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ABSTRAK

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to perform comparison study on usability attribute of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) in a Higher education mainly for Community College. This study focus on two CRMs software – SugarCRM and Vtiger. CRM functionalities are listed down from literature. Usability evaluation of both systems was done by conducting usability test and comparison analysis of both systems was performed. The test users were asked to answer Post Test Questionnaire (PTQ) after using both CRM systems to know their subjective satisfaction. The comparison analysis base on the evaluation result may help as a guideline for Community Colleges while selecting between the two CRM solutions to be implemented in the colleges. The finding is base on Customer Service Officers’ and the full time students’ perspective after using the CRM systems during usability testing. Currently, entire community college in Malaysia has not implement CRM. Hence, with the available time of fourteen weeks, this study was conducted in five Northern Region Community Colleges. Viewing students as main stakeholder provides competitive advantages and enhances the colleges’ ability to attract, retain and serve its customers. The success of an organization is depending on their ability to manage their customers effectively. Due to the need of deploy CRM in one organization, CRM will become more pervasive.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In today’s competitive world, the success of an organization is depending on their ability to manage their customers effectively. Customers nowadays are very demanding on higher level of access to information about the organization. There is no exception for higher education institutions. As one of the higher education institution, Community Colleges should embark the steps to improve their conventional method on managing customer-centric activities to a comprehensive way.

Customer Relationship Management (CRM) is parameter-adjustable software packages that are adopted by organization to manage all aspects of customer interactions within the organization and hence improve the ability of the organization to handle customer-centric activities. CRM application is a more comprehensive view of entire customer life cycle (Gary B. Grant and Greg Anderson, 2002). Therefore, Community Colleges are proposed to take advantage of the emerging of CRM application to drive better growth of their services.

There are a lot of study and comparisons drawn on Open Source CRM software (Bruceet al., 2006, Hakala, 2007, Dengate, 2009, Bucholtz, 2010, Yilmaz E., 2011). In general, the comparison focuses on functionality, ease of use, security, extensibility, customization, compatibility, portability, scalability, support and internationalization. According to ISO/IEC9126, there are six criterias in the quality model. The product quality model is an international standard for the evaluation of software quality. The fundamental objective ISO/IEC9126 is to respond on some such human biases like changing priorities after the project start or not having any clear definition of “project success” that may adversely affect the delivery and perception of a software development project. It is clearly stated in the Figure 1.1 that usability is one of the important criteria in the quality model. However, the focus on usability of CRM is inadequate (Monem, H. et al., 2011). Besides, it takes time, effort and cost to implement
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