Association for Information Systems
AIS Electronic Library (AISeL)

BLED 2013 Proceedings | BLED Proceedings

6-1-2013

Towards Social CRM – Scoping the Concept and Guiding Research

Tobias Lehmkuhl
University of St.Gallen, Switzerland, tobias.lehmkuhl@unisg.ch

Reinhard Jung
University of St.Gallen, Switzerland, reinhard.jung@unisg.ch

Follow this and additional works at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/bled2013

Recommended Citation
Lehmkuhl, Tobias and Jung, Reinhard, "Towards Social CRM – Scoping the Concept and Guiding Research" (2013). *BLED 2013 Proceedings.* Paper 14.
http://aisel.aisnet.org/bled2013/14

This material is brought to you by the BLED Proceedings at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in BLED 2013 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

26th Bled eConference

eInnovations:
Challenges and Impacts for Individuals, Organizations and Society

June 9, 2013 – June 13, 2013; Bled, Slovenia

Towards Social CRM – Scoping the Concept and Guiding Research

Tobias Lehmkuhl
University of St.Gallen, Switzerland
tobias.lehmkuhl@unisg.ch

Reinhard Jung
University of St.Gallen, Switzerland
reinhard.jung@unisg.ch

Abstract

Web 2.0 and Social Media (SoMe) provide new opportunities for collaboration and co-value creation which supports a customer-centric management. Social Customer Relationship Management (SCRM) addresses these opportunities and aims at a high stakeholder engagement as a means to establish mutually beneficial relationships. At present, scholars attempt to comprehend what constitutes SCRM. This paper reviews state-of-the-art scholarly literature to provide a consolidated view on the current SCRM knowledge base. It reveals concurrent opinions, diverging perceptions and future directions for research along the dimensions SCRM definitions, objectives and approaches. We conclude that SCRM as a novel concept requires transformational efforts among all organizational parts. Approaches towards SCRM align on organizational determinants, CRM processes, the customer relationship lifecycle or develop conceptual models. We propose that research further explore this domain to progress the understanding of SCRM as basis for corresponding frameworks.

Keywords: Social CRM, CRM, Web 2.0, Social Media

1 Introduction

Web 2.0 and Social Media fundamentally alter the state of online communication towards a dialogue among web-users as well as organizations and their target groups. Among other things, they provide new opportunities for collaboration and co-value creation which supports a customer-centric management. SCRM addresses these opportunities and deals with the integration of Web 2.0 and SoMe in Customer Relationship Management (CRM).

Market analysts expect SCRM to become mainstream in the coming years due to additional sales and cost-saving potentials. To realize those, SCRM must be addressed by holistic concepts (Bolchover & Symington, 2012). This demands comprehensive system designs, dedicated performance indicators and corresponding measures (Band & Petouhoff, 2010; Sarner & Sussin, 2012; Sarner, Thompson, Sengar, & Sussin, 2011). However, SCRM in practice is immature due to a selective application scope, project based approaches as well as

missing information, skill sets and competences for using SoMe (Reinhold & Alt, 2012; Sigala, 2011).

Scholars call for new approaches, which are in line with the characteristics of SoMe and their effects on customers (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2010). A starting point for those approaches are strategic concepts such as CRM frameworks (Grabner-Kräuter & Mödritscher, 2002). Yet, a clear definition of the underlying CRM concept is missing which is an essential prerequisite for dedicated frameworks. Despite numerous publications on CRM there is a lack of agreement about what exactly constitutes CRM (Awasthi & Sangle, 2012; Boon, Corbitt, & Parker, 2002; Ngai, Xiu, & Chau, 2009; Romano & Fjermestad, 2003). The definitions range from technology based views to strategic oriented management approaches. Consequently, Payne & Frow (2005) claim to initially define CRM in any project because it affects acceptance, implementation and corresponding success measures. Hence, in the context of SCRM, there is a necessity to specify this novel concept as basis for succeeding design or implementation approaches. By aligning on approaches to describe the scope and frame of CRM, corresponding effort for SCRM may include a clear definition, an elaboration on its objectives as well as envisaged (performance) effects.

This research paper aims to take stock of the situation by reviewing state-of-the-art scholarly literature that elaborates on the integration of Web 2.0 and SoMe in CRM. The review provides a consolidated view of the latest scholarly research. This endeavor attempts to better understand SCRM as a concept and should serve as foundation for designing SCRM frameworks. Objective of this paper is therefore to develop answers to the following research questions (RQ):

RQ1: How is Social CRM currently defined in scientific literature?

RQ2: What are the objectives of Social CRM and its envisaged effects?

RQ3: Which organizational approaches are proposed towards Social CRM?

By analyzing related literature, light is shed on concurrent opinions, diverging perceptions and future directions for research. The paper proceeds with a summary on the conceptual background of Web 2.0, Social Media and CRM. Section three demonstrates the underlying research methodology. Section four presents the literature results followed by a discussion in section five. Section six summarizes the paper and provides concluding remarks.

2 Conceptual background

2.1 Web 2.0 and Social Media

In the absence of a commonly accepted definition for Web 2.0, we understand the concept as a multidimensional phenomenon (Musser & O'Reilly, 2006): First, there is a social dimension represented by satisfying basic sociological patterns over the internet like identity seeking through affiliation in groups, sharing experiences, telling stories, and building relationships. Second, a technical dimension is given as web-users use the advancements of modern communication technologies to create, modify and distribute information, to collaborate with others, or to contribute globally regardless of their social status (Dearstyne, 2007; Walsh, Hass, & Kilian, 2011). Last, there is an economic dimension, as organization make use of Web 2.0 principles and tools to create business value (Culnan, McHhugh, & Zubillaga, 2010). In context of this research we emphasis that Web 2.0 represents a set of dynamic principles and practices which relate to behavioral and societal aspects that such as participation and engagement, collaboration and cooperation or transparency and openness.

Social Media are the corresponding web-based applications that facilitate Web 2.0 principles (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). They are the technical enablers for an online-based exchange of digital contents. Eventually, Web 2.0 and Social Media cause a paradigm change in web-users' behaviors and usage of the internet. The active participation in content creation, development and diffusion leads to an empowerment of web-users (Gallaugher & Ransbotham, 2010; Greenberg, 2010). They are able to publicly portray opinions or express thoughts about any issue of relevance. Organizations need to acknowledge situation because web-users determine the extent of conversation with and about organizations. As central stakeholders in interactions, they expect transparency, authenticity and some value from organizations in return for their engagement. Moreover, web-users also generate value for themselves in discourses with other consumers about organizations, products and brands. In conclusion, focal point of a Web 2.0 based interaction for organizations is the web-user who is empowered by a range of different SoMe applications.

The distinct activities that web-users may perform on SoMe depend on the functionalities and features of the platforms. Research usually examines SoMe in the context of their application purpose or impact (Culnan et al., 2010). Only a few studies examine those functionalities (Alfaro, Bhattacharyya, Highlander, Sampath, & Watson-Manheim, 2012; Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Bullinger, Hallerstede, Renken, Soeldner, & Moeslein, 2010). Nonetheless, this perspective is necessary for both a thorough organizational implementation and to better understand the potential value contribution (Parameswaran & Whinston, 2007a, 2007b). In the context of SCRM, there remains little direction on how to integrate Web 2.0 principles to CRM initiatives and objectives (Faase, Helms, & Spruit, 2011). Instead, the majority of related research focuses on effects and technical problems in specific use cases (Reinhold & Alt, 2012).

2.2 Customer Relationship Management

CRM has evolved from the necessity to pursue a customer oriented way of management (Bruhn, 2009a). It seeks to establish, maintain and enhance mutually beneficial long-term relational exchanges between an organization and its customers. A relationship therefore develops over time and builds on the norms of trust and commitment (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). The rationale to establish long-lasting relationships are positive direct effects, e.g. higher revenues and lower costs (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990); and indirect effects, e.g. the influence on other relations due to recommendations (Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml, 1993). The distinct roles of seller and customer may converge when there is collaboration in joint value creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Web 2.0 principles and SoMe facilitate a co-creation of value and relationship management. Whether trust and commitment are necessary antecedents or a result of customers participations is perceived differently by various research (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Vivek, Beatty, & Morgan, 2012).

Divergent opinions are also evident in regards to the scope of CRM in general. Some recognize CRM as a comprehensive approach, while others accentuate single aspects such as strategic issues, processes or technological matters. The multiple attitudes lead to a lack of consensus on defining CRM. (Wahlberg, Strandberg, Sundberg, & Sandberg, 2009) reveal that the largest field of CRM research takes a holistic angle dealing with topics such as customer-centric management, cross-functional integration of process and activities, change management, the role of management, IT systems and success measures. Accordingly, we align on the definition of Payne & Frow (2005) stating that "CRM is a strategic approach that is concerned with creating improved shareholder value through the development of appropriate relationships with key customers and customer segments. CRM unites the potential of relationship marketing strategies and IT to create profitable, long-term relationships with customers and other key stakeholders. CRM provides enhanced opportunities to use data and information to both understand customers and co-create value with them. This requires a cross-functional integration of processes, people, operations, and

marketing capabilities ...” (p.168). Put differently, CRM includes two main design areas: First, a customer oriented strategic approach and second, the application of an integrated IT based CRM architecture. The former sets the basis for customer orientation and serves as a reference framework for success measurement (Grabner-Kräuter & Mödritscher, 2002). Of interest is the customer perspective and those aspects that influence customers’ perceptions and behaviors (Hippner, 2004). CRM systems as subsequent design area consolidate data and interaction channels to enable a holistic perspective on individual customers. Both design areas need to be considered when elaborating on the interplay of CRM with SoMe, i.e. some form of IT innovation, and Web 2.0 principles, i.e. the manner and form of interaction. SCRM as corresponding research realm is nascent. Research focus is on exploring the subject matter. This implies establishing a basic understanding on the scope and effects of SoMe on CRM (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2010) and outlining organizational approaches towards SCRM (Askool & Nakata, 2010; Stone, 2009).

3 Research methodology

The literature review demonstrates the current state of knowledge about a particular object of study (Randolph, 2009). This means to collect, summarize, assess or interpret primary publications within a given domain (Cooper, 1988). The concept of SCRM and its representation in scientific literature is the focal point of this research. To ensure a rigorous research process, there is alignment to the process model by (Vom Brocke et al., 2009).

Initially, the scope of research is examined by the constitutive characteristics of a review following Cooper´s (1988) taxonomy (see Table 1). Emphasis is put on an *exhaustive and selective* review. To reconsider different perspectives of SCRM, there is an interest in research *outcomes* and *applications* of SCRM. A neutral perspective is taken because it allows for identifying and integrating central research issues from multiple research disciplines. A conceptual approach is applicable to organize the search process on known concepts. To account for the multiple disciplines in CRM research, core audiences are specialized and general scholars.

Characteristic	**Categories**			
Focus	*Outcomes*	Methods	Theories	*Applications*
Goal	*Integration*	Criticism	*Identify central issues*	
Organization	Historical	*Conceptual*	Methodological	
Perspective	*Neutral representation*		Espousal of position	
Audience	*Specialized scholars*	*General scholars*	Practitioners	General public
Coverage	Exhaustive	*Exhaustive and selective*	Representative	Central / Pivotal

Table 1: Scope of literature review (focus of research highlighted)

Next, we conceptualized the basic concepts and scrutinized corresponding terms (see section 2). The actual search process needs to be traceable (Vom Brocke et al., 2009). A concept-based search is suitable for developing the understanding of SCRM. Keywords as selection criteria to search for in the documents’ titles (TI), abstracts (AB) and keywords (KW) are a combination of “Web 2.0” or “Social Media” and “CRM” or “Customer Relationship Management” (Group A) as well as “Social CRM” or “SCRM” or “CRM 2.0” or “Social Customer Relationship Management” (Group B). Information sources are the databases

"EBSCO Discovery service", „AISel", "ProQuest", "Science Direct", "Emerald" and "IEEE". This selection allows for an extensive coverage of publishers across different scientific disciplines. Following (Webster & Watson, 2002), publications of interest are limited to peer-reviewed articles or conference proceedings. The selected time span of investigation is 2005-2012 since Web 2.0 and SoMe are recent terms that have gained popularity in academia and practice only in recent years.

The literature search was performed in August 2012 (see Table 2). The initial queries with the selected key words yielded 57 different articles. A subsequent forward and backward search identified 77 additional articles based on the documents' titles. This initial stock of documents (134 publications) was qualitatively assessed by reviewing the publications' introductions to ensure topic relevance. This assessment process eventually led to 31 articles which can contribute to the research objective (see Appendix). Those publications are scrutinized along the research questions by examining and synthesizing the publication's contents.

Databases	**Search fields**	**Key words**		**Total publications**	
		Group A	**Group B**	**Initial**	**Evaluated**
EBSCO	TI, KW, AB	13	1	14	**13**
AISel	TI, KW, AB	5	1	6	**3**
ProQuest	All, but full text	17	0	17	**1**
ScienceDirect	TI, KW, AB	1	0	1	**1**
Emerald	All except full text	13	1	14	**8**
JSTOR	TI, AB	0	0	0	**0**
IEEE	TI, KW, AB	3	2	5	**0**
Forward search	TI	-	-	12	**1**
Backward search	TI	-	-	65	**4**
Total		**52**	**5**	**134**	**31**

Table 2: Results of keyword search (without duplicates)

4 Results

4.1 RQ 1: Definition of Social CRM in scientific literature

Examining the SCRM definitions used within the articles reveals the explanation by Greenberg (2010) to be the most frequently used reference (Baird & Parasnis, 2011a; Faase et al., 2011; Greve, 2011; Hart & Gamal, 2012; Mosadegh, 2011; Nguyen & Mutum, 2012; Woodcock, Green, & Starkey, 2011; Zlateva, Zabunov, & Velev, 2011). Herein, SCRM is defined as "a philosophy and a business strategy, supported by a technology platform, business rules, processes and social characteristics, designed to engage the customer in a collaborative conversation in order to provide mutually beneficial value in a trusted & transparent business environment. It's the company's response to the customer's ownership of the conversation" (p.413). Articles that state their own definition have complementary understandings. That is, SCRM is regarded as a new strategic approach. It extends traditional CRM by means of employing Web 2.0 mechanisms and SoMe in order to adapt to customers' demands. Those customers are supposed to be interested in a B2C interaction because it generates some kind of value to them.

A different perception on SCRM is presented by Ang (2011a, 2011b). He states that CRM is not able to integrate the specificities of Web 2.0. Community Relationship Management should be the appropriate wording: it describes the management of relationships with connected customers but also with the prospects in the connected community. In comparison with other articles, this understanding can be regarded as comparable because Ang's connected community is usually understood as "the network" of customers. The crucial

difference between the articles is the underlying assumptions. Ang argues that SoMe is primarily used for private purposes to bond people together but not customers and organizations. A SCRM cannot be positioned in such a context. Also, CRM is about a 1:1 communication in a B2C relationship. It does not acknowledge the typical public n:m-communication among web-users in an interactive Web 2.0 environment. Therefore, SCRM is a misnomer. Future research may address this issue by elaborating on the scope and difference of SCRM when compared with CRM. Such a discourse may contribute to the convergence progress of establishing a common definition for CRM in general (Nguyen & Mutum, 2012).

A related aspect to the SCRM scoping matter is the determination of relevant target groups. While the articles are likely to make reference to Greenberg's (2010) definition, there is an interchangeable use of several target groups. In particular, reference is made to "customers" (e.g. Greenberg (2010)), to "consumers" (e.g. Baird & Parasnis (2012)), to "the community" (e.g. Ang (2011b)) or to "the network" (e.g. Ahuja & Medury (2010). A clear specification is desirable as different target groups need different management approaches. This includes detailed elaborations on how to deal with customers in different lifecycle states. Traditional CRM focuses on potential, actual and lost customers (Castronovo & Huang, 2012). The SCRM literature shows little consideration of lost customers. Merely Sigala (2011) and Greve (2011) provide some thoughts on that group. The missing attention is explained by the fact that reactivation is simpler by means of traditional CRM instruments. Nevertheless, lost customers might be attracted by SoMe information, so that there is some win-back (Greve, 2011). Future research shall scrutinize this target group challenge. This includes assessments on customers in different lifecycle states next to external target groups such as web-users, community members, or the adjacent network of customers.

In conclusion, it is generally acknowledged that SCRM affects all parts of business, being strategy, technology, processes, governance and culture (Acker, Gröne, Akkad, Pötscher, & Yazbek, 2011). It is a transformative endeavor because organizations have to concede the case of customer empowerment, the importance of the external network as well as the requirements to possess distinct Web 2.0 capabilities (Faase et al., 2011).These exigencies demand a customer-centric management as basis for a two-way interaction between different target groups and an organization.

4.2 RQ 2: Objectives and effects of Social CRM

Following the previous line of reasoning, it can be recognized that organizations shall pursue an outside-in perspective when establishing SCRM. Opportunity should be given for web-users to express themselves as a means to gain more customer insights (Stone, 2009). The empowered customer is self-determined and wants to participate in the creation of its own experience (Greenberg, 2010). This implies that SCRM aims to intensify relationships by integrating individuals in mutual value creation on SoMe platforms (Sashi, 2012; Sigala, 2011). Integration in this context means, e.g. connecting, collaborating or establishing conversations between organizations and their target groups (Ang, 2011b; Askool & Nakata, 2010). Put differently, the ultimate objective of SCRM is to build up mutually beneficial long-term relationships based on a high customer engagement (Baird & Parasnis, 2011a; Faase et al., 2011; Greenberg, 2009).

Customer engagement (CE) itself is an adjacent research field in relationship marketing science (Marketing Science Institute, 2010). Due to the concept's novelty, there is at present mainly exploratory research to establish the characteristics of CE. A proposal by Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric, & Ilic (2011) states that "CE is a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative customer experiences with a focal agent/object […]. It occurs under a specific set of context-dependent conditions generating differing CE levels; and exists as a

dynamic, iterative process […] in which other relational concepts (e.g., involvement, loyalty) are antecedents and/or consequences in iterative CE processes […]" (p.9). Put differently, customer engagement represents the intensity of a web-user's participation via SoMe and the emotional connection attached to an organization/brand based on an ongoing interactive exchange. That exchange becomes decisive because organizations can derive new knowledge about their dialogue partners. This knowledge subsequently allows for the designing of tailored campaigns or personalized interactions (Ahuja & Medury, 2011). Thus, detailed insights are pre-requisite and result in building relationships and facilitating engagement (Greenberg, 2010; Mrkwicka, Kiessling, & Kolbe, 2009; Nguyen & Mutum, 2012; Pavičić, Alfirević, & Žnidar, 2011; Reinhold & Alt, 2011; Töpfer, Silbermann, & René, 2008).

The effects of such an engagement on performance poses a strong case for research because contemporary literature does not put much emphasis that matter (Reinhold & Alt, 2011; Sigala, 2011). Publications that address performance in some way reveal two perspectives: an organizational one and an individual's one. The organizational perspective is about economic and output related CRM measures. Those measures refer to traditional performance indicators such as revenue impacts (Acker et al., 2011), cost reductions in terms of acquisition and cost-to-serve (Baird & Parasnis, 2011b; Woodcock et al., 2011), market share gains and profitability improvements (Stone, 2009). Yet, empirical evidence for the dedicated impact of SCRM on those measures is not provided. The individual's perspective to measure SCRM success is about the single person as unit of analysis. Sigala (2011) calls for measures that elaborate on the social value of customers (e.g. measuring the impact/influence on public opinion) and customer communities (e.g. measuring factors that motivate participation). Measuring value in terms of (revenue and recommendation) potential and impact on others is not new to CRM. Traditional measures pay attention to this relationship potential as a determinant for assessing the total customer lifetime (Leußer, Hippner, & Wilde, 2011). Hence, the effect of a high customer engagement is expected to result in the change of perception as well as behavioral intentions. Behavioral intentions are related to a higher level of activity, connectivity and interaction with others. Positive word-of-mouth recommendations are one example in such a context. SCRM measures for customer perception align on traditional indicators such as trust, benevolence, attitude, satisfaction and commitment (García-Crespo, Colomo-Palacios, Gómez-Berbís, & Ruiz-Mezcua, 2010). These indicators determine the impact on brand reputation due to customer experiences at different points of interactions between organizations and individuals. Those points of interactions become more frequent and manifold in times of SoMe. Consequently, research could start here for determining the impact on changes in traditional perception measures, and whether those measures might be linked back to an interactive digital environment.

In conclusion, measuring effects of SCRM requires complementary approaches taking account of an organizational and individual perspective. Since CE has been identified as a central objective of SCRM, particular attention should be paid to determine the impact of CE on traditional performance metrics and customer relationships at all (Gummerus et al. 2012). This perspective adds to the line of reasoning that SCRM extends traditional CRM. A measurement from the individual/web-users' perspective is reasonable because SCRM is about a customer oriented way of working. Performance measurement in this context is about engagement levels of the "anonymous" online community, the group of heavy influencers and those factors that address web-users' behaviors (e.g. (Coyle, Smith, & Platt, 2012; Gummerus, Liljander, Weman, & Pihlström, 2012; Jahn & Kunz, 2012). Research is needed on the means by which organizations attempt to serve and interact with target groups via SoMe. For example, measure and impact should be set up such as response time to questions or requests, the degree of interactivity per SoMe posting or the degree of problem solving via SoMe channels (e.g. (Ahuja & Medury, 2010)).

4.3 RQ3: Approaches towards Social CRM

Scholarly research acknowledges SCRM as a holistic concept that asks for business transformations or even new business models (Stone, 2009). Examining the identified stock of literature towards organizational approaches SCRM demands an investigation of 17 articles. The remaining articles are left out because of a focus on IT-tools, customer behaviors or literature reviews. Among the relevant publications there are four categories with different emphasis on designing SCRM systems or components thereof (see Table 3).

Category	**Publications**
Organizational determinants	Ang (2011a, 2011b), Askool & Nakata (2010), Baird & Parasnis (2011b, 2012), Pavičić et al. (2011), Stone (2009)
Processes	Hart & Gamal (2012), Mosadegh (2011), Töpfer et al. (2008),
Relationship lifecycle	Greve (2011), Sigala (2011)
SCRM framework	Acker et al. (2011); Faase et al. (2011), Hennig-Thurau et al. (2010), Reinhold & Alt (2012), Woodcock et al. (2011)

Table 3: Research perspectives and publications

Articles in the category of "*organizational determinants*" deal with selective antecedents needed for SCRM. One highlight in this category is the frequently mentioned generic claim to manage customer data and insights. Pavičić et al. (2011) highlights the need for a dedicated customer knowledge management as means to derive and provide customer-relevant information. Baird & Parasnis (2012) and Stone (2009) follow that line of reasoning by advising creative ways to extract information from a single customer such as polls. Yet, those articles rather envision the future. They neglect the major obstacle of SoMe data management. Deriving new knowledge needs to overcome challenges such as automatic data processing and linking of SoMe data with CRM objects (Reinhold & Alt, 2011). Without solving these issues, the efficient and effective transformation of unstructured SoMe data into value information and activities is hardly possible.

Articles emphasizing "*processes*" take a purely organizational perspective and align on the layers of analytical, operational and communicative/collaborative CRM. They acknowledge SCRM to be a complex endeavor which affects more than just the customer-facing functions. Back-office operations need analytical capabilities to manage large volumes of unstructured data ("big data"). The retrieved knowledge thereof needs to be used within the marketing, sales and service (operational CRM) during campaign or lead management. The communicative and collaborative CRM represent the customer front-end and fosters interaction on SoMe (e.g. Facebook). Yet, the articles somewhat miss the customer perspective and how SCRM contributes to value creation for all stakeholders.

A customer-oriented perspective is presented by Greve (2011) and Sigala (2011). Both authors explain SCRM objectives along different *relationship lifecycle phases*. (Sigala, 2011) even specifies the type of customer information needed (e.g. personal data) within the different phases (e.g. acquisition) and matches them with CRM practices (brand awareness through word of mouth). By that means, there is valuable support for operational CRM when linking customer data with marketing or sales activities.

Publications elaborating on *SCRM frameworks* explore new approaches. The models by Acker et al. (2011) and Woodcock et al. (2011) merely sketch the frameworks' outlines. Empirical evidence of the model's development process and interconnection between different pillars is missing. The proposal by Faase et al. (2011) and Alt & Reinhold (2012)

provide thorough documentations in deriving the models' building blocks. The former develops a framework when attempting to define SCRM. The latter pursues a state-of-practice research to identify the purposes of SoMe in CRM processes and the scope of SCRM activities. Hennig-Thurau et al. (2010) do not propose a dedicated framework. They summarize the challenges of new media for CRM and corresponding areas for further research. The acknowledged drawback among the models is their conceptual nature due to a missing proof of concept. Moreover, none of those models aligned on existing CRM frameworks as reference frameworks that have been established in the past (e.g. (Bruhn, 2009b; Payne & Frow, 2005; Winer, 2001)). Yet, as SCRM research is in its infancy, those models provide basis for further research.

5 Discussion

The presented literature review consolidates scholarly research on SCRM to progress the understanding of that novel concept. Following the discourse on defining and scoping SCRM, we propose the following working definition – aligned on Greenberg (2009, 2010) – stating that "*SCRM is a holistic organizational approach supported by strategies, technology platforms, processes, corporate culture and social characteristics. It is designed to engage interested customer and other web-users on organizations' managed Social Media platforms in interactions as a means to providing mutually beneficial value in a trusted and transparent digital environment.*" Since CE becomes a central objective, a major difference between SCRM and traditional CRM is the focus of CRM on the management of a customer, i.e. to acquire, to retain and to revitalize him. In turn, SCRM is about the involvement and participation - hence customer engagement - of potential, current and lost customers as well as other web-users in an interactive exchange on SoMe.

SCRM adoption in practice requires management innovations and transformative approaches to integrate SoMe and Web 2.0 mechanisms (Chui, Manyika, Bughin, & Dobbs, 2012). Organizations need to cope with a more intense and personal online communication aligned with principles such as openness and sincerity. Web-user integration and participation becomes critical to establish trust and commitment in buyer-seller relationships (Sashi, 2012). This demands adaptations in mindsets towards collaboration and transparency (Acker et al., 2011). Hence, a cultural change within organizations becomes a success factor for a Web 2.0 based customer-centric organization. In its most extreme form the move to Web 2.0 means developing a new proposition - indeed a new business - in which customers are the focal point of organizational activities (Stone, 2009). No reviewed article considered this Greenfield perspective. All aimed at defining SCRM to be integrated into existing structures. Those approaches towards SCRM are manifold and mainly of a conceptual nature. They range from single adoption factors to dedicated SCRM frameworks. The reviewed frameworks provide guidance on the different SCRM facets. Yet, they are built from scratch without re-using existing CRM frameworks. They take an organizational perspective and do no explicate how and which target groups are intended to be addressed. Since relationships develop over time, there could be more specificity on the dedicated contribution of SoMe within different relationship lifecycle phases. For example, the retention phase might be more differentiated into new customer and loyalty management (stabilize the relationship) as well as complain and movement prevention management (stabilize the relationship) (Stauss & Seidel, 2007).

Further research can build on those preliminary insights. It is required to find an appropriate level of detail to specify clear accomplishments and to assess the causes and effects of dedicated measures. Otherwise research becomes difficult to be value-adding for practice. Following the call of scholars and market analysis to design comprehensive SCRM frameworks as a starting point for transformation, a guiding research question could read as *"How can organizations strategically deploy Web 2.0 in their Customer Relationship Management to ensure value creation for themselves as well as their target groups?"*

6 Conclusion

Research objective of this paper is to provide a consolidated view of the current knowledge base of scientific SCRM research. To do so, it takes stock of the situation by reviewing 31 scholarly articles published within the last years. By scrutinizing the presented definitions, objectives, envisaged outcomes and organizational approaches towards SCRM, a contribution is made to enhance the understanding of SCRM as a novel concept for research. In line with traditional CRM research, such a specification is a necessary condition for developing comprehensive SCRM models. Moreover, it facilitates the illumination of concurrent opinions, diverging perceptions and future directions for research.

The triggers of SCRM are technological advancements and societal changes leading to an empowered web-user. This person is engaged in a public and direct dialogue with organizations and his peers in order to derive personal utilitarian and affective value. SCRM adds to that point by facilitating a customer engagement as a means to establish mutually beneficial relationships. It is a holistic organizational approach supported by strategies, technology platforms, processes, corporate culture and social characteristic. It differs from traditional CRM, which focuses on managing customers, in its intent to foster involvement and participation of web-users in an interactive exchange on organizations' managed SoMe platforms. Measuring such an engagement and the effects on company performance poses a challenge for research and practice. New indicators and methods are needed to measure the achievement of SCRM objectives or the contribution of SCRM to traditional performance measures.

Scholarly publications on SCRM are increasing but still limited. The paucity of research poses a limitation to this research. Since SCRM stems from practical business there should be a practical validation on the theoretical examinations. The analyzed publications are mainly of conceptual nature and highlight selective organizational determinants (e.g. detailed customer insights), propose a process perspective towards SCRM or demonstrate the customer relationship lifecycle as underlying framework. Comprehensive SCRM models are scarce and need to demonstrate applicability and usefulness in practice. The presented approaches rather identify building blocks for SCRM models in their attempts to define the concept. Hence, future research should empirically explore determinants and outcomes of SCRM. Those insights will facilitate applied research in designing and implementing SCRM.

References

Acker, O., Gröne, F., Akkad, F., Pötscher, F., & Yazbek, R. (2011). Social CRM: How companies can link into the social web of consumers. Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice, 13(1), 3–10. doi:10.1057/dddmp.2011.17

Ahuja, V., & Medury, Y. (2010). Corporate blogs as e-CRM tools – Building consumer engagement through content management. Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management, 17(2), 91–105. doi:10.1057/dbm.2010.8

Ahuja, V., & Medury, Y. (2011). CRM in a Web 2.0 world: Using corporate blogs for campaign management. Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice, 13(1), 11–24. doi:10.1057/dddmp.2011.15

Alfaro, I., Bhattacharyya, S., Highlander, J., Sampath, S. M., & Watson-Manheim, M. B. (2012). Opening the social media black box - a feature based approach. ECIS 2012 Proceedings.

Alt, R., & Reinhold, O. (2012). Social-Customer-Relationship-Management (Social-CRM). Wirtschaftsinformatik, 54(5), 281–286. doi:10.1007/s11576-012-0330-6

Ang, L. (2011a). Is SCRM really a good social media strategy? Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management, 18(3), 149–153. doi:10.1057/dbm.2011.22

Ang, L. (2011b). Community relationship management and social media. Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management, 18(1), 31–38. doi:10.1057/dbm.2011.3

Askool, S., & Nakata, K. (2010). A conceptual model for acceptance of social CRM systems based on a scoping study. AI & SOCIETY, 26(3), 205–220. doi:10.1007/s00146-010-0311-5

Awasthi, P., & Sangle, P. S. (2012). Adoption of CRM technology in multichannel environment: a review (2006-2010). Business Process Management Journal, 18(3), 445–471. doi:10.1108/14637151211232641

Baird, C. H., & Parasnis, G. (2011a). From social media to social customer relationship management. Strategy & Leadership, 39(5), 30–37. doi:10.1108/10878571111161507

Baird, C. H., & Parasnis, G. (2011b). From social media to Social CRM: reinventing the customer relationship. Strategy & Leadership, 39(6), 27–34. doi:10.1108/10878571111176600

Baird, C. H., & Parasnis, G. (2012). A more equal footing: How social media have transformed customer relationships. Strategic Direction, 28(6), 4–6. doi:10.1108/02580541211224021

Band, W., & Petouhoff, N. L. (2010). Topic Overview: Social CRM Goes Mainstream. Cambridge.

Bolchover, D., & Symington, A. (2012). Getting closer to the customer. London, New York, Hong Kong, Geneva.

Boon, O., Corbitt, B., & Parker, C. (2002). Conceptualising the requirements of CRM from an organisational perspective: a review of the literature. In J. Cybulski, L. Nguyen, J. Lamp, & R. Smith (Eds.), AWRE 2002: Proceedings of the 7th Australian Workshop on Requirements Engineering (pp. 83–95). Melbourne: Deakin University.

Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1993). A Dynamic Process Model of Service Quality: From Expectations to Behavioral Intentions. Journal of Marketing Research, 30(1), 7. doi:10.2307/3172510

Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13(1), 210–230. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x

Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, a. (2011). Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research. Journal of Service Research, 14(3), 252–271. doi:10.1177/1094670511411703

Bruhn, M. (2009a). Bedeutung und Entwicklung des Relationship Marketing. Relationship Marketing. Das Management von Kundenbeziehungen (2nd ed., pp. 1–9). München: Valen.

Bruhn, M. (2009b). Kundenbeziehungen aus Nachfragesicht. Relationship Marketing. Das Management von Kundenbeziehungen (2nd ed., pp. 68–89). München: Valen.

Bullinger, A. C., Hallerstede, S. H., Renken, U., Soeldner, J.-H., & Moeslein, K. M. (2010). Towards Research Collaboration – a Taxonomy of Social Research Network Sites. *AMCIS 2009 Proceedings*.

Castronovo, C., & Huang, L. (2012). Social Media in an Alternative Marketing Communication Model. Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness, 6(1), 117–134.

Chui, M., Manyika, J., Bughin, J., & Dobbs, R. (2012). The social economy: Unlocking value and productivity through social technologies. McKinsey Global Institute.

Cooper, H. M. (1988). Organizing knowledge syntheses: A taxonomy of literature reviews. Knowledge in Society, 1(1), 104–126. doi:10.1007/BF03177550

Coyle, J. R., Smith, T., & Platt, G. (2012). "I'm here to help": How companies' microblog responses to consumer problems influence brand perceptions. Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 6(1), 27–41. doi:10.1108/17505931211241350

Culnan, M. J., McHhugh, P. J., & Zubillaga, J. I. (2010). How Large U.S. Companies Can Use Twitter and Other Social Media to Gain Business Value. MIS Quarterly Executive, 9(4), 243–259.

Dearstyne, B. W. (2007). Blogs, Mashups, & Wikis Oh, My! Information Management Journal, 41(4), 24–33. doi:10.1016/j.vetimm.2008.02.018

Faase, R., Helms, R., & Spruit, M. (2011). Web 2.0 in the CRM domain: defining social CRM. International Journal of Electronic Customer Relationship Management, 5(1), 1–22. doi:10.1504/IJECRM.2011.039797

Gallaugher, J., & Ransbotham, S. (2010). Social media and customer dialog management at Starbucks. MIS Quarterly Executive, 9(4), 197–212.

García-Crespo, Á., Colomo-Palacios, R., Gómez-Berbís, J. M., & Ruiz-Mezcua, B. (2010). SEMO: a framework for customer social networks analysis based on semantics. Journal of Information Technology, 25(2), 178–188. doi:10.1057/jit.2010.1

Grabner-Kräuter, S., & Mödritscher, G. (2002). Approaches Toward Measuring CRM Performance. 6th Research Conference on Relationship Marketing and Customer Relationship Management. Atlanta, USA.

Greenberg, P. (2009). Social CRM. CRM at the speed of Light: Social CRM strategies, tools, and techniques for engaging your customer (4th ed., pp. 34–37). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

Greenberg, P. (2010). The impact of CRM 2.0 on customer insight. Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 25(6), 410–419. doi:10.1108/08858621011066008

Greve, G. (2011). Social CRM – ganzheitliches Beziehungsmanagement mit Social Media. Marketing Review St. Gallen, 28(5), 16–21. doi:10.1007/s11621-011-0058-5

Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E., & Pihlström, M. (2012). Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community. Management Research Review, 35(9), 857–877. doi:10.1108/01409171211256578

Hart, S. W., & Gamal, K. (2012). Social Customer Relationship Management - From Customer to Friend. EMICS 2012 Proceedings (pp. 75–88). Munich.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Malthouse, E. C., Friege, C., Gensler, S., Lobschat, L., Rangaswamy, a., & Skiera, B. (2010). The Impact of New Media on Customer Relationships. Journal of Service Research, 13(3), 311–330. doi:10.1177/1094670510375460

Hippner, H. (2004). Zur Konzeption von Kundenbeziehungsstrategien. In H. Hippner & K. Wilde (Eds.), Management von CRM-Projekten – Handlungsempfehlungen und Branchenkonzepte (pp. 33–65). Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag.

Jahn, B., & Kunz, W. (2012). How to transform consumers into fans of your brand. Journal of Service Management, 23(3), 344–361. doi:10.1108/09564231211248444

Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. Business Horizons, 53(1), 59–68. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003

Leußer, W., Hippner, H., & Wilde, K. (2011). CRM – Grundlagen, Konzepte und Prozesse. In H. Hippner, B. Hubrich, & K. Wilde (Eds.), Grundlagen des CRM - Strategie, Geschäftsprozesse und IT-Unterstützung (3rd ed., pp. 15–56). Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag.

Marketing Science Institute. (2010). Research Priorities 2010-2012. Retrieved from http://www.msi.org/pdf/MSI_RP10-12.pdf

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58, 20–38.

Mosadegh, M. J. (2011). Using social network paradigm for developing a conceptual framework in CRM. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1(4), 63–71.

Mrkwicka, K., Kiessling, M., & Kolbe, L. (2009). Potential of Web 2.0 Applications for Viewer Retention. AMCIS 2009 Proceedings (pp. 1–11).

Musser, J., & O'Reilly, T. (2006). Web 2.0 Principles and Best Practices. OReilly Radar. Retrieved from http://radar.oreilly.com/research/web2-report.html

Ngai, E. W. T., Xiu, L., & Chau, D. C. K. (2009). Expert Systems with Applications Application of data mining techniques in customer relationship management: A literature review and classification. Expert Systems With Applications, 36(2), 2592–2602. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2008.02.021

Nguyen, B., & Mutum, D. S. (2012). A review of customer relationship management: successes, advances, pitfalls and futures. Business Process Management Journal, 18(3), 400–419. doi:10.1108/14637151211232614

Parameswaran, M., & Whinston, A. B. (2007a). Research Issues in Social Computing. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 8(6), 336–350.

Parameswaran, M., & Whinston, A. B. (2007b). Social computing: An overview. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 19(37), 762–780.

Pavičić, J., Alfirević, N., & Žnidar, K. (2011). Customer knowledge management: Toward social CRM. International Journal of Management Cases, 13(3), 203–209.

Payne, A., & Frow, P. (2005). A Strategic Framework for Customer Framework Relationship Management. Journal of Marketing, 69(4), 167–176.

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18(3), 5–14. doi:10.1002/dir.20015

Randolph, J. J. (2009). A Guide to Writing the Dissertation Literature Review. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 14(13).

Reichheld, F. F., & Sasser, W. E. (1990). Zero defections: quality comes to services. Harvard Business Review, 68(5), 105–111. doi:10.1016/j.colsurfa.2006.11.029

Reinhold, O., & Alt, R. (2011). Analytical Social CRM: Concept and Tool Support. BLED 2011 Proceedings (pp. 226–241).

Reinhold, O., & Alt, R. (2012). Social Customer Relationship Management: State of the Art and Learnings from Current Projects. BLED 2012 Proceedings (pp. 155–169).

Romano, N., & Fjermestad, J. (2003). Electronic commerce customer relationship management: a research agenda. Information Technology and Management, 4(2/3), 233–258. doi:10.1023/A:1022906513502

Sarner, A., & Sussin, J. (2012). Predicts 2013: Social CRM. Stamford.

Sarner, A., Thompson, E., Sengar, P., & Sussin, J. (2011). Predicts 2012 : Social CRM Remains an Immature Area. Stamford.

Sashi, C. M. (2012). Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media. Management Decision, 50(2), 253–272. doi:10.1108/00251741211203551

Sigala, M. (2011). eCRM 2.0 applications and trends: The use and perceptions of Greek tourism firms of social networks and intelligence. Computers in Human Behavior, 27(2), 655–661. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.007

Stauss, B., & Seidel, W. (2007). Das Aufgabenspektrum des Kundenbindungsmanagements. Beschwerdemanagement. Unzufriedene Kunden als profitable Zielgruppe (4th ed., pp. 29–32). Munich/Wien: Hanser Verlag.

Stone, M. (2009). Staying customer-focused and trusted: Web 2.0 and Customer 2.0 in financial services. Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management, 16(2), 101–131. doi:10.1057/dbm.2009.13

Töpfer, A., Silbermann, S., & René, W. (2008). Die Rolle des Web 2.0 im CRM. In A. Töpfer (Ed.), Handbuch Kundenmanagement (pp. 651–675). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-49924-4_23

Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions. Journal of Service Research, 13(3), 253–266. doi:10.1177/1094670510375599

Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase. The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 20(2), 122–146. doi:10.2753/MTP1069-6679200201

Vom Brocke, J., Simons, A., Niehaves, B., Riemer, K., Plattfaut, R., & Cleven, A. (2009). Reconstructing the Giant: On the Importance of Rigour in Documenting the Literature Search Process. In S. Newell, E. A. Whitley, N. Pouloudi, J. Wareham, & L. Mathiassen (Eds.), 17th European Conference on Information Systems (pp. 3226–3238).

Wahlberg, O., Strandberg, C., Sundberg, H., & Sandberg, K. W. (2009). Trends, Topics and Underresearched Areas in CRM Research. International Journal of Public Information Systems, 3, 191–208.

Walsh, G., Hass, B. H., & Kilian, T. (2011). Grundlagen des Web 2.0. In G. Walsh, B. H. Hass, & T. Kilian (Eds.), Web 2.0 (pp. 3–19). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-13787-7

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. MIS Quarterly, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. doi:10.1.1.104.6570

Winer, R. (2001). A framework for customer relationship management. California management review, 43(4), 89–106.

Woodcock, N., Green, A., & Starkey, M. (2011). Social CRM as a business strategy. Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management, 18(1), 50–64. doi:10.1057/dbm.2011.7

Zlateva, P., Zabunov, G., & Velev, D. (2011). A Model of Intention to Purchase as a Component of Social CRM System. International Conference on E-business, Management and Economics (Vol. 25, pp. 124–128). Singapore.

Appendix - Final stock of documents for literature analyses

Search	Source	Author(s)	Publication title	Publisher	Year
Initial	EBSCO	O. Acker et al.	Social CRM: How companies can link into the social web of consumers	Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice	2011
Initial	EBSCO	V. Ahuja & Y. Medury	CRM in a Web 2.0 world: Using corporate blogs for campaign management	Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice	2011
Initial	EBSCO	L. Ang	Community relationship management and social media	Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management	2011
Initial	EBSCO	S. Askool & K. Nakata	A conceptual model for acceptance of social CRM systems based on a scoping study	AI & SOCIETY	2010
Initial	EBSCO	C. Baird & G. Parasnis	From social media to social customer relationship management	Strategy & Leadership	2011
Initial	EBSCO	C. Baird & G. Parasnis	From social media to Social CRM: reinventing the customer relationship	Strategy & Leadership	2011
Initial	EBSCO	R. Faase et al.	Web 2.0 in the CRM domain: defining social CRM	Int. Journal of Electronic Customer Relationship Management	2011
Initial	EBSCO	P. Greenberg	The impact of CRM 2.0 on customer insight	Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing	2010
Initial	EBSCO	G. Greve	Social CRM – ganzheitliches Beziehungsmanagement mit Social Media	Marketing Review St. Gallen	2011
Initial	EBSCO	J. Pavičić et al.	Customer knowledge management: Toward social CRM	Int. Journal of Management Cases	2011
Initial	EBSCO	M. Stone	Staying customer-focused and trusted: Web 2.0 and Customer 2.0 in financial services	Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management,	2009
Initial	EBSCO	N. Woodcock et al.	Social CRM as a business strategy	Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management	2011
Initial	EBSCO	P. Zlateva et al.	A Model of Intention to Purchase as a Component of Social CRM System	Int. Conference on E-business, Management and Economics,	2011
Initial	AISel	K. Mrkwicka et al.	Potential of Web 2.0 Applications for Viewer Retention	AMCIS 2009 Proceedings	2009
Initial	AISel	O. Reinhold & R. Alt	Social Customer Relationship Management: State of the Art and Learnings from Current Projects	BLED 2012 Proceedings	2012
Initial	AISel	O. Reinhold & R. Alt	Analytical Social CRM: Concept and Tool Support	BLED 2011 Proceedings	2011
Initial	ProQuest	Á. García-Crespo et al.	SEMO: a for customer social networks analysis based on semantics	Journal of Information Technology	2010

Initial	Science Direct	M. Sigala	eCRM 2.0 applications and trends: The use and perceptions of Greek tourism firms	Computers in Human Behavior	2011
Initial	Emerald	B. Nguyen & D. Mutum	A review of customer relationship management: successes, advances, pitfalls and futures	Business Process Management Journal	2012
Initial	Emerald	J. Coyle et al.	"I'm here to help": How companies' microblog responses to consumer problems influence brand perceptions	Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing	2012
Initial	Emerald	C. Baird & G. Parasnis	A more equal footing: How social media have transformed customer relationships	Strategic Direction	2012
Initial	Emerald	L. Ang	Is SCRM really a good social media strategy?	Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management	2011
Initial	Emerald	S. Mohan et al.	Conceptual Modeling of Enterprise Application System Using Social Networking and Web 2.0 "Social CRM System"	Int. Conference on Convergence and Hybrid Information Technology	2008
Initial	Emerald	J. Gummerus et al.	Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community	Management Research Review	2012
Initial	Emerald	C. Sashi	Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media	Management Decision	2012
Initial	Emerald	B. Jahn & W. Kunz	How to transform consumers into fans of your brand	Journal of Service Management	2012
Forward	Google Scholar	S. Hart & K. Gamal	Social customer relationship management - from customer to friend	EMCIS Proceedings	2012
Backward	Google Scholar	V. Ahuja & Y. Medury	Corporate blog as e-CRM tools building consumer engagement through content management	Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management	2010
Backward	Google Scholar	T. Hennig-Thurau et al.	The Impact of New Media on Customer Relationships	Journal of Service Research	2010
Backward	Google Scholar	A. Töpfer et al.	Die Rolle des Web 2.0 im CRM *[EN: The role of Web 2.0 in CRM]*	Handbuch Kundenmanagement	2008
Backward	Google Scholar	M. Mosadegh	Using social network paradigm for developing a conceptual framework in CRM	Australian Journal of Business and Management Research	2011