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Abstract

A systematic literature review has been conducted on the exiting E-CRM system and found that 70% of E-CRM projects do not meet their ultimate goals. Furthermore, more than 77% of E-CRM projects do not succeed in the company’s objectives. Many telecommunication companies reported that the existing E-CRM systems face severe challenges, which hinder the E-CRM system’s successful adoption. This study aims to report the literature review on the Critical Success Factors for E-CRM systems and identify the rate of failure for E-CRM adoption. The systematic literature review (SLR) method has been conducted by analyzing 210 articles between 2011 to 2021 from different databases collections of research papers. The study determines E-CRM Critical Success Factors from three aspects: technology, organization, and individual factors. The three main categories were analyzed as the effects of the issue on E-CRM success in telecommunication companies. The results show that the three aspects (technology, organization, and individual factors) have a significant effect on the successful adoption of E-CRM.
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1. Introduction

Electronic Customer Relationship Management (E-CRM) aims to present customers' needs and grow a healthy relationship between customers and the organization (Chen et al., 2021). It gives the ability to organizations to gather the knowledge of different sources successfully. The gathering of customer data may be through extranets, customer knowledge discovery algorithms, web spiders, cookies, online registration, and purchasing, generating vast amounts of data. E-CRM presents an excellent system to enable quick access to customers, store their information, and analyze customer data to provide a universal view of customer needs (Fjermestad and Romano, 2003). Many authors claim that the E-CRM system is essential to improve customer needs and organizations' performance. In Fjermestad and Romano (2003), the research was focused on enhanced customer services and cost reduction as a significant critical success factor (CSFs). It also considers CSFs as a successful measurement of E-CRM. Previous studies about the use of E-CRM in companies and organizations have shown that E-CRM improves customer loyalty, extends sales, expands customer service, enhances the personalization of relationships and cost savings in marketing, and improves market awareness. Shoniregun et al. (2004) examined the trust factor to increase the effectiveness of E-CRM toward customers. Khalifa and Shen (2009) discussed the successful modeling of E-CRM with practical consideration, and the paper confirmed that there is essential to take into account the conceptualization of customer satisfaction. This systematic review is designed to examine and determine the E-CRM CSFs. This systematic review aims to study many previous works based on the E-CRM scope of CSFs and identify the rate of failure of E-CRM adoption. Moreover, it may help the organization determine the essential E-CRM success. Also, decide E-CRM CSFs that contribute to the success of E-CRM adoption.

2. Background

The E-CRM started in the mid-1990 via combining the Internet and electronic touchpoint.
Touchpoint connects with customers such as email, call centers, direct sales, phone, and social media websites. Web-based E-CRM technology provides a way to interact with the business, customers, and employees. Software, hardware, processes, and executive commitments are included in the process to support an enterprise-wide CRM business strategy. Furthermore, using the Internet as a base for CRM functions and a channel for marketing, commerce, and information introduce new and great opportunities for businesses, described as E-CRM. Toyese (2014) defined E-CRM as part of the traditional CRM system that is provided using internet technology. E-CRM offers many advantages in online services, such as building a good relationship with customers, increasing customer satisfaction with loyalty supported by extensive literature studies.

E-CRM plays a critical role in managing internal and external information, offered anytime and anywhere. E-CRM has a significant role in integrating technology and the organization process. Despite the E-CRM, the system generally depends on the business approach. There are intensely competitive in many organizations in global marketing (Chang et al., 2005). The telecommunication companies attempt to deliver a high level of services to support the marketplace (Ishmael, 2015) competitively. Many studies about E-CRM failure in the literature and the causes of unsuccessful E-CRM in telecommunication companies. Among them are the lack of Top Management Support, user Training (Hosseinianzadeh, 2015), and lack of Experience and skill (Nguyen and Pham, 2015). On the other hand, Kassahun (2012) mentioned that Individual Performance influences the success of the E-CRM adoption. A significant number of previous studies in the E-CRM field suggest investigating the causes of limited E-CRM success (Sunny and Abolaji, 2016; Nguyen and Pham, 2015).

3. Systematic review

This study aims to do a systematic literature analysis to find the most Critical Success Factors (CSFs) that contribute to the successful adoption of E-CRM systems. It also seeks to define comprehensive metrics to aid in the evaluation of these Critical Success Factors. The systematic review uses the framework and guidelines that implement the following three main phases: Preparing the review (research question), selection criteria, and paper ranking.

3.1. Research questions

Bohling et al. (2006) indicated that the examination question is the central part of an empirical review. This section aims to address the issue and challenges in E-CRM adoption by reviewing the studies and literature under the E-CRM field that present the failure levels of the adoption and raise the understanding of the high failure. This study will give insight into the following study questions: What the Critical Success Factors positively affect E-CRM adoption, and how do those factors affect Employee Satisfaction with E-CRM. These questions aim to recognize the extent of those Critical Success Factors that positively affect the successful adoption of E-CRM. Moreover, it identifies the challenges of Employee Satisfaction as the main contribution to E-CRM usage. After identifying the research questions, the review for the study was done. This process has various phases: Keyword study, database selection, quality papers selection, and analysis.

3.2. Searching process in databases

The examination method of this literature involves collecting databases from the thesis, journals, and conferences with keywords. The databases were selected for the years from 2000 to 2020. The databases used are as shown in Table 1. This study selects journals and conferences based on these keyword queries (E-CRM, successful adoption, Critical Success Factors, success factors, challenges, Employee Satisfaction). The database collection provides an important list of possible researches. The processes in selecting the studies relevant to paper review are as follows:

1. Exclude studies whose titles are not relevant to the paper goal.
2. Exclude papers there abstracts and keywords not related to the paper goal.
3. Read the remaining sections on the papers and exclude any paper that is not relevant to the scope.

The details of the initial result for all database reviews are illustrated in Table 1.

| Databases     | Db                      | Initial Results | Years       | Keywords                                                                 |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scholar       | scholar.google.com      | 3150            |             |                                                                          |
| Springer      | www.springer.com        | 3               |             |                                                                          |
| Emerald       | www.emeraldinsight.com  | 110             | 2000-2020   | ("E-CRM" OR "ECRM" successful adoption") AND ("Critical Success Factors" OR "success factors" OR "challenges" OR "Employee Satisfaction") |
| IEEE          | ieeexplore.ieee.org     | 3               |             |                                                                          |
| ACM Digital   | http://dl.acm.org       | 2               |             |                                                                          |
| Library       |                         |                 |             |                                                                          |
| Science direct| http://sciencedirect.com| 72              |             |                                                                          |
| Total         |                         | 7 DB            | 3349        |                                                                          |
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3.3. Paper selection

The papers were selected based on the title and the abstract with the keywords. Then the papers were selected based on the studies conducted between 2000 and 2021. In this process, 210 papers were eligible from the initial 3349 articles, as shown in Table 2.

3.4. Papers based on database

E-CRM and CRM papers were published from different databases. Fig. 1 shows the eligible paper's distribution based on the databases in which 78% papers from google scholar, 13% from the emerald database, 1% from science direct, 5% from IEEE database, 4% from springer, and 1% from Elsevier.

3.5. Papers based on E-CRM years

Fig. 2 shows the number of eligible papers based on years of the publications. The number of eligible papers has remarkably increased in recent years, which indicates that E-CRM is progressively attracting the attention of scholars and researchers.

3.6. Papers based on countries

This research filtered the E-CRM papers based on countries. The details are shown in Fig. 3. 10% of the papers were studies conducted in India, 7% in Indonesia, 12% in Jourdan, 2% in Nigeria, 9% in Iran, 3% in Kenya, 3% in Uganda, 8% in Taiwan, 18% in Malaysia, and 22% in general.

3.7. Investigation of existing studies focusing the critical success factors toward E-CRM

Table 2 shows the previous studies' factors that covered some issues in their Critical Success Factors. Based on the last works' attention, studies have focused on investigating technology, organization, and individual factors' effects on Employee Satisfaction, which is considered the main contributor to E-CRM success.

4. Analysis of related works

Alim and Ozuem (2014) focused on the effect of E-CRM customer satisfaction in the mobile environment. The results showed that E-customer CRM's Service Quality and customer satisfaction are closely linked (Alim and Ozuem, 2014). Hosseini et al. (2013) built a consistent and legitimate mobile communications data quality framework. The study shows that participants play an important role in determining pricing policies and service convenience and improving customer loyalty. The research has shown that the funding focuses on the consumer satisfaction effect of quality of service. The success rate has always been constrained by the lack of response and empathy with service quality. Allozi et al. (2016) addressed an electronic information database framework of the E-customer processes for better e-customer conservation. The resulting research included electronic awareness of the mechanism of E-CRM factors driving the demand for electronic customer engagement.

Furthermore, the research assessed the influence of E-CRM on customer satisfaction, whereas the E-CRM also had a multi-dimensional impact on the customer dimensions. Dubey and Srivastava (2016) studied the quality of service and effects in the Indian communications industry on customer retention. The research finding was performance efficiency, concreteness, and confirmation with important and fundamental effects on customer relationships. Intangibility has a significant impact on customer loyalty. According to the structure model's founding, responsibility, tangibility, empathy, assurance, and reliability are considered the central part of Service Quality. Still, this study has limitations and failed to investigate user
satisfaction, and is still far from measuring E-CRM performance. Employee Satisfaction can significantly impact the effectiveness of companies by contributing to income optimization. Employee Satisfaction is a measurement of critical success and has an impact on the company's competitiveness.

Employee Satisfaction becomes one of the most important and significant professional concepts that the company cannot ignore. E-CRM efficiency depends on several main components, including technology, organization, and, from the individual perspective, the user aspect. Depending on the issues, there is a need for intervention to boost employee success via Employee Satisfaction. Consequently, this paper put the interest and resolve the gap in research. The metrics are adapted when assessing employees' output via the current E-CRM framework.

| Reference               | Previous works focused                              | Factors                                                                 | Outcome                                                                                   | Methodology   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Chang et al. (2014)     | Customer                                            | Customer loyalty and Customer-switching intention (CSI), Customer Privacy | E-CRM performance on customer                                                              | Questionnaires/ students |
| Ismail and Hussin (2016)| Customer                                            | Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty                                        | It indicates that almost all of the participants are happy with the E-services offered by the airlines in Malaysia and by this attitude of consumers; loyalty satisfaction and indirectly, both customer and business are forming successful relationships. | analysis technique |
| Alldaihani and Ali (2018)| Technology factors                                   | Website design, Privacy, Privacy and security, Delivery time             | Electronic Service Quality on customer                                                      | questionnaire |
| Soltani and Navimipour (2016)| Organization                                      | Organizational Capability                                               | Organization Performance                                                                   | questionnaire |
|                       | Customer                                            | Customer Orientation, Customer Knowledge Management                      | Customer retention                                                                         | questionnaires |
|                       | Technology                                           | Information Technology                                                  | Customer satisfaction, customer engagement, pricing                                        | interviews    |
|                       | customer                                             | Confidence, the appeal of replacements, pricing                          | Customer satisfaction with CRM, Overall customer loyalty                                  | interview     |
| Soltani and Navimipour (2016)| Social networking                                    | Communicative Contact, E-direct Mail, Expected Incentives               | Customer loyalty                                                                          | Review 507 of customers |
|                       | Social networking                                    | Customer Focus, Organizational Factors, Knowledge Management, Technology-based CRM, Distribution Channel. | Customer Satisfaction                                                                     | Reviewing paper |
|                       | Technology                                           | Sympathy, Ensure, Awareness, tangibility, and consistency.              | Customer loyalty                                                                          | survey        |
|                       | Service Quality                                      |                                                                           |                                                                                           |               |
|                       | Human                                                | Cognitive Loyalty, Affective Loyalty, Conative Loyalty, Action Loyalty   | Customer Loyalty and Satisfaction                                                          | 507 customers, |
|                       | Technology                                           | Pre—services transaction E-CRM, during service transaction E-CRM, post-service transaction E-CRM | E-customer Satisfaction                                                                   | 78 customers  |
|                       | Customers                                            | Service Quality, Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Customer Relationship Management Empathy | Customer Loyalty                                                                          | 262 customers |
|                       | Customer                                              | Customer companies, loyalty, implement control management                | Commerce companies                                                                         | customers     |
|                       | Implement E-CRM                                      | Customer loyalty, customer retention                                     | Customer profitability                                                                    | Customers     |
|                       | The research framework                               | Customer-based service attribute                                        | The study investigated the organization’s performance via factors of customer satisfaction, Trust, sales revenue, and investment output. | 684 customers |
|                       | Conceptual Framework                                 | CRM, Organizational performance                                         | The study's result supports the association between the Applicability of E-CRM and loyalty retention of customers. | questionnaire |
|                       | Model of this research                               | The study focused on customer loyalty and retention as dependent variables. | This outcome detects which most of the defendant is satisfied with the e-services offered by airlines in Malaysia. | 200 questionnaires |
|                       | Airline e-ticketing model                            | Web feature, promotion, loyalty program, and purchase cycle, boost booking, customer service. | The outcome of the study is a link between E-CRM and customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. | Interview     |
|                       | Customers                                            | Customer Satisfaction and customer loyalty factors.                     | The study that E-CRM is efficient at encouraging customer relations and promoting an appealing virtual community that further improves satisfaction. | Survey on customers |
|                       | Customers                                            | Cognitive Loyalty, Affective Loyalty, Conative Loyalty.                 |                                                                                           |               |
|                       | Proposed research                                    | Interpersonal Communication, Electronic                                 | The study result presented that customers                                                  | 507 customers |
5. Results

This phase presents the result of the systematic literature review process. After reviewing the previous studies dimension of the E-CRM system, this study lists all the selected papers and investigates the essential factors from the studies to meet the addressed study’s objective. The study would answer questions as presented in the following subsections.

5.1. Identify the challenges behind limited E-CRM successful

Adopting E-CRM is often seen as a solution to decrease the massive gap among both consumers and companies. E-CRM is becoming widespread in different world areas for local companies (Benitto and Kumar, 2015). The E-CRM in telecommunication companies is necessary to allow these companies to monitor the vast quantities of information (Anaam et al., 2020a; 2020b; Chavoshi et al., 2015). There is also a high percentage of E-CRM failures, and in the future, this number will be increased (Bhanu and Magiswary, 2010). More than 77% of E-CRM adoption does not succeed the company’s goals, and the rate of success E-CRM is low.

Hence, this provides interest for many academic researchers to investigate the high rate of unsuccessful E-CRM adoption. Previous works that studied the adoption of E-CRM systems in telecommunication companies stated that there are remaining problems that hinder the successful adoption of the E-CRM system (Chavoshi et al., 2015; Ishmael, 2015; Joshi and Sharma, 2015; Sunny and Abolaji, 2016). Furthermore, Bataineh (2015) suggested further investigation on E-CRM in the telecommunication area. Study on 700 firms, the author stated that significant problems behind the failure were organization change 29%, company policy 22%, and lack of CRM understanding 20%. The author also validated that the main issue of CRM failure is the lack of Top Management Support. Table 3 illustrates the summary of the key factors in the previous works.

5.2. Current study of critical success factors

Critical Success Factors are defined as the major measure of a company’s operations essential to its success (Alzaghali and Mukhtar, 2017). In this study, three factors are considered, (1) Technology, (2) Organization, (3) Individual. There is not much research that comprehensively examines the key success factors from the three antecedents in technology, organization, and individual relationships. This study intends to resolve this gap in the existing literature by integrating organizational, technical, and Employee Satisfaction in understanding the importance of Individual Performance to the E-CRM’s successful adoption, specifically in telecommunication companies.

Furthermore, there is not much research that incorporates three-dimension antecedents to examine the performance of E-CRM. Al-Wesha et al. (2019) suggested that academic research on E-CRM efficiency, especially in telecommunication, has poorly been published. Therefore, more empirical
studies are needed to bridge this shortcoming (Anaam et al., 2018). Many studies have investigated the effect of CSFs on E-CRM. The key factors reported by the past researchers depend on their specific research objectives. A collection merely from one dimension would support just a small percentage of success factors that lead to efficient E-CRM adoption within the company.

### Table 3: Critical success factor

| Authors/Years                     | Service Quality | System Quality | Information Quality | Top Management Support | Training | Ease of Use | Skills | Computer it-self | Computer Experience | Perceived Usefulness | Employee Satisfaction |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|-------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| (Zhou et al., 2010)               | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 | X                   |                     |                       |
| (Urbach et al., 2010)             |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     | X                   |                       |
| (Khaligh et al., 2012)            |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Siegel, 2008)                    |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Liang et al., 2009)              | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Hosseiniannazadeh, 2015)         |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Yee et al., 2008)                | X               | X              |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Leong et al., 2013)              | X               | X              |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Lee et al., 2013)                |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Naari and Charfeddine, 2012)     |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Khaligh et al., 2012)            |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Chen and Chen, 2010)             |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 | X                   |                     |                       |
| (Johna, 2015)                     |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Petter et al., 2013)             |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Tam and Oliveira, 2016)          | X               | X              |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Shinglas et al., 2008)           | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Kabak and Dogac, 2010)           |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Li and Mao, 2012)                |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Gruen et al., 2008)              | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (ALHussan et al., 2014)           |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Petter et al., 2008)             | X               | X              | X                  |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Hannachi, 2015)                  |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Yang et al., 2010)               |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Ahmad et al., 2011)              |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Abdulhadi et al., 2014)          | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Hosseiniannazadeh, 2015)         |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Chuchuen and Chuvavath, 2011)    | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Grandhi and Chugh, 2012)         |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Petter et al., 2008)             | X               | X              | X                  |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Hosseiniannazadeh, 2015)         |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (D’ambra and Wilson, 2004)        | X               | X              | X                  |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Seddon, 1997)                    | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Liu and Arnett, 2000)            |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Kassim, 2006)                    |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Mohamad, 2013)                   |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Kim et al., 2004)                | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Maillet et al., 2015)            |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Tam and Oliveira, 2016)          | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Akinmuwesi et al., 2013)         |                 |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |
| (Abdulhadi et al., 2014)          | X               |                |                    |                        |          |             |        |                 |                     |                     |                       |

#### 5.3. Identified critical success factors

This section identifies the factors from the past theories. Critical Success Factors can help an organization determine the key for success or failure for the organization’s needs. There are many key factors from the literature that can be adopted. This method is used vastly in different business fields and is stated in many academic types of research. EUCE, TAM3, UTAUT, LR, and IS theory have been applied in this research to assist the framework modeling. Table 4 shows the factor from each of the theories.

#### 5.4. Design items from previous studies

All questionnaire items were adopted from the previous work related to the context of each factor, as shown in Table 5.

#### 5.5. Research questionnaire design

The data will be collected through questionnaires. A questionnaire is a set of standardized questions, often called items. The questionnaires were sent to employers of the telecommunication companies to determine the views and validate the variables used.
in this study. Questionnaires can assist the researchers in evaluating and comparing with other studies, and they can be used to determine the respondents' attitudes regarding a hypothesis. The questionnaire was designed based on a closed and open question that allowed respondents to provide accurate answers to each question. The questionnaire was designed so that it would not take much time. A brief description of the research objective and focus was given before the respondents began answering the questions. This is to help the responders to answer accurately for each item. All questionnaire items were adapted from the previous studies' work related to each factor's context. Five Likert scaling methods (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat, agree, strongly agree) were used for this questionnaire to determine the agreement level of the responders. Table 6 presents the items of the study.

| Table 4: Adopted theories |
|--------------------------|
| No | Theory | Factors |
|----|--------|---------|
| 1  | Update DeLone and Mckean theory | System Quality, Service Quality, and information |
| 2  | EUCE theory | Top management, Training, Experience, Employee Satisfaction |
| 3  | TAM 3 | Ease of Use, Self-Efficacy, Perceived Usefulness |
| 4  | UTAUT | Experience, age, gender, education |
| 5  | L.R. | Skills |

| Table 5: Design items |
|-----------------------|
| Factor | Items | Resource |
|--------|-------|----------|
| System Quality | 5 | (Tam and Oliveira, 2016) |
| Information Quality | 6 | (Tam and Oliveira, 2016) |
| Service Quality | 7 | (Chang and Thai, 2016; Alanezi et al., 2012) |
| Top Management Support | 6 | (Croteau and Li, 2003) |
| Training | 3 | (Avlonitis and Panagopoulos, 2005) |
| Ease of Use | 6 | (Vella and Caruana, 2012) |
| Skills | 4 | (Nguyen and Waring, 2013) |
| Computer Experience | 5 | (Avlonitis and Panagopoulos, 2005; Chen and Chen, 2010) |
| Computer Self-Efficacy | 5 | (Venkatesh, 2000) |
| Perceive usefulness | 7 | (Vella and Caruana, 2012) |
| Employee's satisfaction | 6 | (Vella and Caruana, 2012; Avlonitis and Panagopoulos, 2005) |
| Individual Performance | 5 | (Tam and Oliveira, 2016; Hart et al., 2004) |

| Table 6: Items |
|----------------|
| Variables | Items | Recourse | Variable |
| E-CRM system has a high level of operational efficiency. | System Quality | The E-CRM system works without crashing. | (Tam and Oliveira, 2016) |
| E-CRM system services are always timely. | E-CRM system is always available for use. | (Chang and Thai, 2016; Alanezi et al., 2012) |
| E-CRM system provides dependable services. | E-CRM system provides data that is suitable for my tasks. |
| Services provided by the E-CRM system can respond to my needs. | E-CRM system is available to provide information and reports of services. |
| E-CRM system provides services that are free from errors. | E-CRM system provides an easy method to search for information. | (Olupot et al., 2014) |
| E-CRM system services are always available. | I am adequately trained to understand using the E-CRM system. |
| E-CRM system provides the right services. | The company provides external Training. |
| E-CRM system provides accurate information. | The company regularly provides suitable Training for the entire business task of the system. |
| The E-CRM system provides reliable information. | The E-CRM system is easy to learn. |
| The E-CRM system provides timeliness information. | The E-CRM system is easy to use. | (Tam and Oliveira, 2016) |
| E-CRM system provides relevant information to my needs. | The E-CRM system is clear and understandable. | (Vella and Caruana, 2012) |
| The E-CRM system provides complete information. | The E-CRM system is controllable. |
| E-CRM system provides useful information. | The E-CRM system is flexible. |
| Top management provides the facilities for E-CRM system success. | The E-CRM system makes it easy for me to become skillful. |
| Top management is interested in the E-CRM system function. | I consider myself an expert in using a computer. | (John, 2017; Croteau and Li, 2003) |
| Top management understands the importance of the E-CRM system. | My Experience helped me to increase my level of satisfaction with the use of the E-CRM system. | (Avlonitis and Panagopoulos, 2005; Hart et al., 2004; Chen and Chen, 2010) |
| Top management always encourages the use of the E-CRM system for job-related work. | My Experience contributes to increased performance with the use of the E-CRM system. |
| Top management understands E-CRM system opportunities. | My Experience helped me to do my work quickly and efficiently. |
5.6. Descriptive statistics

Qualitative analysis can be demonstrated statistically as the likelihood of approval and disapproval (Reimann et al., 2010). Sekaran and Bougie (2003) mentioned descriptive statistics illustrated by the standardized of important propensity and frequency for any indicator dependent on the characteristic of data gathered. The current study has been adopted to explain the new study outcomes statistically. There are descriptive statistics evaluated for every element (System Quality, Service Quality, Information Quality, Top Management Support, Training, Ease of Use, Skills, Experience, Self-Efficacy, Employee Satisfaction, Perceived Usefulness, and Individual Performance). Table 7 displays the descriptive statistics, Skewness ≥2 and Kurtosis ≥2, Corrected item-total Correlation ≥0.30, Cronbach’s Alpha if Item deleted ≥0.70 for each set of factors among employees. The employers were asked to present their viewpoints which have been calculated on a 5-point Likert scale range from 1 for strongly disagree to 8 for strongly agree. Table 8 shows cross Loading and Fig. 4 shows outer loading of formative measurement loading.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics

| Items of                | Respondents | Mean | Standard Deviation | Rank | Skewness ≥2 | Kurtosis ≥2 | Corrected Item-Total Correlation ≥0.30 | Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted ≥0.70 |
|-------------------------|-------------|------|--------------------|------|-------------|------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| System Quality (SQ)     | SQ1         | 3.24 | .971               | 5    | -.049       | -.273      | .577                                   | .826                                 |
|                         | SQ2         | 3.40 | .709               | 4    | -.675       | .472       | .665                                   | .801                                 |
|                         | SQ3         | 3.82 | .823               | 1    | -.345       | .185       | .674                                   | .798                                 |
|                         | SQ4         | 3.59 | .948               | 3    | -.166       | -.667      | .721                                   | .782                                 |
|                         | SQ5         | 3.73 | .890               | 2    | -.397       | -.117      | .590                                   | .820                                 |
|                         | Overall Mean Score | 3.55 | .08 | Overall Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) | 3.38 |
| Service Quality         | IQ1         | 3.50 | 1.120              | 6    | -.431       | -.426      | .728                                   | .874                                 |
|                         | IQ2         | 3.62 | 1.098              | 5    | -.530       | -.506      | .769                                   | .867                                 |
|                         | IQ3         | 3.82 | 1.050              | 5    | -.549       | -.606      | .835                                   | .856                                 |
|                         | IQ4         | 3.78 | 1.002              | 3    | -.665       | .220       | .714                                   | .876                                 |
|                         | IQ5         | 3.77 | .971               | 4    | -.446       | -.461      | .655                                   | .884                                 |
|                         | IQ6         | 3.90 | .873               | 1    | -.390       | -.189      | .598                                   | .892                                 |
|                         | Overall Mean Score | 3.735 | 1.019 | Overall Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) | .894 |
| Top Management Support  | SERQ1       | 3.50 | .931               | 5    | -.426       | .347       | .570                                   | .821                                 |
|                         | SERQ2       | 3.59 | .799               | 4    | -.851       | -.494      | .567                                   | .823                                 |
|                         | SERQ3       | 3.64 | .852               | 3    | -.258       | -.506      | .592                                   | .819                                 |
|                         | SERQ4       | 3.83 | .848               | 1    | -.390       | -.232      | .495                                   | .832                                 |
|                         | SERQ5       | 3.47 | 1.203              | 6    | -.488       | -.612      | .628                                   | .815                                 |
|                         | SERQ6       | 3.42 | 1.167              | 7    | -.529       | -.448      | .717                                   | .797                                 |
|                         | SERQ7       | 3.71 | .991               | 2    | -.318       | -.592      | .616                                   | .815                                 |
|                         | Overall Mean Score | 3.594 | 0.955 | Overall Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) | .840 |
| Training                | TM1         | 3.36 | .908               | 6    | .119        | -.750      | .498                                   | .875                                 |
|                         | TM2         | 3.71 | .849               | 4    | -.340       | -.419      | .740                                   | .835                                 |
|                         | TM3         | 3.69 | 1.092              | 5    | -.578       | -.322      | .684                                   | .847                                 |
|                         | TM4         | 3.94 | .925               | 1    | -.486       | -.653      | .681                                   | .844                                 |
|                         | TM5         | 3.72 | .847               | 3    | -.295       | -.141      | .700                                   | .842                                 |
|                         | TM6         | 3.78 | .803               | 2    | -.250       | -.386      | .743                                   | .836                                 |
|                         | Overall Mean Score | 3.70 | .902 | Overall Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) | .869 |
| Ease of Use             | EOU1        | 3.64 | 1.056              | 6    | -.613       | -.179      | .618                                   | .861                                 |
|                         | EOU2        | 3.83 | .769               | 4    | -.400       | -.449      | .769                                   | .830                                 |
|                         | EOU3        | 3.84 | .849               | 3    | -.355       | -.467      | .762                                   | .831                                 |
|                         | EOU4        | 3.86 | .830               | 2    | -.121       | -.818      | .662                                   | .849                                 |
|                         | EOU5        | 3.79 | .808               | 5    | -.435       | -.435      | .557                                   | .866                                 |
Table 3: Cross loading

| CSE  | (EOU) | (ES) | (IP) | (SK) | (SE) | (CF) | (IP) | (OP) | (SERQ) | (SQ) | (TF) | (TMS) | (T) |
|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|-------|----|
| CSE1 | 0.500 | 0.432 | 0.453 | 0.481 | 0.424 | 0.439 | 0.497 | 0.371 | 0.514 | 0.578 | 0.618 | 0.559 | 0.507 |
| CSE2 | 0.456 | 0.314 | 0.380 | 0.284 | 0.381 | 0.591 | 0.840 | 0.544 | 0.258 | 0.475 | 0.158 | 0.476 | 0.352 |
| CSE3 | 0.476 | 0.228 | 0.328 | 0.234 | 0.381 | 0.284 | 0.891 | 0.602 | 0.371 | 0.370 | 0.087 | 0.410 | 0.277 |
| CSE4 | 0.559 | 0.247 | 0.412 | 0.326 | 0.497 | 0.714 | 0.904 | 0.689 | 0.515 | 0.416 | 0.162 | 0.427 | 0.352 |
| CSE5 | 0.561 | 0.371 | 0.596 | 0.353 | 0.537 | 0.540 | 0.755 | 0.797 | 0.558 | 0.569 | 0.491 | 0.609 | 0.574 |
| CSE6 | 0.720 | 0.464 | 0.556 | 0.495 | 0.508 | 0.504 | 0.463 | 0.713 | 0.449 | 0.455 | 0.281 | 0.459 | 0.487 |
| CSE7 | 0.476 | 0.247 | 0.328 | 0.234 | 0.381 | 0.284 | 0.891 | 0.602 | 0.371 | 0.370 | 0.087 | 0.410 | 0.277 |
| CSE8 | 0.559 | 0.247 | 0.412 | 0.326 | 0.497 | 0.714 | 0.904 | 0.689 | 0.515 | 0.416 | 0.162 | 0.427 | 0.352 |
| CSE9 | 0.561 | 0.371 | 0.596 | 0.353 | 0.537 | 0.540 | 0.755 | 0.797 | 0.558 | 0.569 | 0.491 | 0.609 | 0.574 |
| CSE10 | 0.720 | 0.464 | 0.556 | 0.495 | 0.508 | 0.504 | 0.463 | 0.713 | 0.449 | 0.455 | 0.281 | 0.459 | 0.487 |
| CSE11 | 0.476 | 0.247 | 0.328 | 0.234 | 0.381 | 0.284 | 0.891 | 0.602 | 0.371 | 0.370 | 0.087 | 0.410 | 0.277 |
| CSE12 | 0.559 | 0.247 | 0.412 | 0.326 | 0.497 | 0.714 | 0.904 | 0.689 | 0.515 | 0.416 | 0.162 | 0.427 | 0.352 |

Overall Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha): 0.89
5.7. Cross loadings

The Cross Loading approach is to identify those that have high loadings on the same construct and those that load highly on multiple constructs. To have adequate discriminant validity, the loading of any assessed item on its equivalent construct should be maximum or its loading on another construct. This provides the measuring objects of a construct are scaling their construct. This standard’s satisfaction with each of the measure items load highly on their constructs but not as high on the other construct. The loading detached any potential factor, as hypothesized in the conceptual model. Thus, the cross-loading finding specific that the calculation of the measurement system integrand reliability had been assured. The Cross-Loading review emphasizes which the complete elements for the same construct are poorer than other constructs in the model and stronger about its corresponding construct. The instances of this study are shown in Table 8. In the first instance, CE1, CE2, CE3, CE4, and CE5 load in height on its corresponding construct: Computer Experience (CE) but much lesser on other theories. The second instance is that IF1, IF2, IF3, and IF4 load high on its analogous construct: Individual Factors (IF) but much lower on other constructs. The third example is the EO11, EO12, EO13, EO14, EO15, and EO16 load high on their representative construct EOU (Ease of Use) but much lower on other constructs. As presented in Table 8, the cross-loading criterion meets the requirements due to the indicator’s external loadings on construct are higher than all its cross-loadings with other constructs (in bold). In other words, analysis of cross-loading in the current research confirms that the discriminant validity for the hypothesized model has been established and satisfied.

5.8. Outer loading of formative measurement loading

The first G factor is the Technology Factors with sub-factors such as System Quality (SQ), Information Quality (IQ), and Service Quality (SERQ). The second G factor is the Organization Factors with sub-factors, namely: Top Management Support (TM) and Training (T). The third G factor is the Individual Factors with four subfactors: Easy to Use (EOU), Skills (SK), Computer Experience (CE), and Computer Self-Efficacy (CSE). Fig. 4 verifies the first-order frameworks’ parameters that are concentrating on loadings, STDDEV, T-Values, P-Values, and assuredness intervals bias-corrected. Every construction with its particular components is referred to in the first order. The importance of loading or relationships is presented as T-Values ~1.964 and T-Values <0.05. Confidence intervals (CI) bias-corrected is often used to assist the significance of the loading. The lower limit (LL) of CI and the upper boundary (UL) confirms that the loading value or the correlation is significant if either positive or negative (LL:UL) boundary is found. If one of them is helpful, whereas the other is negative, the relationship is not statistically significant. The second/hierarchical/higher-order constructions in Fig. 4 prove statistically significant since they are located in the same positives on T-Values=1.964, T-Values <0.05, Lower Limit (LL), and Upper Limit (UL).

6. Discussion

This systematic review aims to define and identify critical key factors (CSF) that have highly and significantly influenced successful E-CRM adoption. It also investigates, analyzes, and measures the CSFs. The paper does the coverage of many academic researchers in the field. An inclusive initial list of Critical Success Factors was improved by...
The initial E-CRM key factors list was improved to include five factors that have a significant influence on the E-CRM successful adoption in telecommunication companies. The classification for E-CRM key factors was categorized into thirty dimensions of CSFs: Technology Factors (Information Quality, System Quality, and Service Quality), Organization Factors (Top Management Support and Training), and finally Individual Factors (Skills, Ease of Use, Experience, and Self-Efficacy). The results of analysis using Descriptive Statistics, Cross Loadings, and Outer Loading of Formative Measurement Loading supported that those factors significantly contribute to success E-CRM adoption.

**7. Conclusion**

This study attempts to identify the Critical Success Factors of E-CRM adoption. It also discovers the obstacles and the reason for the failure of the E-CRM system by focusing on the Critical Success Factors. This paper starts with determining the
major challenges behind the successful E-CRM adaption. This study identifies the challenges and key Critical Success Factors on telecommunication companies under Technology, Organization, and Individual factors with regards to Employee Satisfaction. Based on the critical analysis of the previous related works, this study developed the questionnaires and examined the relationship between those factors. Finally, the findings of this study are discussed to highlight the key Critical Success Factors to accomplish a successful E-CRM system for telecommunication companies.

**Acknowledgment**

This research is carried out under the Network and Communication Technology Lab, Center for Cyber Security (CYBER), www.ftsm.ukm.my/cybersecurity, Faculty of Information Science and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.

**Compliance with ethical standards**

**Conflict of interest**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**References**

Abdullateef AO, Muktar SSM, Yusoff RZ, and Ahmad ISB (2014). Effects of customer relationship management strategy on call centre’s employee intention to quit: Evidence from Malaysia call centers. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 130: 305-315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.036

Ahmad K, Madhoush Z, and Yusof MM (2011). Dominant success factors for Knowledge Management in academic institution. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology, 32(2): 152-159.

Akinmuswei BA, Uzoka FM, Olatubuyi SO, Omidiora EO, and Fidzi P (2013). An empirical analysis of end-user participation in software development projects in a developing country context. The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries, 58(1): 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2013.tb00413.x

Alanezi MA, Mahmood AK, and Basri S (2012). E-government service quality: A qualitative evaluation in the case of Saudi Arabia. The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries, 54(1): 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2012.tb00382.x

Aklahani FM and Ali NA (2018). Effect of electronic customer relationship management on electronic service quality provided by the commercial banks in Kuwait. International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences, 8(2): 143-154. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v8i2/4239

ALHussan F, AL-Husan F, and Fletcher-Chen C (2014). Environmental factors influencing the management of key accounts in an Arab Middle Eastern context. Industrial Management Marketing, 43(4): 592-602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2014.02.008

Alim S and Ozuem W (2014). The influences of e-CRM on customer satisfaction and loyalty in the UK mobile industry. Journal of Applied Business and Finance Researches, 3(2): 47-54.

Allozi A, Alryalat H, and Hadi WE (2016). Applying electronic customer processes to electronic customer retention (field study in Jordanian telecommunication sector). International Journal of Business and Management, 11: 152-163. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbvr.v11n1p52

Al-Weshah GA, Al-Manaraih E, and Al-Qatawneh M (2019). Customer relationship management systems and organizational performance: Quantitative evidence from the Jordanian telecommunication industry. Journal of Marketing Communications, 25(8): 799-819. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2018.1449007

Alzaghil Q and Mulhwar M (2017). Factors affecting the success of incubators and the moderating role of information and communication technologies. International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology, 7(2): 538-545. https://doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.7.2.1678

Anaam EA, Bakar KAA, and Satar NSM (2020b). A model of electronic customer relationship management system adoption in telecommunication companies. Amazonia Investig, 9(35): 61-73. https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2020.03.11.5

Anaam EA, Bakar KAA, Satar NSM, and Ma’arif MY (2020a). Investigating the electronic customer relationship management success key factors in the telecommunication companies: A pilot study. Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience, 17(2–3): 1460-1463. https://doi.org/10.1166/jctn.2020.8825

Anaam EA, Khairel A, Abu Bakar NS, and Mohd S (2018). A theoretical review of conceptual model for E-CRM success in telecommunication companies. International Journal of Engineering and Technology, 7(4): 6381-6390.

Avlonitis G and Panagopoulos N (2005). Antecedents and consequences of CRM technology acceptance in the sales force. Industrial Marketing Management, 34(4): 355-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.09.021

Bataineh AQ (2015). The effect of eCRM practices on eWOM on banks’ SNSs: The mediating role of customer satisfaction. International Business Research, 8(5): 230-243. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v8n5p230

Benitto JJ and Kumar JS (2015). Impact of e-CRM on customer satisfaction, loyalty and retention: Case of Le Meridan, Combatore. International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review, 3(11): 124-129.

Bhanu F and Magiswary D (2010). Electronic customer relationship management systems (E-CRM): A knowledge management perspective. In the International Conference on Education and Management Technology, IIEE, Cairo, Egypt: 409-413. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEMT.2010.5657629

Bohling T, Bowman D, LaValle S, Mittal V, Narayandas D, Ramani G, and Varadarajan R (2006). CRM implementation: Effectiveness issues and insights. Journal of Service Research, 9(2): 184-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670506293573

Chang CH and Thai VV (2016). Do port security quality and service quality influence customer satisfaction and loyalty? Maritime Policy and Management, 43(6): 720-735. https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2016.1151086

Chang HH, Wong KH, and Fang PW (2014). The effects of customer relationship management relational information processes on customer-based performance. Decision Support Systems, 66: 146-159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2014.06.010

Chang I, Hwang HG, Hung MC, Lin MH, and Yen DC (2007). Factors affecting the adoption of perspective of hospital electronic signature: Executives’ information department. Decision Support Systems, 44(1): 350-359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2007.04.006

PMID:32287564 PMCID:PMC7114195
Hosseini, M. (2015). A framework for e-CRM implementation in health service industry of a developing country. International Journal of Engineering and Innovative Technology, 4(8): 20-26.

Chung, T.M., Liao, L.L., and Hsiao, W.F. (2005). An empirical study on the e-CRM performance influence model for service sectors in Taiwan. In the IEEE International Conference on e-Technology, e-Commerce and e-Service, IEE, Hong Kong, China: 240-245. https://doi.org/10.1109/EIEE.2005.33

Chavoshi, M., Tze, A., and Jee, M.H. (2015). A CRM adoption model for Malaysian telecommunication and finance companies. Journal of Information Systems Research and Innovation, 9(2): 119-125.

Chen, C.F. and Chen, F.S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. Tourism Management, 31(1): 29-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008

Chen, H., Li, L., and Chen, Y. (2021). Explore success factors that impact artificial intelligence adoption on telecom industry in China. Journal of Management Analytics, 8(1): 36-68. https://doi.org/10.1080/23720012.2020.1858295

Chuang, S. and Lin, H. (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(2): 271-281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.12.003

Chucuén C and Chantarashut P. (2011). The adoption factors of E-CRM in service sector of Thai SMEs. In the 2nd International Proceedings of Networking and Information Technology IPCIST, 17: 350-355.

Croteau AM and Li P. (2003). Critical success factors of CRM technological initiatives. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 20(1): 21-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1356-4490.2003.tb00303.x

D'ambría J and Wilson CS. (2004). Use of the World Wide Web for international travel: integrating the construct of uncertainty in information seeking and the task-technology fit (TTF) model. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 55(8): 731-742. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20107

Dubey A and Srivastava AK. (2016). Impact of service quality on customer loyalty: A study on telecom sector in India. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 18(2): 45-55.

Dubhílela J and Molise-Khosa P. (2014). Impact of e-CRM implementation on customer loyalty, customer retention and customer profitability for hotelsiers along the Vaal Meander of South Africa. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(16): 175-183. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n16p175

Fjermestad J and Romano NC. (2003). Electronic customer relationship management: Revisiting the general principles of usability and resistance—An integrative implementation framework. Business Process Management Journal, 9(5): 572-591. https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150310496695

Grandi S and Chugh R. (2012). Strategic value of mobile CRM applications: A review of mobile CRM at dogorning and DirectTV. International Proceedings of Computer Science and Information Technology, 36(2): 388-393.

Green TW, Summers J, and Acito F. (2000). Relationship marketing activities, commitment, and membership behaviors in professional associations. Journal of Marketing, 64(3): 34-49. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.43.3.34.18030

Hannachi R. (2015). Information quality in customer relationship management. Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 15: 6E.

Hart, S., Hogg, G., and Banerjee, M. (2004). Does the level of experience have an effect on CRM programs? Exploratory research findings. Industrial Marketing Management, 33(6): 549-560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.01.007

Hosseini, M.B., and Bideh, A.Z. (2013). Providing a multidimensional measurement model for assessing mobile telecommunication service quality (MS-QUAL). Iranian Journal of Management Studies, 6(2): 7-29.
on performance. Journal of Relationship Marketing, 12(4): 301-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332667.2013.846204

Leong LY, Ooi KB, Chong AYL, and Lin B (2013). Modeling the stimulators of the behavioral intention to use mobile entertainment: Does gender really matter? Computers in Human Behavior, 29(5): 2109-2121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.004

Li L and Mao JY (2012). The effect of CRM use on internal sales management control: An alternative mechanism to realize CRM benefits. Information and Management, 49(6): 269-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2012.09.005

Liang TP, Chen HY, and Turban E (2009). Effect of personalization on the perceived usefulness of online customer services: A dual-core theory. In the 11th International Conference on Electronic Commerce, Association for Computing Machinery, Taipei, Taiwan: 279-288. https://doi.org/10.1145/1593254.1593296

Liu C and Arnett KP (2000). Exploring the factors associated with Web site success in the context of electronic commerce. Information and Management, 38(1): 23-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(00)00049-5

Maillet É, Mathieu L, and Sicotte C (2015). Modeling factors explaining the acceptance, actual use and satisfaction of nurses using an electronic patient record in acute care settings: An extension of the UTAUT. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 84(1): 36-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.09.004

PMid:25288192

Mang’umyi EE, Khabala OT, and Govender KK (2017). Exploring the e-adoption of electronic customer relationship management (CRM) technology in SMEs: An extension of the TRA/TPA model. International Journal of Electronic Business, 15(2): 129-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747468.2017.1319748

Maillet É, Mathieu L, and Sicotte C (2015). Modeling factors explaining the acceptance, actual use and satisfaction of nurses using an electronic patient record in acute care settings: An extension of the UTAUT. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 84(1): 36-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.09.004

PMid:25288192

Mang’umyi EE, Khabala OT, and Govender KK (2017). Exploring the e-adoption of electronic customer relationship management (CRM) technology in SMEs: An extension of the TRA/TPA model. International Journal of Electronic Business, 15(2): 129-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747468.2017.1319748

Salehi S, Kheyrumand M, and Faraghian H (2015). Evaluation of the effects of e-CRM on customer loyalty (Case study: Esfahan Branch of Sepah Bank). In the 9th International Conference on e-Commerce in Developing Countries: With Focus on e-Business (ECD). IEEE, Isfahan, Iran: 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1109/ECD2015.7156314

Seddon PB (1997). A respecification and extension of the DeLone and McLean model of IS success. Information Systems Research, 8(3): 240-253. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.8.3.240

Sekaran U and Bougie R (2003). Research methods for business, a skill building approach. John Willey and Sons, New York, USA.

Shoniregun CA, Omoguen A, Brown-West D, and Logynovskiy O (2004). Can eCRM and trust improve e-C customer base? In the International Conference on e-Commerce Technology, IEEE, San Diego, USA: 303-310. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICETC.2004.1319748

Siegel D (2008). Accepting technology and overcoming resistance to change using the motivation and acceptance model. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA.

Sivaraks P, Krairit D, and Tang JC (2011). Effects of e-CRM on customer–bank relationship quality and outcomes: The case of Thailand. The Journal of High Technology Management Research, 22(2): 141-157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhitech.2011.09.006

Soltani Z and Navimipoj SJ (2016). Customer relationship management mechanisms: A systematic review of the state of the art literature and recommendations for future research. Computers in Human Behavior, 61: 667-688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.008

Sunny EE and Abolaji OS (2016). Electronic customer relationship management (E-CRM) and marketing performance: Empirical evidence from Nigeria telecom sector. Journal of Economics, Management and Trade, 11(1): 1-14. https://doi.org/10.9734/BJEMT/2016/19924

Tam C and Oliveira T (2016). Understanding the impact of m banking on individual performance: DeLone and McLean and TTF perspective. Computers in Human Behavior, 61: 233-244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.016

Tan TL and Trang DTV (2017). Successful factors of implementation electronic customer relationship management (e-CRM) on e-commerce company. American Journal of Software Engineering and Applications, 5(5): 121-127. https://doi.org/10.11649/ajsea.20170605.12

Toyese AY (2014). Customer relationship management and customer loyalty in Nigerian telecomunication industry. The Business and Management Review, 4(3): 43-50.

Urbach N, Smolnik S, and Riemp G (2010). An empirical investigation of employee portal success. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 19(3): 184-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2010.06.002

Veila J and Caruana A (2012). Encouraging CRM systems usage: A study among bank managers. Management Research News, 35(2): 121-133. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211195152

Venkatesh V (2000). Determinants of perceived ease of use: Integrating control, intrinsic motivation and emotion into the technology acceptance model. Information Systems Research, 11(4): 342-365. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.11.4.342.11872
Vujic D, Stanujičić D, Urošević S, and Karabašević D (2016). An approach to leader selection in the mining industry based on the use of weighted sum preferred levels of the performances method. Mining and Metallurgy Engineering Bor, (4): 53-62. https://doi.org/10.5937/mmeb1604053V

Wang S, Cavusoglu H, and Deng Z (2016). Early mover advantage in e-commerce platforms with low entry barriers: The role of customer relationship management capabilities. Information and Management, 53(2): 197-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2015.09.011

Yang Z, Jun M, and Peterson RT (2010). Measuring customer perceived online service quality: Scale development and managerial implications. International Journal of Operations and Production Management, 24(11): 1149-1174. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570410563278

Yazdani M, Chatterjee P, Montero-Simo MJ, and Araque-Padilla RA (2019). An integrated multi-attribute model for evaluation of sustainable mobile phone. Sustainability, 11(13): 3704. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133704

Yee RW, Yeung AC, and Cheng TE (2008). The impact of employee satisfaction on quality and profitability in high-contact service industries. Journal of Operations Management, 26(5): 651-668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2008.01.001

Zhou T, Lu Y, and Wang B (2010). Integrating TTF and UTAUT to explain mobile banking user adoption. Computers in Human Behavior, 26(4): 760-767. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.01.013