

Organizational Climate and Customer Relationship Management in a Cooperative

Rienier S. Vergara, DBA¹, Eliand Rey C. Soliman, LPT, DBA²

¹Instructor, College of Business and Management, Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology

²Professor, College of Business and Accountancy, Silay Institute Inc.

Abstract

Members are the primary customers and lifeblood of multi-purpose cooperatives. This study aimed to determine the extent of organizational climate and customer relationship management among members of a Multi-Purpose Cooperative in Negros Occidental. This study is anchored in Social Exchange Theory and Relationship Management theory. The researchers conducted a quantitative study between November 2021 and March 2022 with 347 members. The researchers used descriptive, comparative, and correlational methods. The result indicates a great extent in both organizational climate and customer relationship management based on the responses of the members. The study found a high association between organizational climate and customer relationship management. The researchers conclude that the multi-purpose cooperatives emphasized the benefits and well-being of their members which enhances their organizational climate perspective by providing quality and innovative service through customer relationship management.

Keywords: Business Administration, Organizational Climate, Customer Relationship Management, Multi-Purpose Cooperative, Quantitative Research, Negros Occidental, Philippines.

Introduction

Cooperatives are legal entities based on the principle of kinship, which consists of all members of natural or legal persons for the welfare of their members (Manurung & Purba, 2019). Members are cooperatives' core customers (Benos et al., 2018; Birchall, 2010). Members have multiple roles as owners and customers or users, so the sustainability of a cooperative business depends on members' participation (Trisuladana & Suparman, 2017). Cooperatives are known for requiring high levels of participation, striving toward community, and making space for affective relationships among their members (Sobering, 2021). They differ in horizontal and vertical communications intensity, innovation policies, and their centralization of decision-making power (Peng et al., 2018). The interaction between individuals and organizations forms perception, directly influencing commitment (Chanpoom & Intrawong, 2019; Guo, 2018).

Organizational climate is currently of interest to almost all companies, including cooperatives, due to their influence on organizational and psychological processes, such as communication, decision-making, problem-solving, learning, motivation, and its impact on the efficiency of the organization and the satisfaction of its members (Armenteros et al., 2020). It looks at the recurring patterns of behavior,

attitudes, and feelings that characterize life in the organization (Lenberg et al., 2015). That focused on how members of the organization perceive their environment and interactions (Sawan et al., 2017).

Cooperatives are similar to other businesses, especially regarding facilities, functions, practices, and structures that elect a board of directors that establishes a vision and develops broad policies for the organizations; both structures have a management team to oversee daily operations and implement policies (Widjojo, 2018). Structures are mechanisms that define how transactions are configured and can occur via market, hierarchy, or arrangements of various forms (Baumol & Williamson, 1986; Pereira et al., 2022).

Reward demonstrates the original motivation toward consensus among all stakeholders to equally contribute to implementing the organization's sustainability (Kadariusman & Herabadi, 2018). Reward systems help realize organizational goals and objectives and act as a powerful tool that may increase members' efficiency (Omolawal & Bawalla, 2017).

The most important dimension of organizational climate was the sense of warmth and support (Lipińska-Grobelny, 2021). The stronger the feeling of warmth and support, the better the organization (Sajithaparvin & Dawood, 2019).

An organization comprises different individuals, teams, and groups, which has distinct personality, opinion, values, perceptions, and views that arise as a result of different opinion, ideas, and values, which does not necessarily mean violence and fights; conflict is part of the organization (Khayat, 2016). Conflicts are inevitable in any organization (Muthoni & Muathe, 2021).

Organizational identity uniquely and directly affects the cooperative organization (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2018). It is a significant challenge for many social enterprises like cooperatives (Cornelissen et al., 2021). Many organizations are adopting culture management, including ethics, to meet social demands (Martínez et al., 2021). Ethical practices significantly impact any organization (Ononogbo et al., 2016).

On the other hand, Customer Relationship Management is a strategy that attracts, retains, and elevates clients (Mena & Zaveri, 2020). A most effective approach to maintaining and creating a relationship with customers who are also cooperative members. (Singh et al., 2017). Customer relationship management seeks to improve customer satisfaction, loyalty, and profitability by acquiring, developing, and maintaining effective customer relationships and stakeholder interactions (Baashar et al., 2020). That enables a firm organizational behavior rapid adaptation to changes occurring in the market; thus, the organization will be able to satisfy the wishes and demands of much better clients (Radut & Spinciu, 2016). An essential segment of every business, including cooperatives (Lambert, 2009; Wareewanich et al., 2019).

The value-based approach to strategy argues that a firm's ability to capture value depends on the extent of its added value (Chatain, 2011; Ma et al., 2021). Organizations need to understand the drivers of value creation for clients to make competitive positioning decisions and understand when they can capture value under competition (Chatain & Mindruta, 2017).

The challenges of dealing with empowered customers mean creating and delivering relevant customer service experience is crucial (Ceesay, 2020). With customer-centricity becoming a critical success factor, companies must drive customer satisfaction through excellent products and customer-centric processes (Kreuzer et al., 2020).

Developing a technology-based CRM is the best way to facilitate the organization in expanding its operation (Hendrayati & Karimah Syahidah, 2018). Organizations should use CRM-based technology to analyze customer information and design customized products (Sofi et al., 2020).

In light of the above scenario, a study focusing on cooperative members' perception of organizational climate and customer relationship management is significant. Various literature reveals that while enough information exists in cooperatives, very little literature exists in the Philippines regarding organizational climate and customer relationships in a multi-purpose cooperative.

Thus, the researchers found this study relevant as well as timely. This study demonstrates the researchers' interest in the field of multi-purpose cooperatives and that this study is boundless. The researchers' perspective in understanding and discussing the cooperative organizational climate and customer relationship management gets us to understand the situation and provide necessary solutions. The horizon of knowledge needs to be expanded continuously, the study provided insight into the members' perception of their organization by studying the organizational climate and customer relationship management. The result helps the multi-purpose cooperative in managing its members and the organization effectively.

Objectives of the Study

- To determine the extent of organizational climate in structure, reward, support, conflict, organizational identity, and ethical practices when taken collectively and grouped according to age, sex, civil status, type of membership, and length of membership.
- To determine the extent of customer relationship management in value-based CRM, customer-centered organizational configuration, and technology-based CRM when taken collectively and grouped according to age, sex, civil status, type of membership, and length of membership.
- To determine the significant difference in the extent of organizational climate when compared according to age, sex, civil status, and length of membership.
- To determine the significant difference in customer relationship management when compared according to age, sex, civil status, and length of membership.
- To determine the significant relationship between organizational climate and customer relationship management among members of a Multi-Purpose Cooperative in Negros Occidental.

Framework

This study was anchored in Social Exchange Theory and Relationship Management Theory. Among all management disciplines that involve human relationships, social exchange theory is probably the most prominent (Deszczyński, 2021) and has been extensively examined (Paraskevaïdis & Andriotis, 2017; Sharpley, 2014). The theory asserts that when presented with choices, one will undergo subjective cost-benefit analysis and weighing. Individuals tend to believe in how much their contribution is valued (Ahmed et al., 2020; Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Attitudes and support are usually rationally driven by the prospects of economic gain and self-interest (Daye et al., 2020; García et al., 2015). The social exchange would incline members to produce feelings of personal gratitude, obligation, and trust (Blau, 1964; Wang et al., 2020). When members perceive that their organizations treat them well, they reciprocate positively (Blau, 1964; Mostafa & Andrews, 2018). Social exchange theory explains that when organizations provide a conducive organizational climate, it contributes to organizational loyalty (Purnamasari & Sintaasih, 2019).

On the other hand, Relationship Management Theory refers to the management relation process between an organization with the internal and external public (Ayuningtyas et al., 2019). It was used to assess trust, reciprocity, control mutuality, commitment, satisfaction, mutual understanding, and

legitimacy (Aldoory et al., 2015). Building relationships with members who are also the customer requires comprehensive knowledge of management concepts and the transformation of all components within the organization (Sarkum & Syamsuri, 2021). According to relationship management theory, relationships are states existing between an organization and its strategic constituencies where the actions of one side influence the attitudes and activities of the other to provide mutual benefits to all parties involved (Ledingham, 2003, 2009; Ledingham & Ledingham, 2016; Liu et al., 2020). An initiative by the organization requires commitment, strategic principles, and a mindset for it to succeed (Oumar et al., 2017). It occurs directly when the organization can communicate directly with the members (Mahardika, 2020).

Methodology

This quantitative research used Descriptive Comparative and Correlational Research design. The respondents are 347 members out of the 3,500 members of select multi-purpose cooperatives in Negros Occidental. The researchers used a stratified random sampling proportionate allocation method to determine the exact size based on the population.

This study utilized an adapted, modified instrument. The instrument was subjected to content validations using Lawshe Validity Model and yielded a CVI of 0.99, which indicates that the research tool is valid. The research instrument was tested for reliability using Cronbach's Alpha. A reliability result of 0.85 for organizational climate and 0.97 for customer relationship management; thus, the research instrument is highly reliable.

The researchers used mean and standard deviation to determine the extent of organizational climate and customer relationship management when taken collectively and grouped according to age, sex, type of membership, and length. In measuring the significant difference in the extent of organizational climate and customer relationship management when taken collectively and grouped according to age, sex, type of membership, and length of membership, t-tests, and ANOVA were used. In computing the significant relationship between organizational climate and customer relationship management, the Pearson correlation was utilized in this study.

Results and Discussion

Organizational Climate Dimension as a Whole.

The result shows that ethical practices got the highest mean at 4.05 and a standard deviation of 0.760, while cooperative structure got the lowest ratings with a mean of 2.83 and a standard deviation of 1.075, which was interpreted as moderate.

It implies that cooperative organizational identity got the highest rating. It infers that members value their cooperative organizational identity. Members choose to join because of the cooperative's positive organizational identity or image. This means they look at the organization's reputation before becoming a member. In consultation with the members, according to them, they applied for membership because they saw that the cooperative is active in the community. The cooperative of choice engages the community by giving needed support, especially for the needy and the poor. They further said that government agencies showed cooperative awards because of their active involvement in uplifting their members' lives.

Cooperatives support schools, homes, and welfare centers; they care about the environment, demonstrating their economic commitment and social contribution, which are contributive factors that

build their reputation (Martínez Charterina, 2015; Picciotti, 2017). Dowling (2006), as cited by Yadiati et al. (2019), described that a positive reputation underlies the potential of raising a firm's name and provide the organization to utilize the equity generated from the organizational identity to enlarge market segmentation, improves financial performance, organized institutional investment and upsurge share values. An organization's positive reputation among the stakeholders is understood as reputational capital favorable to the organization (Irfan et al., 2020; Luoma-aho, 2007).

Age.

Structure. The result suggests that members who are twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 2.73 and a standard deviation of 0.986. In comparison, thirty-one to forty-year-olds had a mean of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 1.108. All are interpreted to a moderate extent.

Reward. Data shows that members who are thirty-one to forty years old got a mean of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 1.078 ranked as the highest. While fifty to sixty years old, 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.978 placed the lowest. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Warmth and Support. The result shows that those twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.713. While thirty-one to forty years old got a mean of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.764 ranked as the highest. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Conflict. Data indicates that as per the age variable, it was found that members who are twenty-one to thirty years old got a mean of 3.56 and a standard deviation of 0.829, thirty-one to forty years old scored the highest mean of 3.91 and standard deviation of 0.940. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Organizational Identity. It indicates that as per age variable, it was found that members who are twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.88 and a standard deviation of 0.918, Thirty-one to forty years old members got the highest mean of 4.04 a standard deviation of 0.664. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Ethical Practices. Results indicate that the age variable shows that members who are twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.87 and a standard deviation of 0.781. Those who are thirty-one to forty years old rated the highest with a mean of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 0.632. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Overall. The result demonstrates that in terms of age when grouped to all organizational climate dimensions, the result showed that members who are thirty-one to 40 forty years old got a mean of 3.74 and a standard deviation of 0.207 placed the highest, those who are 21 to 30 years old got the lowest mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.097. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

It infers that members have very high regard for a cooperative organizational climate. This means that the organization is member or people-oriented that the organizational culture includes a core set of values and puts its onus on care and concern for the members.

Members said that their cooperative values their membership. The cooperative takes care of its member by placing policies and programs favorable to its members, such as secured interest on shared capital and patronage refunds for every member's investment in the cooperative.

According to members, what they loved most about their cooperative is that it has a much-diversified investment that translates to the security of members' money deposited within it. They said that the cooperative is transparent with every member because members are the lifeblood of the organization.

Pozveh & Karimi (2016) showed a significant difference in respondents' opinions about organizational climate, considering their age. An age-friendly organizational climate is associated with greater perceptions of opportunities, satisfaction, organizational commitment, and motivation (Zacher et al., 2018).

Sex.

Structure. The result directs that males got a mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 1.116. At the same time, females generated a mean of 2.93 and a standard deviation of 1.033. All are interpreted to a moderate extent.

Reward. The result indicates that males got a mean of 3.54 and a standard deviation of 0.817 and females rated 3.61 and a standard deviation of 1.067. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Warmth and Support. It indicates that the members' sex variable directs that males got a mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.696 while female members got a mean of 3.59 and a standard deviation of 0.781. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Conflict. The results found that male members got a mean of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.971 compared to female members, which yielded an average of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.805. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Organizational Identity. The data indicate that male members got 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.844, and then female members got a mean of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.752. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Ethical Practices. The result indicates that male members got an average of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.778 in contrast with female members, which generated a mean of 4.10 and a standard deviation of 0.744. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Overall. According to the result in terms of sex, when grouped to all organizational climate dimensions, female employees got a mean of 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.146. In contrast, male employees got a mean of 3.62 and a standard deviation of 0.150. All results were interpreted to a great extent.

It means that female members scored the highest in all organizational climate dimensions. This means that female members have positive views on their organization's organizational climate and equal dealing and assistance in every transaction regardless of sex. They cited that their organization is sensitive to members' sexual roles. According to them, members and management have a mutual sense of respect and comfort.

Members said they are happy with their cooperatives, for there is no gender or sex bias. That their organization does not only desire to foster sex diversity but implements and manages sex diversity. Members cited that they have not heard or known of any issues regarding sex or gender-related. According to them, the organization developed guidelines incorporating variety into the policies catering to everyone. Based on Ezzeldin (2020) finding, positive relationship between organizational climate and respondents' sex. The study by Genoveva Espinoza-Santeli & Jimenez Vera (2019) mentioned that organizational climate varies when the results are analyzed by sex.

Civil Status.

Structure. The result shows that as part of the organizational climate dimension concerning civil status, it indicates that single members got a rating of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 1.020. In contrast, married got a 2.85 mean and a standard deviation of 1.100. All are interpreted to a moderate extent.

Reward. Regarding reward as part of the organizational climate dimension as per civil status variables, it indicates that single members got a mean of 3.54 and a standard deviation of 0.841, and married rated 3.60 and a standard deviation of 1.015. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Warmth and Support. The data indicate that single members got an average of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.687, while married members got a mean of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.769. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Conflict. The result suggests that per civil status variables, single members yield a mean of 3.74, a standard deviation of 0.770, a mean of 3.81, and a standard deviation of 0.929 for married members. All results were interpreted to a great extent.

Organizational Identity. For organizational identity as part of the organizational climate dimension as per the civil status variable, it showed that single members got a mean of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.851. In contrast, married members yielded 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.768. All results were interpreted to a great extent.

Ethical Practices. The data suggest that single members got a rating of 4.02, a standard deviation of 0.764, a mean of 4.07, and a standard deviation of 0.760 for married members. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

Overall. Data shows that in terms of civil status when grouped to all organizational climate dimensions, married members got the highest mean of 4.07 and a standard deviation of 0.748. In contrast, single employees got a mean of 4.00 and a standard deviation of 0.708. All results were interpreted to a great extent.

It implies that married members placed the highest result in all organizational climate dimensions. It suggests that a cooperative understands the needs of its members regardless of marital status. It implies that the cooperative is open to single and married individuals who want to join the organization. The requirement for both single and married people to participate in cooperative groups is distinguished by an open culture. Based on some members' descriptions, cooperative embraces everyone who wants to be part of the organization. They said there is a strong desire for cooperatives to encourage married individuals to participate in influencing family members to join the same. They added that cooperatives set up activities for members' engagement to foster strong relations between cooperatives and members. According to one member, the cooperative establishes and provides family days to married employees to strengthen further the bond between married family members and the cooperative.

According to Chang et al. (2017), marital status significantly differed in the organizational climate when taken collectively and compared. At the same time, a significant relationship exists between marital status and organizational climate (Jaymalin-Dulay & Razalan, 2016). Ostovarfar et al. (2021) cited that socio-demographic variables such as marital status were the fundamental factors in the perception of organizational climate.

Type of Membership.

Structure. The result indicates that regular members got a mean of 2.84 and a standard deviation of 1.092. While associate members got a rating of 2.79 and a standard deviation of 0.888. They are interpreted to a moderate extent.

Reward. The data suggest that regular members got a mean of 3.59 and a standard deviation of 0.977, and associate members got a rating of 3.48 and a standard deviation of 0.821. They interpreted to a great extent.

Warmth and Support. The result indicates that regular members got a 3.66 and a standard deviation of 0.766, and associate members rated 3.51 and a standard deviation of 0.486, which was interpreted to a great extent.

Conflict. It indicates that regular members generated a mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 0.907, and associate members got a mean of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.569. They interpreted to a great extent.

Organizational Identity. It shows that regular members rated 3.96 with a standard deviation of 0.815, while associate members got a mean of 4.00 and a standard deviation of 0.510. They were interpreted to a great extent.

Ethical Practices. The result indicates that regular members were 4.06 and a standard deviation of 0.775, while associate members got a mean of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.589. They are interpreted to a great extent.

Overall. The result indicated that in terms of the membership type when grouped according to all organizational climate dimensions, regular members got the highest mean of 4.01 and a standard deviation of 0.535. In contrast, associate members got a mean of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.358. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

Data infers that regular members ranked the highest in organization climate dimensions because of all the privileges they avail, such as assured voting rights, access to multiple types of loans, and other benefits compared to associate members.

Regular members said that since they can exercise their fundamental rights to vote, be heard and participate in the decision-making process, and help the cooperatives plan organizational direction. They said every regular member has an equal chance to voice and be heard. Regular members noted that there is no discrimination in the opinions of each member and that they are taken positively to derive outcomes favorable to everyone, including associate members.

Organizational members aim for active participation in internal decision-making or want their organization to cultivate such processes (Bolleyer & Correa, 2022). The strengthening of the rights and responsibilities of the membership is very vital in the governance of the cooperatives (Ishak et al., 2020; Stuart, 2007). One example that reflects the implication of this study is from Mojo et al. (2018) which emphasizes the need to strengthen membership incentives by improving members' rights.

Length of Membership.

Structure. The result indicates that members who are less than five years got a mean of 2.83 and a standard deviation of 0.982 compared to members who are more than five years, rated 2.83 and a standard deviation of 1.126. All are interpreted to a moderate extent.

Reward. The data indicates that employees under five years with the cooperative got an average of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.830. In comparison, members who are more than five years yield a mean of 3.56 and a standard deviation of 1.033. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Warmth and Support. The result shows that members who are less than five years rated 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.683, and more than five years of membership got a mean of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.782. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Conflict. The calculation indicates that those who are less than five years got a mean of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.971, and those who are more than five years rated 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.829. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Organizational Identity. As part of the organizational climate dimension as per the length of membership variable, it indicates that less than five years in the cooperated got a mean of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.806 while those more than five years rated 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.788. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Ethical Practices. The data suggest that members who are less than five years generated a mean of 4.04 and a standard deviation of 0.722 compared to those who are more than five years, which got a mean of 4.06 and a standard deviation of 0.783. All are interpreted to a great extent.

Overall. Table 1 shows that collectively organizational climate when grouped to the membership length, members who are less than five years and more than five years got 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.589 and 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.688 mean scores.

The result suggests that regardless of their length of membership, they have identical perspectives of the organizational climate of their cooperatives. This implies that the organization values both new and old members and that members view their cooperatives positively. It further suggests that members who stayed with the cooperative genuinely care about the organization and are emotionally invested in it.

Members said they joined and participated in their respective cooperatives because they believe in what they stood for. They said that they are not only putting financial ventures into their cooperatives but, at the same time, emotional, effort, and time investments. They emphasized that they are very satisfied with how their cooperatives manage their members' well-being, investment, and processes. That as members, they are proud of their association with the organization.

The pride of belonging to the organization has been linked as a generator of organizational climate. At the same time, it has been described as a factor of organizational climate (Alvarez et al., 2016; Gunter & Furnham, 1996). Managing social capital such as members can offer a people-focused perspective that enhances an organizational climate (Black & Fitzgerald, 2018).

Customer Relationship Management Dimension as a Whole.

The result shows that technology-based CRM got a higher rating of 4.09 and a standard deviation of 0.835. In contrast, value-based CRM with 4.00 and a standard deviation of 0.757. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

It implies that technology-based CRM placed higher responses among members. It suggests that members have high regard for cooperatives' technology-based CRM. It infers that cooperatives value innovation to reach and connect with its members and streamline the process to expedite transactions further. It further suggests that members acknowledge their cooperatives' efforts in investing and implementing technology to manage organizational relationships and engagement among existing and prospective members.

As practical innovation enables firms to meet the demands of a highly unpredictable competitive market, innovation capabilities are the most crucial factor for competitive advantage (Rajapathirana & Hui, 2018). Innovation capability has become a means for firms to increase their competitive advantage, respond to customer satisfaction, and increase revenue (Mulyana et al., 2020). Nazari-Shirkouhi (2015) study, as cited by Chi (2021), demonstrated that technology effectively improved firms' competitive advantage by enabling them to respond quickly to customer requests.

Age.

Value-Based CRM. The data shows that those twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.80 and a standard deviation of 0.754, while members who are thirty-one to forty years old got a mean of 4.10 and a standard deviation of 0.682 ranked as the highest. All indicated to a great extent.

Customer-Centered Organizational Configuration. Data reflects that those twenty-one to thirty years old got a mean of 3.92, a standard deviation of 0.780, while thirty-one to forty years old got 4.13, a standard deviation of 0.670. All indicated to a great extent.

Technology-Based CRM. Results suggest that members twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.83, with a standard deviation of 0.911. At the same time, thirty-one to forty-year-old members got an average of 4.19, with a standard deviation of 0.736, the highest. All indicated to a great extent.

Overall. Table 2 results when customer relationship management when grouped according to age indicates that members who are thirty-one to forty years old got the highest mean of 4.14, a standard deviation of 0.246. That twenty-one to thirty years old got the lowest mean of 3.85, a standard deviation of 0.366. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

The result implies that in terms of members' age, members are fully satisfied members and customers of the organization. It also suggests that the cooperatives as an enterprise provide exceptional engagement and service to their clients and their members. It further indicates that the members experience top-notch customer service relationships and assistance from their organization.

Members said their cooperative has a very efficient system of procedures catering to members' transactions. Members said that the management and staff are very approachable and polite. They said cooperatives always asked for feedback after a transaction to improve their processes further. One senior member shared that their cooperative established a special assistance desk for the elderly to expedite and comfort the senior citizens during transactions.

Customer takes the acquisition judgment in the face of multiple alternatives; getting satisfied with the service and its outcomes are compulsory (Ehrenberg & Nicosia, 1968; Ferreira et al., 2021; Kollat et al., 1972). Quality of service and client satisfaction are crucial to increasing service utilization (Hussen & Worku, 2022).

Sex.

Value-Based CRM. The data shows that male members got a mean of 3.94, a standard deviation of 0.767, while females got a mean of 4.04, a standard deviation of 0.748. All indicated to a great extent.

Customer-Centered Organizational Configuration. The result shows that males rated 3.94, a standard deviation of 0.756, while female members got an average of 4.15, a standard deviation of 0.757. All indicated to a great extent.

Technology-Based CRM. The data suggests that male members got 4.01, a standard deviation of 0.792, and female members got a mean of 4.15, a standard deviation of 0.866. All indicated to a great extent.

Overall. When customer relationship management was taken collectively and grouped according to sex, female members yielded the highest mean of 4.12, a standard deviation of 0.065, while male members got 3.97, a standard deviation of 0.018. All results are interpreted to a great extent. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

Results suggest that members highly regard customer relationship management regardless of their sex. It implies that both male and female members are delighted with their cooperatives' services and customer relations.

Members said there is no gender or sex bias in their organization. That organization deals with their male or female clients in the same way without preference except for pregnant, senior citizens, and persons with disability. One member recalled that during her pregnancy with her second child, the organization was the one that processed her transaction upon informing the cooperative that she would avail of a short-term loan. Cooperatives understand the predicament of their members, as added by another member.

Service quality positively influences satisfaction, which was significantly and positively related to loyalty (Ratanavaraha et al., 2016). An essential part of the organization is reflected in the organization's vision, mission, and values so that the company can implement superior service to customers, always measure customer satisfaction, and makes customers loyal to the company. The importance of awareness in providing exceptional service quality to create satisfaction, foster customer loyalty, and accomplish objectives to survive in the competitive world of business (Devi & Yasa, 2021; Hapsari et al., 2016; Kuntari et al., 2016).

Civil Status.

Value-Based CRM. The researchers found that single members got a mean of 3.93, a standard deviation of 0.720, and married rated 4.03, a standard deviation of 0.772. All indicated to a great extent.

Customer-Centered Organizational Configuration. The data shows that single members got a mean of 4.06 standard deviation of 0.726, and married members got a rating of 4.06, a standard deviation of 0.780. All indicated to a great extent.

Technology-Based CRM. The result indicates that single members got an average of 4.02, a standard deviation of 0.834, while married members generated a mean of 4.12, a standard deviation of 0.836. All indicated to a great extent.

Overall. The result shows that when customer relationship management, when grouped according to civil status, married got a mean of 4.07, a standard deviation of 0.748 placed as the highest, while single employees got a mean of 4.00, a standard deviation of 0.708. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

The data suggest that married members are fully contented with the cooperatives' customer relationship management. It implies that customer relationship management's effectiveness is felt by its members regardless of civil status. It infers that organizations are doing well in strategizing, innovating, and implementing their customer relationship management system and program.

The implementation of customer relationship management (CRM) has become increasingly important over the last two decades (Abbad et al., 2022). This is expected to enable businesses to understand their customers better and retain them by providing an enhanced experience. Additionally, it

attracts new customers, improves profitability, and reduces customer management expenses (Cherapanukorn, 2019; Shaon & Rahman, 2015; Tawinunt et al., 2015).

Type of Membership.

Value-Based CRM. The data indicate that regular membership generated a mean of 4.00 and a standard deviation of 0.777. In contrast, associate membership got a rating of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.514). All indicated to a great extent.

Customer-Centered Organizational Configuration. The data suggest that regular membership got a mean of 4.06, a standard deviation of 0.778, and members who belong to associate membership rated 4.04, a standard deviation of 0.588. All indicated to a great extent.

Technology-Based CRM. The study established that members under the regular membership got an average of 4.06, a standard deviation of 0.778. In contrast, associate membership yielded a mean of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.682. All indicated to a great extent.

Overall. Regarding membership type, when grouped according to all dimensions of customer relationship management, regular members got a mean of 4.05 and a standard deviation of 0.752, which placed the highest. In contrast, an associate member got a mean of 4.01 and a standard deviation of 0.535. All results are interpreted to a great extent.

This implies that members, irrespective of membership, are fully aware of their cooperatives' customer relationship management practices. It suggests that they have felt the improvement brought by innovations in their dealing and transaction with their cooperatives.

Service innovations challenge existing offerings and business models, shape existing markets, and create new ones (Gustafsson et al., 2020). To attract and retain customers and maintain their competitiveness, service organizations need to offer high-quality new services and improve their innovation abilities (Babaei & Aghdassi, 2022).

Length of Membership.

Value-Based CRM. The result indicates that members who are less than five years 3.93, a standard deviation of 0.740, while those who are more than five years got a mean of 4.03, a standard deviation of 0.766. All indicated to a great extent.

Customer-Centered Organizational Configuration. The data suggests that members under five years got a mean of 4.07 a standard deviation of 0.758, while those over five years got an average of 4.05, a standard deviation of 0.768. All indicated to a great extent.

Technology-Based CRM. It was found that members under five years got a rating of 3.98, with a standard deviation of 0.864. In comparison, members who are more than five years rated 4.15, with a standard deviation of 0.814. All indicated to a great extent.

Overall. The results show that when customer relationship management is grouped according to the length of membership, those who have been members for more than five years got the highest mean of 4.08, a standard deviation of 0.734, while those who are less than five years got a mean of 3.65 a standard deviation of 0.688.

It implies that regardless of length, members provided high responses on all dimensions of customer relationship management. They stayed with the organization because they felt their cooperatives' excellent customer service. That suggests that the organization's effort in improving its service has a positive result as viewed by its clients.

According to Afthanorhan et al. (2019), they found that quality of service had a significant impact on customer satisfaction. Service quality and customer satisfaction are parts of the factors that influence customer loyalty (Samarakoon et al., 2021; Supriyanto et al., 2021). It shows that service quality influences service loyalty through customer satisfaction (Kiumarsi et al., 2020)

Table 1. Significant differences in Organizational Climate when compared according to Age, Sex, Civil Status, and Length of Membership.

Variable	p-value	Significant @ 0.05	Decision
Age	0.106	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis
Sex	0.287	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis
Civil Status	0.340	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis
Length of Membership	0.207	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis

The researchers tested the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the extent of organizational climate when compared according to age, sex, civil status, and length of membership. Using a t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) – based on the number of classifications, the result shows no sufficient data to reject the null hypothesis at a 95% level of confidence, as indicated in Table 1 that members' age got a 0.106; sex got a p-value of 0.287. In contrast, civil status got a p-value of 0.340 and a p-value of 0.207 for the length of membership.

Thus, the study can surmise that there is no significant difference in the extent of organizational climate when compared according to age, sex, marital status, membership status at the cooperative, and length of years in terms of membership. It suggests that differences in the data obtained are not meaningful and legitimate and that any observed differences are considered due to chance or random factors. According to some members, they have a very positive perspective of their cooperatives. They said their cooperative provides an environment where members are satisfied and can contribute and help with their organization. Members emphasized that they trust their cooperatives because of the organization's policies in which they benefit.

The role of trust is very important, and a key construct that is beneficial for promoting organizational climate; trust is, in this case, important because it enables individuals to develop shared perceptions, expectations, and behavioral normal with their supervisors and team coworkers, which encourages a favorable organizational climate (Agbejule et al., 2021; Costa & Anderson, 2011; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001).

Table 2. Significant Differences in Customer Relationship Management when compared according to Age, Sex, Civil Status, and Length of Membership.

Variable	p-value	Significant @ 0.05	Decision
Age	0.062	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis
Sex	0.022	Significant	Reject Hypothesis
Civil Status	0.246	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis
Length of Membership	0.161	Not Significant	Accept Hypothesis

The researchers tested the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the extent of customer relationship management when compared according to age, sex, civil status, and length of years

in terms of membership. Using a t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) - depending on the number of groupings, the study has no sufficient data to reject the null hypothesis at a 95% level of confidence, as indicated in Table 2 that members’ age got a p-value of 0.062, for civil status a p-value of 0.246, and a p-value of 0.161 for the length of membership. While in terms of sex, the result generated a p-value of 0.022, thereby accepting the null hypothesis.

Hence, the study can surmise that there is no significant difference in the extent of customer relationship management when compared according to age, civil status, and length of years in terms of membership. It suggests that differences in the data obtained are not meaningful and legitimate and that any observed differences are considered due to chance or random factors. However, it cannot make the same claim about sex. Some members say they value the efforts made by their cooperatives to implement customer relationship management innovation. They said that, unlike before, in which they encountered difficulties in the transaction processes, now they have faster and paperless transactions due to innovation. Even the engagement is now more pronounced as the organization reaches out to them without the members going to the office.

Innovation matters, the enterprises' success increasingly depends upon sustainable innovation (Costa & Matias, 2020). Service quality thru service innovation positively impacts customer satisfaction, and customer satisfaction positively impacts customer loyalty (Rantianti & Halim, 2020).

Table 3. Relationship between Organizational Climate and Customer Relationship Management.

Variables	r	p-value	Sig. @0.05	Decision
Organizational Climate	0.7325	0.000	Significant	Reject Hypothesis
Customer Response Management				

Table 3 illustrates the relationship between the study variables. A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between Organizational Climate and Customer Relationship Management. There was a positive correlation between the two variables, $r = 0.7325$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$.

The result implies a very high degree of correlation between the organizational climate and customer relationship management. This simply means that members' perception of their cooperative organizational climate is highly related to their perception of customer relationship management. It also indicates that if the cooperative organization climate improves, the same happens with customer relationship management and vice versa.

Cooperative managers indicated that maintaining their members is of utmost priority. One manager said that in his years as a manager, he noticed that as they improve their relationship with their members, who are also their clients, their organizational climate also improves, resulting in more engaged and committed members. Managers added that their organizational climate and customer relationship management practices reflect their respective cooperatives' performance.

Organizational climate is important in promoting customer services (Zabani et al., 2019). Improving the organizational climate could be a valuable strategy for improving members' organizational commitment (Bahrami et al., 2016). Good relationship management with customers or customer relationship management is one of the company's strategies to optimize profit through efforts to develop customer satisfaction (Rokhim et al., 2021).

Conclusion

The researchers conclude that members have high regard for cooperatives' organizational climate and customer relationship management due to high responses from members, as indicated by the result. The existence of a strong link between organizational climate and customer relationship management motivates and further encourages members' engagement with the cooperatives. That the multi-purpose cooperatives emphasized the benefits and well-being of their members which enhances their organizational climate perspective by providing quality and innovative service through customer relationship management.

References

1. Abbad, M. M., Musa Magboul, I. H., Jaber, F., & Alrawabdeh, W. (2022). User antecedents, CRM implementation, and impact on customer outcomes in the Jordanian service industry. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCRMM.289208>
2. Afthanorhan, A., Awang, Z., Rashid, N., Foziah, H., & Ghazali, P. L. (2019). Assessing the effects of service quality on customer satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2018.11.004>
3. Agbejule, A., Rapo, J., & Saarikoski, L. (2021). Vertical and horizontal trust and team learning: the role of organizational climate. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 14(7). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-05-2020-0155>
4. Alvarez, D. G., Ruiz, V. E., Ojeda, J. F., & Ramírez, N. I. (2016). Factorial Validity of an Instrument in Order to Measure the Organizational Climate in Preschoolers. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n1p111>
5. Babaei, M., & Aghdassi, M. (2022). Measuring the dimensions of quality in service innovation: A dynamic capability and organisational competency perspective. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 33(3–4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2020.1861933>
6. Bahrami, M. A., Barati, O., Ghoroghchian, M. sadat, Montazer-alfaraj, R., & Ranjbar Ezzatabadi, M. (2016). Role of Organizational Climate in Organizational Commitment: The Case of Teaching Hospitals. *Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrp.2015.11.009>
7. Baumol, W. J., & Williamson, O. E. (1986). Williamson's The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2555390>
8. Black, H., & Fitzgerald, A. (2018). Organisational climate for change and innovativeness: A social capital perspective. In *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management* (Vol. 13, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.24083/APJHM.V13I1.27>
9. Bolleyer, N., & Correa, P. (2022). Member Influence and Involvement in Civil Society Organizations: A Resource Dependency Perspective on Groups and Parties. *Political Studies*, 70(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720968018>
10. Ceesay, L. B. (2020). Building a High Customer Experience Management Organization: Toward Customer-Centricity. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278682120968983>
11. Chang, C.-P., Chiu, L.-Y., & Liu, J. (2017). A Study on the Relationship between Well-Being and Turnover Intentions among Rural School Teachers: School Organizational Climate as a Moderating

- Variable. *Creative Education*, 08(04). <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.84041>
12. Chatain, O. (2011). Value creation, competition, and performance in buyer-supplier relationships. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.864>
 13. Chatain, O., & Mindruta, D. (2017). Estimating Value Creation from Revealed Preferences: Application to Value-based Strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(10). <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2633>
 14. Cherapanukorn, V. (2019). Antecedents of eCRM success in the hospitality industry. *International Symposium on Wireless Personal Multimedia Communications, WPMC, 2019-November*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WPMC48795.2019.9096096>
 15. Cornelissen, J. P., Akemu, O., Jonkman, J. G. F., & Werner, M. D. (2021). Building Character: The Formation of a Hybrid Organizational Identity in a Social Enterprise. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12640>
 16. Costa, A. C., & Anderson, N. (2011). Measuring trust in teams: Development and validation of a multifaceted measure of formative and reflective indicators of team trust. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903272083>
 17. Costa, & Matias. (2020). Open innovation 4.0 as an enhancer of sustainable innovation ecosystems. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198112>
 18. Devi, A. A. D. T., & Yasa, N. N. K. (2021). role of customer satisfaction in mediating the influence of service quality and perceived value on brand loyalty. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v8n3.1786>
 19. Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The Role of Trust in Organizational Settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.4.450.10640>
 20. Dowling, G. (2006). How Good Corporate Reputations Create Corporate Value. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550017>
 21. Ehrenberg, A. S. C., & Nicosia, F. M. (1968). Consumer Decision Processes: Marketing and Advertising Implications. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3150361>
 22. Ferreira, D. C., Marques, R. C., Nunes, A. M., & Figueira, J. R. (2021). Customers satisfaction in pediatric inpatient services: A multiple criteria satisfaction analysis. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2021.101036>
 23. Genoveva Espinoza-Santeli, M., & Jimenez Vera, A. A. (2019). Measurement of Organizational Climate with a Gender Focus in the Escuela Politecnica Nacional. *Revista Universidad Empresa*, 21(36).
 24. Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1996). Biographical and climate predictors of job satisfaction and pride in organization. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 130(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1996.9915001>
 25. Gustafsson, A., Snyder, H., & Witell, L. (2020). Service Innovation: A New Conceptualization and Path Forward. In *Journal of Service Research* (Vol. 23, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520908929>
 26. Hapsari, R., Clemes, M., & Dean, D. (2016). The Mediating Role of Perceived Value on the Relationship between Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction: Evidence from Indonesian Airline Passengers. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(16\)00048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)00048-4)
 27. Hendrayati, H., & Karimah Syahidah, R. (2018). Barriers and Possibilities of Implementation of Customer Relationship Management on Small and Medium Enterprises by Womenpreneurs. *Jurnal*

- Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.24198/jbm.v19i2.196>
28. Hussen, M. A., & Worku, B. T. (2022). Quality of Antenatal Care Service and Factors Associated with Client Satisfaction at Public Health Facilities of Bele Gasgar District. *Journal of Patient Experience*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23743735221083163>
29. Irfan, M., Hassan, M., Hassan, N., Habib, M., Khan, S., & Nasruddin, A. M. (2020). Project Management Maturity and Organizational Reputation: A Case Study of Public Sector Organizations. *IEEE Access*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988511>
30. Ishak, S., Omar, A. R. C., Sum, S. M., Othman, A. S., & Jaafar, J. (2020). Smallholder Agriculture Cooperatives' Performance: What is in the Minds of Management? *Journal of Co-Operative Organization and Management*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcom.2020.100110>
31. Jaymalin-Dulay, & Razalan. (2016). Personnel's Demographics as Modifiers of Organizational Climate in Chartered Higher Education Institutions (HEI) in Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR), Philippines. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5(6).
32. Kadarusman, Y. B., & Herabadi, A. G. (2018). Improving Sustainable Development within Indonesian Palm Oil: The Importance of the Reward System. *Sustainable Development*, 26(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1715>
33. Khaiyat, R. (2016). Differences among the three views of Organizational Conflict. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 7(4).
34. Kollat, D. T., Blackwell, R. D., & Engel, J. F. (1972). The Current Status of Consumer Behavior Research: Developments During the 1968-1972 Period. *SV - Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of the Association for Consumer Research, 1969*.
35. Kreuzer, T., Röglinger, M., & Rupperecht, L. (2020). Customer-centric prioritization of process improvement projects. *Decision Support Systems*, 133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2020.113286>
36. Kuntari, B. D., Kumadji, S., & Hidayat, K. (2016). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan dan Loyalitas Pelanggan (Survei Pada Pelanggan Bengkel PT Astra International Tbk – Daihatsu Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 36(1).
37. Lipińska-Grobelny, A. (2021). Organizational climate and counterproductive work behaviors - The moderating role of gender. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 34(4). <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.01623>
38. Luoma-aho, V. (2007). Neutral Reputation and Public Sector Organizations. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550043>
39. Ma, D., Fisher, R., & Nesbit, T. (2021). Cloud-based client accounting and small and medium accounting practices: Adoption and impact. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2021.100513>
40. Martínez, C., Skeet, A. G., & Sasía, P. M. (2021). Managing organizational ethics: How ethics becomes pervasive within organizations. *Business Horizons*, 64(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.09.008>
41. Martínez Charterina, A. (2015). Las cooperativas y su acción sobre la sociedad. *REVESCO. Revista de Estudios Cooperativos*, 117(0). https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_reve.2015.v117.48144
42. Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., Asencio, R., Seely, P. W., & DeChurch, L. A. (2018). How Organizational Identity Affects Team Functioning: The Identity Instrumentality Hypothesis. *Journal of Management*, 44(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315614370>
43. Mojo, D., Degefa, T., & Fischer, C. (2018). The Development of Agricultural Cooperatives in

- Ethiopia: History and a Framework for Future Trajectory. *Ethiopian Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.4314/ejossah.v13i1.3>
44. Mulyana, M., Hendar, H., Zulfa, M., & Ratnawati, A. (2020). Marketing Innovativeness on Marketing Performance: Role of Religio-Centric Relational Marketing Strategy. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332667.2019.1664869>
45. Muthoni, M. G., & Muathe, S. M. A. (2021). Organizational Conflict Management: The All Important Public Universities Performance Strategy Under Neglect in Kenya. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 17(12). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p181>
46. Omolawal, S., & Bawalla. (2017). Performance and Reward Systems in Organizations. *Journal Performance and Reward Systems*.
47. Ononogbo, M. C., Joel, A.-D., & Edeja, S. M. . (2016). Effect Of Ethical Practices On The Corporate Image Of SMEs In Nigeria: A Survey Of Selected Firms In Imo State. *International Journal For Research In Business, Management And Accounting*, 2(8).
48. Pereira, J. A., Guimarães, A. F., Santos, R. H. dos, Schiavi, S. M. de A., & Souza, J. P. de. (2022). Governance structures in cooperative slaughterhouses: a study on the chain of differentiated beef in the state of Paraná. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 60(1). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9479.2021.233496>
49. Picciotti, A. (2017). Towards Sustainability: The Innovation Paths of Social Enterprise. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 88(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12168>
50. Pozveh, A., & Karimi, F. (2016). The relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behaviors of the staff members in the Department of Education in Isfahan city. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Researches*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.4103/2395-2296.186520>
51. Rajapathirana, R. P. J., & Hui, Y. (2018). Relationship between innovation capability, innovation type, and firm performance. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.06.002>
52. Rantyanti, V. N. P., & Halim, R. E. (2020). The influence of service innovation and service quality to customer satisfaction and loyalty in banking industry. *European Journal of Molecular and Clinical Medicine*, 7(1).
53. Ratanavaraha, V., Jomnonkwao, S., Khampirat, B., Watthanaklang, D., & Iamtrakul, P. (2016). The complex relationship between school policy, service quality, satisfaction, and loyalty for educational tour bus services: A multilevel modeling approach. *Transport Policy*, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2015.09.012>
54. Rokhim, R., Mayasari, I., & Wulandari, P. (2021). Customer relation management of financial service provider for people entrepreneurship credit sustainability in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 716(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/716/1/012108>
55. Sajithparvin, A., & Dawood, A. K. (2019). A study on organizational clarity and its impact on employer branding in automobile companies in Chennai City. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 28(7).
56. Samarakoon, S. M. A. K., Dahanayake, P., & Karunarathne, A. (2021). Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Telecommunication Industry in Sri Lanka: The Mediating Role of Perceived Value. *Journal of Business and Technology*, 5(1).
57. Shaon, & Rahman. (2015). A Theoretical Review of CRM Effects on Customer Satisfaction and

- Loyalty. *Central European Business Review*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.116>
58. Sofi, M. R., Bashir, I., Parry, M. A., & Dar, A. (2020). The effect of customer relationship management (CRM) dimensions on hotel customer's satisfaction in Kashmir. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-06-2019-0075>
59. Stuart, G. (2007). Regulatory Innovation in Microfinance: The MACS Act in Andhra Pradesh. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 2(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2007.2.1-2.181>
60. Supriyanto, A., Wiyono, B. B., & Burhanuddin, B. (2021). Effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on loyalty of bank customers. *Cogent Business and Management*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1937847>
61. Tawinunt, K., Phimonsathienand, T., & Fongsuwan, W. (2015). A structural equation model of customer relationship management factors affecting customer retention of long-stay travelers in the thai tourism industry. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.9323/rjbm.2015.1.24>
62. Widjojo, R. (2018). A Comparison of the Cooperative structure in Indonesia and Hungary. *Gazdaság És Társadalom*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.21637/gt.2018.01.04>
63. Yadiati, W., Nissa, Paulus, S., Suharman, H., & Meiryani. (2019). The role of green intellectual capital and organizational reputation in influencing environmental performance. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeeep.7752>
64. Zabani, F., Shekofteh, M., Kazerani, M., & Zayeri, F. (2019). The evaluation of organizational climate in college libraries and its relation with clients' satisfaction. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 2019.
65. Zacher, H., Kooij, D. T. A. M., & Beier, M. E. (2018). Active aging at work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.08.001>