Description: Compares First Touch, Last Touch, Linear, and other real attribution models – how each assigns credit, what it’s actually good for, and its honest limitation.

How to use it: Use as a reference when deciding which single model your org should adopt as its official one, or when explaining to a stakeholder why their preferred model isn’t the whole picture.

One Deal, Four Models, Four Different Winners

Model	Content Team’s Credit	Paid/Demo Team’s Credit	Sales’ Credit	Who “Wins”
First Touch	\$100,000 (100%)	\$0	\$0	Content, decisively
Last Touch	\$0	\$0	\$100,000 (100%, credited to the final sales touch)	Sales, decisively
Linear (Equal Weight)	~\$16,700 (1 of 6 touches)	~\$16,700 (1 of 6 touches)	~\$66,700 (4 of 6 touches)	Sales, by volume of touches
W-Shaped	\$40,000 (first touch)	\$40,000 (opportunity-creation touch, the demo request)	\$20,000 (split across remaining touches)	Content and Demo, roughly tied

Description: A real worked example showing how the exact same closed deal gets credited completely differently depending which attribution model is used.

How to use it: Use this in a cross-functional meeting to make the case for a single, agreed model – it’s the clearest possible illustration of why attribution disagreements aren’t about the data, they’re about the model.

Activity Volume Tracker

Activity Type	Wk 1-13 (weekly)	QTR Total	Status
Field Events / In-Person			
Virtual Events / Webinars			
Content / Inbound			
Paid Digital / SEM			
Email / Nurture			
Partner / Channel			
SDR Outbound			
Other			
TOTAL			

Description: A blank quarterly tracker for logging weekly volume by activity type (field events, webinars, content, and others).

How to use it: Populate weekly through the quarter to catch a channel's volume quietly declining before the quarter closes, not after.

Activity Conversion Rate Tracker

Activity Type	Q1 Conv. Rate	Q2 Conv. Rate	Q3 Conv. Rate	Q4 Conv. Rate / Notes
Field Events / In-Person				
Virtual Events / Webinars				
Content / Inbound				
Paid Digital / SEM				
Email / Nurture				
Partner / Channel				
SDR Outbound				
Other				
OVERALL AVG				

Description: A blank quarter-over-quarter tracker for logging conversion rate by activity type.

How to use it: Populate each quarter to see which channels are actually converting better or worse over time, not just producing more or less volume.
