CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE AMONG SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED HOTELS IN LANGKAWI

LEE CHOON TONG

MASTER OF SCIENCE (MANAGEMENT) UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA JUNE 2014

CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE AMONG SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED HOTELS IN LANGKAWI

 $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$

LEE CHOON TONG

Thesis Submitted to the
Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business,
Universiti Utara Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Sciences (Management)

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation/project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this dissertation/project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence, by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business where I did my dissertation/project paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this dissertation/project paper parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the UUM in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation/project paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this dissertation/project paper in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman

ABSTRACT

Customer relationship and organization performance is an important issues among the small and medium size hotels in Langkawi. This is because customer is the main source of income for the organization. Therefore, organization requires seeking methods to improve the customer relationship since it can influence the organization performance. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between customer relationship management and organization performance among small and medium size hotels in Langkawi. The sample of this study comprised of the 69 managers among the small and medium size hotels in Langkawi. In this study, questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. In addition, regression and correlation analysis are used to analyze the correlation between independent variables and dependent variable. The research results have shown that the small and medium size hotels in Langkawi has high implementation in customer relationship management at current stage. Meanwhile, technology based CRM, CRM organization and customer orientation as dimensions of customer relationship management significantly influenced organization performance. However, only knowledge management is not significantly influenced organization performance. Besides, the study faced several limitations such as time and budget constraints which limited this study only to concentrate in Langkawi area. The findings of this study have some contributions for future research and organization performance development.

Keywords: Customer relationship management; Organization performance; Small and medium size hotels; Langkawi

ABSTRAK

Perhubungan pelanggan dan prestasi organisasi adalah antara isu- isu penting di kalangan hotel kecil dan serdehana di Langkawi. Ini adalah kerana pelanggan merupakan sumber utama pendapatan kepada organisasi. Oleh itu, organisasi perlu mencari kaedah untuk memperbaiki perhubungan sesama pelanggan kerana ia boleh mempengaruhi prestasi organisasi. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji hubungan antara pengurusan perhubungan pelanggan dan prestasi organisasi di kalangan hotel-hotel kecil dan sederhana di Langkawi. Sampel untuk kajian ini adalah 69 orang pengurus diantara hotel kecil dan sederhana di Langkawi. Dalam kajian ini, kaedah soal selidik telah digunakan sebagai instrumen untuk mengumpul data. Di samping itu, kaedah analisis regresi dan kaedah analisis korelasi telah digunakan untuk analisis korelasi antara pembolehubah bebas dan pembolehubah bersandar. Keputusan penyelidikan telah menunjukkan bahawa hotel kecil dan sederhana di Langkawi mempunyai kadar pelaksanaan yang tinggi dalam pengurusan perhubungan pelanggan pada peringkat semasa. Oleh itu, teknologi berasaskan CRM, organisasi CRM dan orientasi pelanggan sebagai dimensi pengurusan perhubungan pelanggan mempengaruhi prestasi organisasi secara ketara. Tetapi, hanya pengurusan pengetahuan yang tidak mempengaruhi prestasi organisasi secara ketara. Selain itu, perlaksanaan kajian ini menghadapi beberapa batasan seperti kekangan masa dan bajet yang terhad telah menyebabkan kajian ini hanya tertumpu pada kawasan Langkawi sahaja. Hasil daripada kajian ini telah membuat beberapa sumbangan untuk penyelidikan masa depan dan pembangunan prestasi organisasi.

Kata kunci: Pengurusan perhubungan pelanggan; Prestasi organisasi; Hotel kecil dan serdehana; Langkawi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thanks to my supervisor, Mr. Shahmir Sivaraj Bin Abdullah for his continuous support during the progress of complete this report. I was very fortune and feel lucky to be under his supervision. I am very grateful for his advice, guidance and reading as well as give me many useful comments and opinion. Without you, I could not complete my report on time. Besides, I would like to thanks Dr. Thi Lip Sam and Dr. Rajoo a/l Ramanchandram for their advice during viva-voce session. Additionally, I would like to thanks all my UUM lectures for their guidance in the past three years.

A special words of thanks to my parents who have always inspire me on my academy advancement. I would like to thank my mother, Liew Lian Keow for her love and care. Thank you to my father, Lee Eng Chuan and uncle Lee Eng Seng for their guidance, advice and support. Also thanks to my brother Chun Pin and sister Mei Yunn for their encouragement and care. Furthermore, thank you to my fiancée, Yew Ching Hui for her support, care and encouragement.

Last but not least, I would like to thank all my friends who have given me idea and support during my study. Special thanks to my best friends, Su Hang and Tang Ying.

In the end, once again thank you to all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| PERMISSION TO USE | I |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT | II |
| ABSTRAK | III |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | IV |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | V |
| LIST OF TABLES. | IX |
| LIST OF FIGURES | X |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | XI |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | |
| 1.1 Background of study | 1 |
| 1.2 Overview of Langkawi Hotel Industry | 3 |
| 1.3 Problem Statement | 4 |
| 1.4 Research Questions | 7 |
| 1.5 Research Objectives | 8 |
| 1.6 Scope of Research | 9 |
| 1.7 Significance of Study | 10 |
| 1.8 Structure of Report | 12 |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW | |
| 2.1 Introduction | 13 |
| 2.2 Customer Relationship Management Evolution | 13 |
| 2.3 Customer Relationship Management Practices | 18 |

| | 2.3.1 Knowledge Management | .21 |
|-----|---|-----|
| | 2.3.2 Technology Based CRM | .26 |
| | 2.3.3 CRM Organization. | .31 |
| | 2.3.4 Customer Orientation. | .35 |
| 2.4 | Summary | .42 |
| СН | APTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 43 |
| 3.2 | Research Framework. | .44 |
| 3.3 | Research Design. | .45 |
| 3.4 | Hypotheses Development | .47 |
| 3.5 | Operational Definition and Measurement. | .51 |
| 3.6 | Research Population. | 57 |
| 3.7 | Sampling Data | 58 |
| 3.8 | Data Analysis Methods. | .58 |
| | 3.8.1 Descriptive Statistics. | 59 |
| | 3.8.2 Correlation Analysis. | .59 |
| | 3.8.3 Regression Analysis | .61 |
| 3.9 | Summary | .62 |
| СН | APTER 4: RESULTS AND FINDINGS | |
| 4.1 | Introduction. | .63 |
| 4.2 | Overview of Data Collected. | .64 |
| 4.3 | Reliability Analysis | .65 |

| 4.4 Demographic Analysis | 66 |
|--|----|
| 4.4.1 Gender | 66 |
| 4.4.2 Age | 66 |
| 4.4.3 Marital status. | 67 |
| 4.4.4 Length of Service. | 68 |
| 4.4.5 Education Level. | 68 |
| 4.5 Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis | 69 |
| 4.6 Correlation Analysis | 70 |
| 4.6.1 CRM Practices and Organization Performance | 72 |
| 4.7 Regression Analysis | 73 |
| 4.7.1 Regression Analysis on Coefficient of Determination (R Square) | 73 |
| 4.7.2 Regression Analysis of Coefficient. | 74 |
| 4.8 Hypotheses Testing. | 76 |
| 4.8.1 Hypotheses 1 | 76 |
| 4.8.2 Hypotheses 2 | 76 |
| 4.8.3 Hypotheses 3 | 77 |
| 4.8.4 Hypotheses 4. | 77 |
| 4.9 Summary of Hypotheses Results | 78 |
| 4.10 Summary | 79 |
| CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION | ON |
| 5.1 Introduction | 81 |
| 5.2. Discussion | 81 |

| 5.3 | Discussion on Research Objectives. | .83 |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| | 5.3.1 Research Objective 1 | .83 |
| | 5.3.2 Research Objective 2 | .84 |
| | 5.3.3 Research Objective 3 | .86 |
| 5.4 | Limitations of Study | .87 |
| 5.5 | Suggestions for Future Study. | 89 |
| 5.6 | Recommendations | 90 |
| 5.7 | Conclusion. | .92 |
| RE | FERENCES | 93 |
| AP | PENDIX | 97 |
| Apj | pendix A | 98 |
| Apı | pendix B | 103 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 3.1: Five-Point Respondant Format | 51 |
|--|----|
| Table 3.2: The Strength of Correlation. | 60 |
| Table 4.1: The Reliability of Dependent Variable and Independent Variable | 65 |
| Table 4.2: Gender of Respondents | 66 |
| Table 4.3: Age of Respondents | 67 |
| Table 4.4: Marital Status of Respondents | 67 |
| Table 4.5: Respondents' Length of Service | 68 |
| Table 4.6: Respondents' Education Level | 68 |
| Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics. | 69 |
| Table 4.8: Correlation Analysis IV and DV | 71 |
| Table4.9: Correlations between CRM Practices and Organization Performance. | 72 |
| Table 4.10: Model Summary (R Square) | 73 |
| Table 4.11: Regression analysis of Coefficients | 74 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 2.1: Evolution of Customer Relationship Management | 17 |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.2: CRM process with the technology: All type of IT tools | |
| as input and output will be the results | 29 |
| Figure 3.1: Research Framework | 44 |
| Figure 3. 2:Layout of Questionnaire | 52 |
| Figure 3.3: Independent Variables Measurement. | 53 |
| Figure 3.4: Dependent Variable Measurement. | 56 |
| Figure 4.1: Hypotheses Results | 78 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CRM Customer Relationship Management

ETP Economic Transformation Program

GDP Gross Domestic Product

MAH Malaysia Association of Hotels

NKRAs National Key Result Areas

SMEs Small and Medium Sized Enterprises

SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In today dynamic marketplace, many businesses and industries have classified and defined customer as an vital aspect; however they have to faced many challenges such as the customer demands, needs and behavior (Agnes, 2009; Chuchuen & Chanvarasuth, 2011). Therefore, in order to be able to compete and survive in the competitive marketplace, it is important for the business, company or organization to change their focus from production to customization or specialization (Chuchuen & Chanvarasuth, 2011). Besides, these companies also must implement different business strategies that consider on customer such as customer-oriented strategies in order to meet the customers' needs and demand (Agnes, 2009).

Generally, in order to expand the market share and increase company sales, acquire new customers become an important aspect that most of the company will consider. However, the issue on retaining the existing customer is also one of the vital factors that can ensure the success of the company. This is because it related with the costing issue. Basically, find or acquire a new customer are more costly and expensive compare to retaining the existing customer in the market or business (Chuchuen & Chanvarasuth, 2011). Therefore, many researchers suggest and

The contents of the thesis is for internal user only

References

- Acar, A.Z., Zehir, C., Ozgenel, N. and Ozsahin, M. (2013). The effects of customer and entrepreneurial orientations on individual service performance in banking sector. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 526 535.
- Agnes, L.K.Y. (2009). CRM Adoption and Its Impact in Organizational Performance: *Unpublish Doctor's Thesis, University of Nottingham.*
- Akroush, M.N., Dahiyat, S.E., Hesham, S.G. and Abu-Lail, B.N. (2011). Customer Relationship Management Implementation, An Investigation of a Scale's Generalizability and Its Relationship With Business Performance In a Developing Country Context. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 158-19.
- Bahrami, M., Ghorbani, M. and Arabzad, S.M. (2012). Information Technology (IT) as An Improvement Tool For Customer Relationship Management (CRM). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 59 64.
- Becker, J.U., Greve, G. and Albers, S. (2009). The impact of technological and organizational implementation of CRM on customer acquisition, maintenance, and retention. *Interm. J. of Research in Marketing*, 26, 207–215.
- Berry, L.L. (1983). Relationship marketing, in Berry, L.L., Stostack, G.L. and Upah, G.D. (Eds), Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing. *American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL*, 25-28.
- Bose, R. (2002). Customer relationship management: key components for IT success, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 89-97.
- Chang, H.H. (2007). Critical Factors and Benefits in the Implementation of Customer Relationship Management, *Total Quality Management*, 483–508.
- Chang, W., Park, J.E. and Chaiy, S. (2010). How does CRM technology transform into organizational performance? A mediating role of marketing capability. *Journal of Business Research 63*, 849–855.
- Chen, I.J and Popovich, K. (2003). Understanding customer relationship management (CRM): People, process and technology. *Business Process Management Journal*, 672-688.

- Chuang, S.H. and Lin, H.N. (2013). The roles of infrastructure capability and customer orientation in enhancing customer-information quality in CRM systems: Empirical evidence from Taiwan. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33, 271–281.
- Chuchuen, C. and Chanvarasuth, P. (2011). The Adoption Factors of E-CRM in Service Sector of Thai SMEs. *International Conference on Networking and Information Technology*, 17.
- Dhesi, D. (2011). Financing issues affecting the SMEs. *Retrieved on January 15*, 2014, from http://www.thestar.com.my/story.aspx/?file=%2f2011%2f12%2f31%2fbusine ss%2f10171114&sec=business
- EI-Ansart, A. I., (2005). Relationship Marketing Management: A School in the History of Marketing Thought. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 4, 43-56.
- Elkordy, M. (2014). The Impact of CRM Capability Dimension on Organizational Performance. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 10(2), 128-146.
- Gamble, P.R., Stone, M., Woodcock, N. and Foss, B. (1999). *Customer Relationship Marketing @ work*, London and Sterling, VA.
- Grant, G.B. and Anderson, G. (2002). Customer Relationship Management: A Vision for Higher Education, Jossey-Bass, A Wiley.
- Grissemann, U., Plank, A. and Alexandra, B. (2013). Enhancing business performance of hotels: The role of innovation and customer orientation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 347–356.
- Kamal, G. (2012). Investigation of the Effect of Focusing on Customers, Knowledge Management, Organizing Business Processes and Up-to-Date Technologies on Establishment of Customer Relationship Management in Iranian Insurance Firms. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 1(4), 42-47.
- Ko, E., Kim, S.H., Kim, M. and W, J.Y. (2008). Organizational characteristics and the CRM adoption process. *Journal of Business Research*, 61, 65–74.
- Ling, R. and Yen, D. (2001). Customer relationship management: an analysis framework and implementation strategies. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*.

- Mohammadhossein, N., Zakaria, N.H., Rafsanjani, A.H.N. and Asadi, S. (2013). The Relationship of Knowledge Management and Market Segmentation on CRM. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(4), 615-626.
- Moreno, A.G. and Padilla-Meléndez, P. (2011). Analyzing the impact of knowledge management on CRM success: The mediating effects of organizational factors. *International Journal of Information Management*, 31, 437–444.
- Nee, E.A. (2013). SME uplift a shot in the arm for FDIs. *Retrieved on January 15*, 2014, from http://www.thesundaily.my/news/743749.
- Nejatian, H., Sentosa, I., Piaralal, S.K. and Bohari, A.M. (2011). The Influence of Customer Knowledge on CRM Performance of Malaysian ICT Companies: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(7).
- Ngai, E.W.T. (2005). Customer Relationship Management Research (1992-2002), An Academic literature Review and Classification. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 23(6), 582-605.
- Nguyen, T.U.H. and Waring, T.S. (2013). The adoption of customer relationship management (CRM) technology in SMEs: An empirical study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20(4), 824-848.
- Ozgener, S. and Iraz, R. (2006). Customer relationship management in small-medium enterprises: The case of Turkish tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1356–1363.
- Plessis, M.D. and Boon, J.A. (2004). Knowledge management in eBusiness and customer relationship management: South African case study findings. *International Journal of Information Management*, 24, 73–86
- Rapp, A., Trainor, K.J. and Agnihotri, R. (2010). Performance implications of customer-linking capabilities: Examining the complementary role of customer orientation and CRM technology. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 1229–1236.
- Richardson, J.T.E. (2005). Instruments for Obtaining Student Feedback: A Review of the Literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 387-415.
- Ro, H. and Chen, P. J. (2011). Empowerment in hospitality organizations: Customer orientation and organizational support. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30,422–428.

- Sigala, M. (2004). Integrating customer relationship management in hotel operations: managerial and operational implications. *Hospitality Management*, 24, 391–413.
- Sin, L.Y.M., Tse, A.C.B., Yim, F.H.K. (2005). CRM: Conceptualization and Scale Development. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(11/12), 1264-1290.
- Stefanou, C.J., Sarmaniotis, C. and Stafyla, A. (2003). CRM and customer-centric knowledge management: an empirical research. *Business Process Management Journal*, 9(5), 617-634.
- Tajeddini, K., Elg, U. and Truema, M. (2013). Efficiency and effectiveness of small retailers: The role of customer and entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 20(5), 453-462.
- Tang, T.W. (2014). Becoming an ambidextrous hotel: The role of customer orientation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 39, 1–10.
- Uma, S., Roger, B. (2009). *Research methods for Business*: A Skill Building Approach, 5thed, Wiley.
- Xu, M. and Walton, J. (2005). Gaining Customer Knowledge Through Analytical CRM. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 105(7), 955-971.
- Xu, Y., Yen, D.C., Lin, B. and Chou, D.C. (2002). Adopting Customer Relationship Management Technology. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 102(8/9), 442-52.
- Yaacob, M.R. and Ju, W.P. (2013). Strategic Practices in Hotel Industry in Langkawi Island, Malaysia Does Size Matter. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 1(1), 39-48.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Questionnaire

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am inviting you to participate in my research project entitled "Customer

Relationship Management and Organization Performance among Small and Medium

Size Hotels in Langkawi".

The study aims to indentify the relationship between customer relationship

management and organization performance in your company. Please answer

carefully and honestly all items, as it will direct influence the results of this research.

All information provided will be treated as private strictly confidential for

academic purpose only.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation

Yours sincerely

LEE CHOON TONG

Master of Science (Management), UUM

Tel: 014-9048318

Email: choontong_lee@ymail.com

111

| Instructions | | · | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Section 1: Demographic Pro | Section 1: Demographic Profile | | | | | | |
| Section 2: Customer Relatio | onship Management Practic | res | | | | | |
| Section 3: Organization Perf | formance | | | | | | |
| Section 1: Demographic propriate Please tick ($$) the appropriate | | ions | | | | | |
| 1.1 Gender | Male | Female | | | | | |
| 1.2 Marital Status | Married | Single | | | | | |
| 1.3 Age | 19-24 | 25-30 | | | | | |
| | 31-36 | 37-42 | | | | | |
| | 43-48 | above 48 | | | | | |
| 1.4 Level of Education | Master | Bachelor's Degree | | | | | |
| | Diploma | Senior High School | | | | | |
| | Secondary School | Others | | | | | |
| 1.5 Length of Service | 0- 2 years | 3-5 years | | | | | |
| | 6-10 years | above 10 years | | | | | |

Section 2: Customer Relationship Management Practices

| No. | Factors | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Moderate | Agree | Strong Agree |
|-------|---|-------------------|----------|----------|-------|-----------------|
| Knov | vledge Management | | | 1 | | 1 - 8 |
| 2.1 | My organization's employees are willing to help customers in a responsive manner. | | | | | |
| 2.2 | My organization fully understands the needs of our key customers via knowledge leading. | | | | | |
| 2.3 | My organization provides channels to enable on going, two-ways communication with our key customers and us. | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Customers can expect prompt service from employees from my organization. | | | | | |
| Techi | nology based CRM | | | 1 | | |
| 2.5 | Organization has the right hardware to serve its customers. | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Organization has the right software to serve its customers. | | | | | |
| 2.7 | Organization's information systems are integrated across the different functional areas. | | | | | |
| 2.8 | Individualized information about each customer is available at all contact point. | | | | | |
| 2.9 | Organization is able to consolidate all information acquired about customers in comprehensive, centralized, up to date data. | | | | | |
| CRM | Organization | <u> </u> | | J. | | |
| 2.10 | My organization has the sales and marketing expertise and resources to succeed in CRM. | | | | | |
| 2.11 | Our employee training programs are designed to develop the skills required for acquiring and deepening customer relationship. | | | | | |
| 2.12 | My organization has established clear business goals related to customer acquisition, development, | | | | | |

| | retention, and reactivation. | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| 2.13 | Employee performance is measured | | | |
| | and rewarded based on meeting | | | |
| | customer needs and on succesfully | | | |
| | serving the customer. | | | |
| 2.14 | Our organizational structure is | | | |
| | meticulously designed around our | | | |
| | customers. | | | |
| 2.15 | Customer-centric performance | | | |
| 2.10 | standards are established and | | | |
| | monitored at all customer touch | | | |
| | points. | | | |
| 2.16 | My organization commits time and | | | |
| 2.10 | resources to managing customer | | | |
| | relationship. | | | |
| Custo | mer Orientation | | | |
| 2.17 | Organization's business objectives | | | |
| 2.17 | are oriented to customer | | | |
| | satisfaction. | | | |
| 2.18 | Organization closely monitors and | | | |
| | assesses its level of commitment | | | |
| | in serving customer needs. | | | |
| 2.19 | Organization's competitive | | | |
| 2.19 | advantage is based on | | | |
| | understanding customer needs. | | | |
| 2.20 | Organization's business strategies | | | |
| 2.20 | are driven by objectives of | | | |
| | increasing value for customers. | | | |
| 2.21 | Organization frequently measures | | | |
| | customer satisfaction. | | | |
| 2.22 | Organization pays great attention | | | |
| 2.22 | to after-sales service. | | | |
| 2 22 | Organization offers personalized | | | |
| 2.23 | products and services for key | | | |
| | customers. | | | |
| | | | | |

Section 3: Organization Performance

| No. | Factors | Strongly | Disagree | Moderate | Agree | Strongly |
|-------|--|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------|
| | | Disagree | | | | agree |
| Inter | nal Process Perspective | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Increase market share. | | | | | |
| 3.2 | Increase operating efficiency. | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Reduce customer complaint. | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Improve the ability to retain old customers. | | | | | |
| 3.5 | Improve the ability to comfirm target customers. | | | | | |
| Custo | omer Perspective | · | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 3.6 | Increase sales growth rate. | | | | | |
| 3.7 | Satisfy needs of various types of customers. | | | | | |
| 3.8 | Increase customer intention to purchase. | | | | | |
| 3.9 | Increase customer satisfaction. | | | | | |
| Learı | ning and Growth Perspective | | | | | |
| 3.10 | Improve employee's problem-solving ability. | | | | | |
| 3.11 | Improve employee's service quality. | | | | | |
| 3.12 | Improve employss's intention to learn. | | | | | |
| 3.13 | Effectively promote corporate culture. | | | | | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Appendix B

Frequencies

Statistics

Gender

| 0011 | 301 | |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| N | Valid | 69 |
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mea | n | 1.1159 |
| Std. Deviation | | .32250 |
| Minimum | | 1.00 |
| Max | imum | 2.00 |

Gender

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | Male | 61 | 88.4 | 88.4 | 88.4 |
| Valid | Female | 8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Age

| Age | | |
|---------|-----------|---------|
| N | Valid | 69 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 3.9130 |
| Std. D | Deviation | 1.19729 |
| Minim | ium | 2.00 |
| Maximum | | 6.00 |
| | | |

Age

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | 25 year-30 year | 7 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| | 31 year-36 year | 22 | 31.9 | 31.9 | 42.0 |
| | 37 year-42 year | 19 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 69.6 |
| Valid | 43 year-48 year | 12 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 87.0 |
| | above 48 | 9 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Marital status

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 1.1739 |
| Std. Deviation | | .38181 |
| Minim | um | 1.00 |
| Maxim | num | 2.00 |

Marital status

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
|-------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
| | | | | | Percent |
| | Married | 57 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 |
| Valid | Single | 12 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Level of Education

| ᆣ | Level of Ludcation | |
|---|--------------------|--------|
| | Valid | 69 |
| N | N Missing | 0 |
| N | Mean | 2.3333 |
| 5 | Std. Deviation | .53321 |
| ١ | Minimum | 1.00 |
| N | Maximum | 3.00 |

Level of Education

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative | |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|--|
| | | | | | Percent | |
| | Master | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | |
| Valid | Bachelor's degree | 42 | 60.9 | 60.9 | 63.8 | |
| valid | Diploma | 25 | 36.2 | 36.2 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Length of Service

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 1 | 3.1449 |
| Std. Deviation | | .64797 |
| Minim | num | 2.00 |
| Maxir | mum | 4.00 |

Length of Service

| | | =01.91 | 1 Of Oct vice | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 3-5 years | 10 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 |
| Valid | 6-10 years | 39 | 56.5 | 56.5 | 71.0 |
| valiu | Above 10 years | 20 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Knowledge management

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 3.7333 | |
| Std. Deviation | | .49784 |
| Minimum | | 1.60 |
| Maximum | | 4.60 |

Knowledge management

| | Knowledge management | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | |
| | 1.60 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | |
| | 2.60 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.9 | |
| | 2.80 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 5.8 | |
| | 3.20 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 11.6 | |
| | 3.40 | 11 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 27.5 | |
| \/alial | 3.60 | 11 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 43.5 | |
| Valid | 3.80 | 16 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 66.7 | |
| | 4.00 | 8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 78.3 | |
| | 4.20 | 8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 89.9 | |
| | 4.40 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 94.2 | |
| | 4.60 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Technology based CRM

| 100111 | Toolinology bacca crain | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--------|--|--|
| N | Valid | 69 | | |
| IN | Missing | 0 | | |
| Mear | า | 3.8406 | | |
| Std. Deviation | | .49995 | | |
| Minimum | | 2.50 | | |
| Maxi | mum | 5.00 | | |

Technology based CRM

| | reclinology based CKW | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 2.50 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.75 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.9 |
| | 3.00 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 8.7 |
| | 3.25 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 14.5 |
| | 3.50 | 9 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 27.5 |
| Valid | 3.75 | 21 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 58.0 |
| Valid | 4.00 | 12 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 75.4 |
| | 4.25 | 6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 84.1 |
| | 4.50 | 6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 92.8 |
| | 4.75 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 98.6 |
| | 5.00 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

CRM organization

| N | Valid | 69 |
|--------|-----------|--------|
| N | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | l | 3.6063 |
| Std. [| Deviation | .60901 |
| Minim | num | 1.83 |
| Maxir | num | 4.83 |

CRM organization

| | 1 | | Rivi organiza | itioii | |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | _ | | | | Percent |
| | 1.83 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.33 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.9 |
| | 2.50 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 5.8 |
| | 2.67 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 7.2 |
| | 2.83 | 7 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 17.4 |
| | 3.00 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 20.3 |
| | 3.17 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 26.1 |
| | 3.33 | 6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 34.8 |
| Valid | 3.50 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 39.1 |
| | 3.67 | 13 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 58.0 |
| | 3.83 | 10 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 72.5 |
| | 4.00 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 76.8 |
| | 4.17 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 82.6 |
| | 4.33 | 6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 91.3 |
| | 4.50 | 5 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 98.6 |
| | 4.83 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Customer orientation

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mear | 1 | 3.7623 |
| Std. Deviation | | .55230 |
| Minin | num | 2.00 |
| Maxir | mum | 5.00 |

Customer orientation

| | | Out | stomer orien | tation | |
|-------|-------|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 2.00 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.40 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 4.3 |
| | 2.80 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 7.2 |
| | 3.00 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 13.0 |
| | 3.20 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 17.4 |
| | 3.40 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 21.7 |
| | 3.60 | 11 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 37.7 |
| Valid | 3.80 | 15 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 59.4 |
| | 4.00 | 8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 71.0 |
| | 4.20 | 12 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 88.4 |
| | 4.40 | 5 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 95.7 |
| | 4.60 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 97.1 |
| | 4.80 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 98.6 |
| | 5.00 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Internal process perspective

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 3.7913 |
| Std. Deviation | | .52293 |
| Minimum | | 2.40 |
| Maxin | num | 5.00 |

| | | interna | l process pe | erspective | |
|-------|-------|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 2.40 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.60 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 4.3 |
| | 2.80 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 7.2 |
| | 3.00 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 11.6 |
| | 3.20 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 14.5 |
| | 3.40 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 20.3 |
| Valid | 3.60 | 12 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 37.7 |
| valiu | 3.80 | 16 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 60.9 |
| | 4.00 | 7 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 71.0 |
| | 4.20 | 11 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 87.0 |
| | 4.40 | 5 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 94.2 |
| | 4.60 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 97.1 |
| | 5.00 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Customer perspective

| _ | _ | |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| N | Valid | 69 |
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 3.8225 |
| Std. Deviation | | .57218 |
| Minim | um | 2.25 |
| Maxim | num | 4.75 |

Customer perspective

| Customer perspective | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 2.25 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.50 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 7.2 |
| | 2.75 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 8.7 |
| | 3.00 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 11.6 |
| | 3.25 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 14.5 |
| Valid | 3.50 | 10 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 29.0 |
| valiu | 3.75 | 15 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 50.7 |
| | 4.00 | 11 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 66.7 |
| | 4.25 | 13 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 85.5 |
| | 4.50 | 7 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 95.7 |
| | 4.75 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Learning and growth perspective

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| IN | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | ı | 3.9058 |
| Std. Deviation | | .60345 |
| Minim | num | 1.75 |
| Maxir | mum | 5.00 |

Learning and growth perspective

| | | Lourning | and growth | peropeouve | |
|-------|-------|-----------|------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| | | | | | Percent |
| | 1.75 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.75 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 7.2 |
| | 3.00 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 10.1 |
| | 3.25 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 11.6 |
| | 3.50 | 10 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 26.1 |
| Volid | 3.75 | 14 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 46.4 |
| Valid | 4.00 | 15 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 68.1 |
| | 4.25 | 8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 79.7 |
| | 4.50 | 5 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 87.0 |
| | 4.75 | 6 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 95.7 |
| | 5.00 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Statistics

Organization performance

| N | Valid | 69 |
|----------------|---------|--------|
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 1 | 3.8399 |
| Std. Deviation | | .49278 |
| Minim | num | 2.20 |
| Maxir | mum | 4.83 |

Organization performance

| | | Organ | ization perf | ormanice | |
|-------|------|-----------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| | 2.20 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | 2.55 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.9 |
| | 2.75 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 4.3 |
| | 2.83 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 5.8 |
| | 2.92 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 7.2 |
| | 3.10 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 8.7 |
| | 3.20 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 10.1 |
| | 3.28 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 11.6 |
| | 3.30 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 14.5 |
| | 3.37 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 15.9 |
| | 3.43 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 17.4 |
| | 3.45 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 18.8 |
| Valid | 3.48 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 21.7 |
| valid | 3.52 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 23.2 |
| | 3.53 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 24.6 |
| | 3.62 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 26.1 |
| | 3.63 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 27.5 |
| | 3.68 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 31.9 |
| | 3.77 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 33.3 |
| | 3.78 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 34.8 |
| | 3.80 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 36.2 |
| | 3.82 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 37.7 |
| | 3.83 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 40.6 |
| | 3.85 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 44.9 |
| | 3.87 | 3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 49.3 |
| | 3.88 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 50.7 |

| | _ | _ | | |
|-------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| 3.90 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 52.2 |
| 3.92 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 53.6 |
| 4.00 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 55.1 |
| 4.02 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 58.0 |
| 4.03 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 59.4 |
| 4.05 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 60.9 |
| 4.07 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 63.8 |
| 4.08 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 65.2 |
| 4.10 | 4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 71.0 |
| 4.12 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 72.5 |
| 4.13 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 73.9 |
| 4.15 | 5 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 81.2 |
| 4.27 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 84.1 |
| 4.28 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 85.5 |
| 4.30 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 87.0 |
| 4.33 | 2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 89.9 |
| 4.37 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 91.3 |
| 4.38 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 92.8 |
| 4.40 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 94.2 |
| 4.53 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 95.7 |
| 4.57 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 97.1 |
| 4.67 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 98.6 |
| 4.83 | 1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 69 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Descriptive

Descriptive Statistics

| 2001,0110,0110 | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Knowledge management | 69 | 1.60 | 4.60 | 3.7333 | .49784 |
| Technology based CRM | 69 | 2.50 | 5.00 | 3.8406 | .49995 |
| CRM organization | 69 | 1.83 | 4.83 | 3.6063 | .60901 |
| Customer orientation | 69 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.7623 | .55230 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Knowledge management | 69 | 1.60 | 4.60 | 3.7333 | .49784 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Technology based CRM | 69 | 2.50 | 5.00 | 3.8406 | .49995 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| CRM organization | 69 | 1.83 | 4.83 | 3.6063 | .60901 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Customer orientation | 69 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 3.7623 | .55230 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Descriptive Statistics

| Becomparte orangement | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Customer relationship | 69 | 2.11 | 4.47 | 3.7338 | .43033 |
| management | 03 | 2.11 | 7.77 | 0.7000 | .40000 |
| Organization performance | 69 | 2.20 | 4.83 | 3.8399 | .49278 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 69 | | | | |

Reliability

Case Processing Summary

| | out of the control of | | | | |
|-------|--|----|-------|--|--|
| | | N | % | | |
| | Valid | 69 | 100.0 | | |
| Cases | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 | | |
| | Total | 69 | 100.0 | | |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .897 | 7 |

| Rom Total Gallottee | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|--|--|
| | Scale Mean if | Scale Variance if | Corrected | Cronbach's | | |
| | Item Deleted | Item Deleted | Item-Total | Alpha if Item | | |
| | | | Correlation | Deleted | | |
| Knowledge management | 22.7287 | 7.313 | .631 | .890 | | |
| Technology based CRM | 22.6215 | 7.280 | .641 | .889 | | |
| CRM organization | 22.8558 | 6.700 | .695 | .883 | | |
| Customer orientation | 22.6998 | 6.890 | .712 | .881 | | |
| Internal process perspective | 22.6708 | 7.006 | .715 | .881 | | |
| Customer perspective | 22.6396 | 6.629 | .782 | .872 | | |
| Learning and growth perspective | 22.5563 | 6.623 | .732 | .878 | | |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .715 | 2 |

Item-Total Statistics

| Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 3.8399 | .243 | .557 | |
| | Item Deleted | Item Deleted Item Deleted 3.8399 .243 | Item DeletedItem DeletedItem-Total Correlation3.8399.243.557 |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .761 | 2 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Technology based CRM | 3.8399 | .243 | .615 | |
| Organization performance | 3.8406 | .250 | .615 | |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .809 | 2 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total | Cronbach's Alpha if Item |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | Correlation | Deleted |
| CRM organization | 3.8399 | .243 | .694 | |
| Organization performance | 3.6063 | .371 | .694 | |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .819 | 2 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Customer orientation | 3.8399 | .243 | .697 | |
| Organization performance | 3.7623 | .305 | .697 | |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | N of Items |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | |
| .905 | 2 |

| nom rotal otaliono | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total | Cronbach's Alpha if Item |
| | | | Correlation | Deleted |
| Customer relationship management | 3.8399 | .243 | .835 | |
| Organization performance | 3.7338 | .185 | .835 | |

Correlations

Correlations (Organization performance and customer relationship management)

Correlations

| | | | Organization performance | Customer relationship |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | periorillarice | management |
| | | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .835** |
| Organization pe | rformance | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | | N | 69 | 69 |
| | 1.0 | Pearson Correlation | .835 ^{**} | 1 |
| Customer | relationship | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| management | | N | 69 | 69 |

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

$Correlations \ (Organization \ performance \ and \ knowledge \ management)$

Correlations

| | | Organization | Knowledge |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------|
| | | performance | management |
| | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .557** |
| Organization performance | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 69 | 69 |
| | Pearson Correlation | .557 ^{**} | 1 |
| Knowledge management | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 69 | 69 |

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations (Organization performance and technology based CRM)

Correlations

| | | Organization performance | Technology based CRM |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .615** |
| Organization performance | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 69 | 69 |
| | Pearson Correlation | .615 ^{**} | 1 |
| Technology based CRM | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 69 | 69 |

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations (Organization performance and CRM organization)

Correlations

| | | Organization | CRM |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | performance | organization |
| | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .694** |
| Organization performance | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 69 | 69 |
| | Pearson Correlation | .694 ^{**} | 1 |
| CRM organization | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 69 | 69 |

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations (Organization performance and customer orientation)

Correlations

| | | Organization | Customer |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | performance | orientation |
| | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .697** |
| Organization performance | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 69 | 69 |
| | Pearson Correlation | .697 ^{**} | 1 |
| Customer orientation | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 69 | 69 |

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression

Model Summary

| F | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the |
| | | | Square | Estimate |
| 1 | .825 ^a | .681 | .661 | .28700 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Customer orientation, Technology based CRM, CRM organization, Knowledge management

ANOVA^a

| Мо | del | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 11.241 | 4 | 2.810 | 34.116 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 5.272 | 64 | .082 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

- a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Customer orientation, Technology based CRM, CRM organization, Knowledge management

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | (Constant) | .438 | .312 | | 1.405 | .165 |
| | Knowledge management | .030 | .098 | .030 | .304 | .762 |
| 1 | Technology based CRM | .296 | .094 | .300 | 3.152 | .002 |
| | CRM organization | .292 | .074 | .360 | 3.926 | .000 |
| | Customer orientation | .293 | .084 | .329 | 3.507 | .001 |

Regression Knowledge Management

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the |
|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|
| | | | Square | Estimate |
| 1 | .557 ^a | .310 | .300 | .41240 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge management

$ANOVA^a$

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 5.117 | 1 | 5.117 | 30.088 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 11.395 | 67 | .170 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge management

Coefficients^a

| Mode | ıl | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.783 | .378 | | 4.712 | .000 |
| | Knowledge management | .551 | .100 | .557 | 5.485 | .000 |

Regression Technology Based CRM

Model Summary

| Model | R R Square | | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the |
|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|
| Model | K | N Squale | , | |
| | | | Square | Estimate |
| 1 | .615 ^a | .378 | .369 | .39150 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Technology based CRM

$\mathbf{ANOVA}^{\mathbf{a}}$

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 6.243 | 1 | 6.243 | 40.731 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 10.269 | 67 | .153 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Technology based CRM

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.512 | .368 | | 4.112 | .000 |
| | Technology based CRM | .606 | .095 | .615 | 6.382 | .000 |

Regression CRM Organization

Model Summary

| Model | R | R R Square Adjusted R | | Std. Error of the |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------------|
| | | | Square | Estimate |
| 1 | .694 ^a | .482 | .475 | .35721 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), CRM organization

$\mathbf{ANOVA}^{\mathbf{a}}$

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 7.963 | 1 | 7.963 | 62.407 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 8.549 | 67 | .128 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), CRM organization

Coefficients^a

| Mode | el | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.813 | .260 | | 6.972 | .000 |
| | CRM organization | .562 | .071 | .694 | 7.900 | .000 |

Regression Customer Orientation

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | Square | Estimate | |
| 1 | .697 ^a | .486 | .479 | .35578 | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Customer orientation

$\mathbf{ANOVA}^{\mathbf{a}}$

| Mod | del | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 8.031 | 1 | 8.031 | 63.450 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 8.481 | 67 | .127 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Customer orientation

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.499 | .297 | | 5.046 | .000 |
| | Customer orientation | .622 | .078 | .697 | 7.966 | .000 |

Regression Customer Relationship Management

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R | Std. Error of the | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | Square | Estimate | |
| 1 | .835 ^a | .696 | .692 | .27351 | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Customer relationship management

ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| | Regression | 11.500 | 1 | 11.500 | 153.733 | .000 ^b |
| 1 | Residual | 5.012 | 67 | .075 | | |
| | Total | 16.512 | 68 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organization performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Customer relationship management

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized | t | Sig. | |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------|--------------|--------------|--------|------|
| | | | | | Coefficients | | |
| | | | В | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| | (Constant) | | .272 | .290 | | .938 | .352 |
| 1 | Customer management | relationship | .956 | .077 | .835 | 12.399 | .000 |