

## DIGITAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE IMPACT OF CRM ON MARKETING PERFORMANCE

<sup>1</sup>JASSIM AHMAD AL-GASAWNEH, <sup>2</sup>GHADA HAMMAD AL-RAWASHDEH, <sup>3</sup>NAWRAS M. NUSAIRAT, <sup>4</sup>ALAEDDIN MOHAMMAD KHALAF AHMAD, <sup>5</sup>ABDUL HAFUZ NGAH and <sup>6</sup>QAIS HAMMOURI

<sup>1, 3, 6</sup> Marketing Department, Applied Science Private University, Amman, Jordan.

<sup>2</sup> Cyber Security Department, Irbid National University, Amman, Jordan.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Marketing and Social Media, Prince Sumaya University for Technology, Amman, Jordan.

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Business, Economy and Social Development, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia.

### Abstract:

The performance of marketing has been a major factor in the recent significant decline in hotel occupancy rates. As a result, hoteliers and decision-makers are looking for innovative ways to boost "marketing performance" and raise occupancy rates. Thus, the current work investigates how "customer relationship management dimensions" (such as "CRM organizations, CRM knowledge management, and CRM technology-based") affect "marketing performance." A total of 149 hotel managers in Jordan provided information, which was then compiled and analyzed. The analysis process employed "Smart Partial Least Squares," which demonstrated that the key customer focus, CRM organizations, CRM knowledge management, and CRM technology-based dimensions had a positive impact on "marketing performance. Hoteliers can use these findings to create efficient marketing plans that make use of contemporary communication and technological resources.

**Keywords:** CRM Performance, Marketing Performance, hotels

### 1. Introduction

The idea of hospitality is one of warmth and deference. It may even be connected to safety and protection in some circumstances. Additionally, hospitality can foster cultural understanding and appreciation (Sharar & Yousef, 2018). According to statistics, Jordan had a population of only 9.5 million people in 2018, which is a small number. The nation is home to a variety of natural resources and borders Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. Hoteliers have significantly contributed 10%–14% of the nation's GDP over the past ten years, making tourism one of the most significant industries in the nation. Additionally, this industry is the second-highest earner of foreign currency and employs the most people in the private sector (Muhtaseb & Daoud, 2018). Jordan is significantly reliant on outside sources to meet its energy needs, unlike its neighbors. Additionally, Alshourah et al. (2018) note that the nation is small and has few natural resources, making it particularly vulnerable to outside shocks. Due primarily to the influx of refugees seeking asylum in Jordan as a result of the conflict in other countries in the region, Jordan is ranked 73rd on the Global Competitiveness Index. Their average economic growth decreased from 5.4% between 2000 and 2012 to just 1.9% in 2015, a record low (Ghazal, 2018; Hammouri, et al., 2021).

The hotel industry is currently facing a large number of challenges, particularly with regard to marketing performance and customer perception (Bruni & Magno, 2017; Huang & Chen, 2016; Maroofi, 2015; Hammouri et al., 2021). Therefore, it is essential that hotel managers take into account customer satisfaction when putting strategies into place to improve product promotion, brand value, and marketing performance. Standard operating procedures and market performance in Jordan's star-rated hotels still need significant development, even though marketing performance and branding have been acknowledged as key factors in hotel management (Shaaban and Ghoneim, 2017; Al-Gasawneh., 2022).

Jordan's economy, as well as economies around the world, depend heavily on tourism. According to a number of studies (Alshourah et al., 2018; Rababah, 2012; Al-Momani and Noor, 2009), Jordan's hotel market is extremely competitive. Al-Azzam (2016) also noted that since 2012, Jordan's occupancy rates have been fluctuating and dropping. One of the main causes of this decline was guest dissatisfaction, which ultimately led to insufficient customer retention, a decline in market share, and a sharp decline in profitability. As a result, hotels in Jordan are performing worse in terms of marketing (Al-Adamat, 2015; Al-Laymoun, 2016; Waskito, 2018). Researchers have also pointed out the need for Jordanian hotels to improve their business and marketing performances, as is also the case for hotels in many other countries (Talabi, 2015; Al-Adamat, 2015; Yadav & Singh, 2014; and Alshourah et al., 2018; Ra'd Almestarihi., 2021). In order to do this, they must build lasting relationships with their customers by putting various tactics, like special offers, into practice. To improve the performance of their CRM, they must also implement various information technologies effectively.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 CRM Performance**

Customer relationship management (CRM) has been described as a process involving a variety of systems, including database marketing, call center management, transaction support systems, and decision support systems. CRM may also incorporate a number of business and technological processes (Mu et al., 2015; Thejaswarup, 2017; Lis and Szczepanska-Woszczyna, 2015). Additionally, CRM is based on an organizational strategy that permits businesses to locate, entice, and keep customers by maintaining long-term relationships with them (Alwahaishi & Amine, 2018). From a strategic, analytical, and operational standpoint, CRM is regarded as a key business strategy that can be used in conjunction with technology to manage the customer life cycle. CRM is also used in business operations to automate the vast majority of corporate activities. Additionally, from an analytical standpoint, CRM is primarily concerned with using customer data to create marketing campaigns and stimulate sales (Talón-Ballesterio et al., 2018). CRM can also be used to make sure that tasks are given to the right individuals who are qualified to handle them. Customer issues can be effectively and efficiently resolved through proactive customer support, according to Alananzeh et al. (2018).

In the literature on CRM, a variety of methods and metrics, such as CRM practices, success factors, and performance, have been suggested. Customer orientations, knowledge

management, technology, and CRM organization are the four main components of CRM practices. The following elements, according to Nandeesh and Venkatesh (2019), are essential for CRM success: Skills in knowledge management (KM), technological readiness, top management support, change-process readiness, data-sharing readiness, CRM strategy communication, cultural shifts, customer-focused, and system integration. In addition, Wang and Feng (2008) and Alshourah (2012) defined customer relationship management performance as an organization's ability to uphold strong relationships with its clients as well as its marketing and sales effectiveness following the adoption of CRM technology. Performance in customer relationship management is primarily influenced by four factors: customer focus, knowledge management, CRM organization, and CRM-based technology. Given its emphasis on customer profitability, CRM technology is regarded as appropriate and effective for use in the service sector, particularly in the hotel and hospitality industries. Furthermore, CRM performance factors were used in the current work because CRM must be measured (Al-Momani & Mohd Noor, 2009; Dalla Pozza, Goetz & Sahut, 2018). (Alshourah, 2012; Wang & Feng 2008; Hammouri et al., 2022).

### 2.3 Marketing Performance

According to Bonoma and Clark (1988), marketing performance may be the only concept in the history of marketing that has resisted development, definition, and application as much as it has. According to this study, marketing performance is an inherently multidimensional process. This finding is supported by research from the strategic (Chakravarthy, 1986; Morgan and Strong, 2003) and marketing fields (Clark, 2000; Clark and Ambler, 2001; Morgan et al., 2002; Vorhies and Morgan, 2003). (GAO, 2010; Perin, & Almeida, 2011). (Wang & Feng 2008; Alshourah, 2012).

Analyzing marketing performance involves a number of variables, including adaptability, effectiveness, and efficiency. Efficiency in this context refers to the assessment of the connection between marketing inputs, outputs, and inputs. Additionally, efficiency's main goal is to increase output while decreasing input. Effectiveness, the second factor, refers to the anticipated result of marketing initiatives. On the other hand, adaptability is characterized as a performance evaluation based on the external environment of the company. A business must adjust to the environment it operates in. This indicates that it is significantly influenced by the actions of rivals as well as broad changes in the business environment, such as adjustments to policies, client preferences, and marketing partners (such as suppliers, service companies and distribution channel members). Thus, these elements must be taken into account when creating marketing initiatives (Clark, 2000).

Various metrics for gauging business performance have been proposed in recent years. These include both financial and non-financial measures, such as sales growth, revenues, etc (such as market share, customer satisfaction, customer retention, customer loyalty, adaptability, and brand equity). Additionally, they can be one or more dimensions (effectiveness, efficiency, marketing audits, marketing assessments, marketing implementation, etc.) Clark (1999; Ambler et al., 2004; Ahmad et al., 2022). According to Martin (2009) and Jalu (2014), customer retention, customer satisfaction, and company market share will be used in this research to

evaluate company performance. JHA (2015) recommends addressing and resolving any defections found in these areas.. In this study, all variables were interrelated. To put it another way, any changes to one will affect the other. All of these elements are crucial when evaluating marketing effectiveness in the hotel sector because happy customers are more likely to recommend the same business to others. Profits will consequently rise for the business, which will ultimately result in a rise in market share.

### **CRM Performance and Marketing Performance**

Previous studies investigating CRM have shown that companies who use CRM achieve better performance (Alshourah, 2012; Akroush et al., 2011; Boateng, 2014). Moreover, it has been found that customers are more loyal to a company if they have a strong relationship with them. They are also more likely to remain in a mutually beneficial relationship (Henczel, 2016; Sendjaya, 2016). It was revealed by neely (2017) that loyal customers are happy to purchase the products from the same company over and over again. Additionally, Sayani (2015) highlights the importance of improving customer loyalty, stating that the costs of serving loyal customers are less than attracting new ones. Thus, improving customer loyalty and retention would save the company money in terms of marketing. To address this, Qasem and Abukhadijeh (2016) investigated the effects that CRM had on customer retention and market share for bank customers in Jordan. They discovered that CRM has a positive, significant relationship with customer attitudes. Similarly, Nasution & Rafiki (2018) revealed a negative correlation between CRM and company performance through top management support, and between CRM implementation and customer retention. Sayed Soliman (2011) and Al-Bakri (2014) highlight customer retention as a key dimension of marketing performance. However, neither Reinart et al. (2004) nor Ernst et al. (2011) was able to find a significant relationship between CRM implementation and company performance.

Nonetheless, a number of researchers, including Sayed Soliman (2011) have found that organizing of the company and marketing performance are significantly and positively related. Moreover, Shaaban and Ghoneim (2017) and Sivesan (2015) also found that technology affects a company's marketing performance. As a result, criteria for marketing performance and growth have been established. Research conducted by Gladson (2015) and Al-Bakri (2014) also found that CRM positively affects business performance. Similar findings were also revealed by Ewnetu (2015). The current study hypothesized specifically the dimensions of CRM performance as technology perspective to enhance the marketing performance as in the following.

- H1: key customer focus positively impacts marketing performance
- H2: CRM organization positively impacts marketing performance
- H3: CRM knowledge management positively impacts marketing performance
- H4: CRM technology based positively impacts marketing performance

## Methodology

Data on "customer relationship management dimensions" (key customer focus, CRM organizations, CRM knowledge management, and CRM technology-based) and marketing performance at 1–5 starred hotels in Jordan were gathered through surveys for the current study. The questionnaire included demographic data as well as 40 items broken down into three main sections. Four crucial CRM components—Key Customer Focus, CRM Knowledge Management, CRM Organization, and CRM Based Technology—were covered in the first section. This section contained a total of 20 items, all of which were related to CRM performance and were based on suggestions from other researchers (Alshourah, 2012; Wang & Feng 2008; Sin, Alan & Yim, 2005). Customer Satisfaction, Customer Retention, Market Share, and Profitability were the five key dimensions used to analyze marketing performance in the second section. This section contained 20 marketing performance-related items that were taken and modified from Al-Bakri (2014).

The survey tool was given to three university researchers to ensure its validity. On the basis of the suggestions made by these researchers, adjustments were made. Thirty general managers were subsequently interviewed to determine the suitability, accuracy, and clarity of the survey tool. Participants' comments were taken into consideration. Professors were then asked to review the tool to make sure all of the items were impartial. Explanatory factor analysis was then performed to ascertain the precise number of items necessary to accurately represent the data. The results led to the establishment of a 0.6 cutoff point with no deletion. Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess the constructs' internal consistency, and all of them scored higher than 0.70.

Each survey question was evaluated using a Likert scale. These scales are frequently employed in market research (Sekaran, U. Bougie. 2010). When using a Likert scale, there is no prescribed number of points that must be used. But in this study, a five-point scale was thought to be useful.

In this study, a sample of the research population will consist of Jordan's five-star hotels. There were 236 hotels included in total. In addition, the key informant methodology was used to gather data from hotel general managers. This is due to the fact that hotel general managers are high-level respondents who would have the knowledge and experience to address the questionnaire's items (Alshourah, Alassaf & Altawalbeh, 2018; Lo, Stalcup & Lee, 2010).

In order to determine the minimum sample size, the G-power method was used in the current study. This method makes use of a variety of predictors. The minimum sample size calculated for the present work was 74, ensuring that there would be a sufficient number of responses collected. The researcher considered the fact that the survey method typically has a low response rate when conducting this process. However, in order to conduct a successful analysis, at least 100 completed questionnaires must be received (Hair et al., 2006). 230 questionnaires were therefore given to general managers in the current study. Additionally, PLS 3.0 was used in this work for data analysis.



## Result

180 responses in total were gathered for this study. However, 31 were disqualified as a result of providing inaccurate data (i.e., brief answers and partial data). There were 149 still valid responses after this.

### Measurement Model:

In total, 180 responses were gathered for this study. However, 31 were disqualified because they supplied inaccurate data (i.e., brief answers and partial data). For analysis, this left 149 valid responses. On the other hand, market share, customer retention, profitability, and customer satisfaction were measured to evaluate marketing performance. To produce a deep understanding of the pertinent conceptual and consensus features, marketing performance was used as second-order elements. The second-order is also suggested by Hair et al. (2016) to lessen the number of relationships and hypotheses that need to be tested by the structural model. In other words, it makes the PLS path model and interpretation process simpler. Furthermore, Becker et al. (2012) suggested a two-stage procedure. A repeated indicator approach should be used in the first stage to collect first-order construct scores. Using the first-order variable weightings, the CR.AVE of the second-order constructs can be determined in the second stage.

Based on suggestions made by Hair et al. (2017), the following metrics were calculated in the current study: Cronbach's Alpha (CA), factor loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). This was done to determine convergent validity. Each factor had a loading above the recommended level of 0.5, according to the results (Table 1). Additionally, all of the constructs had AVE values higher than 0.5 and CA and CR values above 0.7. This followed the recommendations made by Hair et al (2017). The current work verified convergent validity.

**Table 1: Measurement Model**

First order Construct	Items	Factor loading	CR	AVE
Key customer focus (KCF)	KCF 1	0.888	0.966	0.744
	KCF 2	0.843		
	KCF 3	0.876		
	KCF 4	0.898		
	KCF 5	0.921		
CRM organization (ORG)	ORG 1	0.954	0.965	0.841
	ORG 2	0.933		
	ORG 3	0.930		
	ORG4	0.911		
	ORG 5	0.943		
CRM knowledge management (KLM)	KLM 1	0.856	0.911	0.743
	KLM 2	0.809		
	KLM 3	0.865		
	KLM 4	0.811		
	KLM 5	0.823		
CRM technology-based (TKB)	TKB 1	0.754	0.912	0.760

	TKB 2	0.876		
	TKB 3	0.855		
	TKB 4	0.874		
	TKB 5	0.822		
Customer Satisfaction (CSS)	CSS 1	0.898	0.922	0.702
	CSS 2	0.865		
	CSS 3	0.827		
	CSS 4	0.879		
	CSS 5	0.817		
Market Share (MKS)	MKS 1	0.854	0.925	0.711
	MKS 2	0.839		
	MKS 3	0.839		
	MKS 4	0.832		
	MKS 5	0.744		
Profitability (PRF)	PRF 1	0.820	0.932	0.733
	PRF 2	0.832		
	PRF 3	0.854		
	PRF 4	0.897		
	PRF 5	0.849		
Customer Retention (CSR)	CSR 1	0.878	0.932	0.750
	CSR 2	0.843		
	CSR 3	0.867		
	CSR 4	0.814		
	CSR 5	0.805		
<b>Second Order Constructs</b>				
Marketing Performance (MP)	CSS	0.865	0.901	0.761
	MKS	0.706		
	PRF	0.816		
	CSR	0.858		

Furthermore, the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) criteria were used to assess discriminant validity in this study. According to [64], the fact that the resulting HTMT values were all less than 0.90 was evidence of discriminant validity. More information about discriminant validity in the current work is provided in Table 2.

**Table 2: Discriminant Validity (HTMT)**

	CRMP	CSR	CSS	KCF	KLM	MKS	MP	ORG	PRF	TKB
CRMP										
CSR	0.686									
CSS	0.787	0.811								
KCF	0.763	0.685	0.789							
KLM	0.889	0.630	0.723	0.821						
MKS	0.549	0.626	0.607	0.579	0.566					
MP	0.776	0.509	0.809	0.792	0.735	0.840				
ORG	0.515	0.088	0.157	0.228	0.080	0.052	0.103			
PRF	0.675	0.779	0.734	0.697	0.636	0.572	0.876	0.061		
TKB	0.886	0.693	0.727	0.789	0.706	0.479	0.739	0.100	0.670	

The analysis findings for the study's constructs, including convergent validity and discriminant validity, are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Additionally, based on the measurement model, the scale used for measurement can be regarded as appropriate and accurate.

### Structure Model

Hair et al. (2016) proposed that when evaluating a structural model, R<sup>2</sup>, beta, t-values via bootstrapping with a 1,000 resample, and predictive relevance analysis (Q<sup>2</sup>) should be carried out. Consequently, (VIF) was used in this study.

**Table 3: Hypothesis Testing**

		S. B	S. D	R <sup>2</sup>	Q <sup>2</sup>	VIF	F <sup>2</sup>	T-value	P- Values
H1	KCF > MP	0.509	0.176	0.665	0.270	2.341	0.052	2.892	0.000
H2	ORG > MP	0.366	0.133			2.220	0.048	2.751	0.000
H3	KLM > MP	0.442	0.169			1.765	0.056	2.615	0.012
H4	TKB > MP	0.543	0.198			1.321	0.066	2.564	0.000

On the basis of the structural model, Table 3 displays the direct effects KCF has on MP (H1). Additionally, the effects of ORG on MP were looked into (H2). Thirdly, the effects of KLM on MP were investigated (H3). Finally, the effects of TKB on MP were investigated (H4). In this study, the significance level was set at 0.05. (One-tailed). In this work, the following hypotheses were advanced: According to the hypothesis in (H1), KCF has a significant and positive impact on MP (T-value = 2.892, St, B = 0.509, p-value = 0.000). A significant impact of ORG on MP was predicted in (H2) (T-value = 2.751, St, B = 0.366, p-value = 0.000, one-tailed). Third, it was hypothesized in (H3) that KLM significantly and favorably affects MP (T-value = 2.615, St, B = 0.442, p-value = 0.012, one-tailed). Last but not least, TKB significantly and favorably affects MP in (H4) (T-value = 2.615, St, B = 0.442, p-value = 0.012, one-tailed). Moreover, table 3 displays the R<sup>2</sup> values for MP. And the variables under



investigation could account for about 66.5% of the variation in MP. Additionally, the results showed that the R<sup>2</sup> values exceeded Chin's recommended threshold value of 0.19. (1998). The marketing performance value for Q2 was discovered to be 0.270, which is higher than 0. This indicates predictive relevance within the model, according to Chin (2010). In light of the study's findings, hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 could all be accepted. Therefore, it seemed as though CRM dimensions (KCF, ORG, KLM, and TKB) have a favorable impact on MP.

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

The current decline in hotel occupancy rates in Jordan inspired the researcher to conduct the current study. This decline ultimately denotes a decline in the hotels' marketing performance. The current study thus looked into the variables affecting this issue. This study developed and put forth four hypotheses, which the research was designed to test. The findings indicated that by enhancing customer relationship management performance dimensions, marketing performance can be improved (CRM organizations, CRM knowledge management, and CRM technology-based). This means that when providing hotel goods and services, a focus on creating and maintaining a strong connection between customers and staff is crucial. In order to improve customer satisfaction, the services provider must concentrate on its key clients and give them good service, products, and attention. Such clients will then return, which will subsequently boost sales and the hotel's general marketing effectiveness. Hotels and other businesses will also be better able to improve their marketing performance if they can access customer information and turn it into useful knowledge. The organizational structure of hotels may not be "customer oriented." It is crucial to have an efficient organizational structure because it brings order to every aspect of hotel operations, including the front desk, room service, and the marketing division. In a similar vein, IT systems and updated CRM tools and techniques will improve usability, access to information, and organizational activity speed, which will improve customer satisfaction and encourage repeat business, which will increase market share and subsequently raise the level of marketing performance.

## **Recommendations for Future Research**

To achieve the goals of the research, a quantitative approach was used in this work. However, employing such a strategy may have some drawbacks. The analysis method, for instance, was flawed because it only used data that was collected from managers. Additionally, it was investigated how "customer relationship management dimensions" (such as "CRM organizations, CRM knowledge management, and CRM technology-based") impact marketing performance.. Future study recommendations include the following: First, the topic should be investigated using both qualitative and quantitative methods in the same study as this would produce a more in-depth understanding of hotels' marketing performances. Future researchers might also want to look into whether CRM has a moderating effect on marketing performance.

## References

- Ahmad, A. M. K., Shattal, M. H. A., Rawashdeh, L. A., Ghasawneh, J., & Nusairat, N. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and brand equity of operating telecoms: brand reputation as a mediating effect. *International Journal of Sustainable Economy*, 14(1), 78-97.
- Al-Gasawneh, J. A., & Al-Adamat, A. M. (2020). The relationship between perceived destination image, social media interaction and travel intentions relating to Neom city. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 19(2), 1-12.
- Al-Gasawneh, J. A., AlZubi, K. N., Anuar, M. M., Padlee, S. F., ul-Haque, A., & Saputra, J. (2022). Marketing Performance Sustainability in the Jordanian Hospitality Industry: The Roles of Customer Relationship Management and Service Quality. *Sustainability*, 14(2), 803.
- Alshourah, S. M. (2012). The Antecedents of Customer Relationship Management and Impact on Hotels Performance in Jordan (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.
- Bibi, P. A. L. W. A. S. H. A., Pangil, F., & Johari, J. (2016). HRM practices and employees' retention: The Moderating Role of Work Environment. *European Academic Research*, III, 12, 12994-13015.
- Chubing, Z., Shenghao, H., & Na, L. (2019). A Literature Review of Social CRM and Future Prospects. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 41(04), 71-84.
- Coltman, T. (2007). Can superior CRM capabilities improve performance in banking? *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 12(2), 102-114.
- Diffley, S., & McCole, P. (2015). Extending customer relationship management into a social context. *The Service Industries Journal*, 35(11-12), 591-610.
- Diffley, S., & McCole, P. (2015). Extending customer relationship management into a social context. *The Service Industries Journal*, 35(11-12), 591-610.
- Emerson, R.M. (1976). "Social exchange theory." *Annual review of sociology*: 335-362
- Ernst, H., Hoyer, W. D., Krafft, M., & Krieger, K. (2011). Customer relationship management and company performance—the mediating role of new product performance. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 39(2), 290-306.
- Ernst, H., Hoyer, W. D., Krafft, M., & Krieger, K. (2011). Customer relationship management and company performance—the mediating role of new product performance. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 39(2), 290-306.
- Foltean, F. S., Trif, S. M., & Tuleu, D. L. (2019). Customer relationship management capabilities and social media technology use: Consequences on firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 563-575.
- Hammouri, Q., Al-Gasawneh, J., Abu-Shanab, E., Nusairat, N., & Akhorshaideh, H. (2021). Determinants of the continuous use of mobile apps: The mediating role of user's awareness and the moderating role of customer focus. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 5(4), 667-680.
- Hammouri, Q., Altaher, A., Al-Gasawneh, J., Rabaai, A., Aloqool, A., & Khataybeh, H. (2022). Understanding the determinants of digital shopping features: The role of promo code on custom-er behavioral intention. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 6(3), 641-650.

- Hammouri, Q., Majali, T., Almajali, D., Aloqool, A., & AlGasawneh, J. A. (2021). Explore the Relationship between Security Mechanisms and Trust in E-Banking: A Systematic Review. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 25(6), 17083-17093.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American journal of sociology*, 63(6), 597-606.
- Josiassen, A., Assaf, A. G., & Cvelbar, L. K. (2014). CRM and the bottom line: do all CRM dimensions affect firm performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 130-136.
- Marolt, M., Zimmermann, H. D., Žnidaršič, A., & Pucihar, A. (2020). Exploring social customer relationship management adoption in micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of theoretical and applied electronic commerce research*, 15(2), 38-58.
- Nasution, F. N., & Rafiki, A. (2018). The effect of CRM on organization performance: A study of medium enterprises In Indonesia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(1), 24-49.
- Nasution, F. N., & Rafiki, A. (2018). The effect of CRM on organization performance: A study of medium enterprises In Indonesia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(1), 24-49.
- Pan, B., & Crotts, J. C. (2012). Theoretical models of social media, marketing implications, and future research directions. *Social media in travel, Tourism and hospitality: Theory, practice and cases*, 1, 73-86.
- Ra'd Almestarihi, J. A. A., Gasawneh, S. A. J., Malik Khlaif Gharaibeh, E., & Odai Nawras, M. N. (2021). The impact of social media marketing on brand equity: A systematic review. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(6), 4073-4088.
- Rapp, A., Trainor, K. J., & Agnihotri, R. (2010). Performance implications of customer-linking capabilities: Examining the complementary role of customer orientation and CRM technology. *Journal of Business research*, 63(11), 1229-1236.
- Wang, Y. G., & Feng, H. (2008, October). CRM capability in service industries: conceptualization and scale development. In 2008 IEEE International Conference on Service Operations and Logistics, and Informatics (Vol. 1, pp. 83-88). IEEE.
- Wang, Z., & Kim, H. G. (2017). Can social media marketing improve customer relationship capabilities and firm performance? Dynamic capability perspective. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 39, 15-26.
- Zaker, R. A. (2017). The Effect of Social Media on the Successful Implementation of CRM. *Global Journal of e-Business & Knowledge Management*, 8, 13.