**The determinants of** **social CRM Entrepreneurship: An institutional perspective**

**Abstract**

Despite a growing interest in social media adoption by corporations, there is minimal knowledge about the drivers of social customer relationship management (SCRM). This study examines the determinants of SCRM entrepreneurship from an institutional perspective. Data on 19 banks were obtained from 183 responses to a questionnaire. These data were analyzed using PLS path modeling. The findings show that organizational and technological contexts have a significant positive impact on SCRM entrepreneurship. The results also reveal a significant impact of institutional normative and coercive pressures on SCRM entrepreneurship. The findings of this study provide researchers and practitioners with a deeper understanding of how external institutional pressures and internal organizational and technological contexts can interact to create SCRM entrepreneurship. Furthermore, this study contributes to knowledge about the motivations and methods of SCRM adoption and evaluation.
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**1. Introduction**

A firm’s ability to rapidly sense and respond to dynamic customer needs has become a critical business capability (Gustafsson & Khan, 2017). The key entrepreneurial activities involve not only creating new products or services before competitors but also leading the business in exploring customers’ changing needs and expectations (Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Gustafsson & Khan, 2017). Entrepreneurship has become one of the most engaging concepts in the management and information technology fields in the modern era.

In recent years, social media have become the most powerful platforms in revolutionizing the way companies interact with their customers. It is becoming more and more a feature and an integral part of entrepreneurial orientation for managing customer relationships (Ahmad et al., 2018). Social customer relationship management (SCRM) is an innovative paradigm for incorporating social media into traditional customer relationship management (CRM) technologies, providing a novel way of managing relationships with customers. The literature confirms that SCRM creates the opportunity for organizations to access more data through emotional and behavioral insights about customers. They can thus interact with customers more effectively and cost-efficiently than when using traditional CRM techniques ([Ahani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217303539#!) et al., 2017; Kantorová & Bachmann, 2018).

Recent studies confirm that social computing is a promising avenue for enhancing corporate entrepreneurship (Duhan & Singh, 2014; Dutot & Bergeron, 2016; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Gustafsson & Khan, 2017). More specifically, the literature indicates that social media platforms offer critical entrepreneurial resources in the pursuit of effective CRM (Duhan & Singh, 2014; Dutot & Bergeron, 2016; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Gustafsson & Khan, 2017). Indeed, social media platform use can influence entrepreneurial entry in a given context (Wang et al., 2020).

SCRM entrepreneurship aims to make proactive use of social media opportunities to promote customer acquisition, satisfaction, retention, and profitability by developing insightful relationships that create greater value for the firm and the customer. SCRM is a young phenomenon and is still relatively unexplored (Yunis et al., 2018). The literature reveals that little attention has been paid to studying the role of social media in corporate entrepreneurship (Ahmad et al., 2018). Furthermore, the adoption of social media in business organizations is limited, possibly due to the lack of knowledge about how to capitalize on social media adoption and achieve benefits or advantages from doing so (Braojos-Gomez et al., 2015). Many companies fail to exploit social media opportunities to enhance their customer relationships and achieve competitive advantages (Crammond et al., 2018). Many business executives still do not see value in implementing SCRM (Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018).

Despite growing interest in social media adoption by corporations, there is minimal knowledge about how SCRM can be integrated into corporate entrepreneurship to increase the customer focus. Much less is known about the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship and its impact on CRM performance. Given the aforementioned research gap, this study empirically examines the role of social media in building superior corporate abilities to manage customer relationships in an entrepreneurial context. It examines the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship. In addition, this study investigates the impact of SCRM entrepreneurship on CRM performance.

**2. Literature review**

In today’s market, organizations overwhelmingly recognize that the customer is at the center of any business strategy. Indeed, the success of a firm largely depends on the effectiveness of its CRM (Bahrami et al., 2012). Entrepreneurship is strongly rooted in organizations with well-developed innovative capabilities related to the detection of customers’ needs or market orientation (Nasution et al., 2014; Presutti & Odorici, 2019). Entrepreneurship has been defined as a process of innovation and the exploitation of new opportunities. This process requires the entrepreneurial attributes of autonomy, proactiveness, and risk-taking (Nasution et al., 2014; Shane et al., 2003). Entrepreneurship has occasionally been seen as a mechanism to create value by using a unique set of resources to create and exploit new opportunities (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Duhan & Singh, 2014; Garud & Karnoe, 2003). While entrepreneurship is perceived as indispensable for improving business competitiveness, entrepreneurship success requires an ability to find new opportunities to create greater customer value than competitors (Lagrosen & Josefsson, 2012; Nasution et al., 2014; Nethravathi et al., 2020).

Sashi (2012) found a correlation between customer engagement and new technologies. This relationship may owe to the greater interactivity between individuals and organizations. CRM is perceived as a business and marketing strategy that combines information, technologies, processes, value co-creation, and the acquisition and sharing of customer knowledge (Bahrami et al., 2012). Woodcock et al. (2011) referred to CRM as the methodology, technology, and e-business capabilities that are adopted by a firm to manage its relationship with customers. Porter (2001) emphasized that the use of e-CRM applications enables organizations to attract, acquire, retain, and build and maintain a long‐term relationship with profitable customers.

The popularity of social media services has opened new avenues of CRM that engage customers more easily, directly, and personally (Gu et al., 2017). The concept of SCRM has been gaining popularity among practitioners over the past few years. However, research in this area is still at a nascent stage. Hence, most previous studies (Gu et al., 2017; Guha et al., 2017; Hasani et al., 2017) have focused on developing theoretical frameworks of acceptance and adoption of SCRM. Another stream of recent research (Chierici et al., 2018; Latuny, 2018; Trainor et al., 2014; Wang & Kim, 2017) has investigated how SCRM usage contributes to improving CRM and how it can affect organizational performance.

Scholars emphasize that social media offer a promising source of entrepreneurship research (Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Gustafsson & Khan, 2017). The literature recommends the adoption of social media technologies due to their prominent role in corporate entrepreneurship (Crammond et al., 2018; Duhan & Singh, 2014). Gustafsson and Khan (2017) describe social media entrepreneurship as the process of identifying and exploiting potential opportunities executed by stakeholders through social media tools.

The literature indicates that social media entrepreneurship, along with its implications, has attracted attention in the broader marketing literature. For example, several studies (Latuny, 2018; Yong & Hassan, 2019) have investigated the impact of social media marketing on corporate entrepreneurship. Much of the prior research (Crammond et al., 2018; Lagrosen & Josefsson, 2012; Nguyen et al., 2015) has focused on the role of social media in entrepreneurial learning and knowledge acquisition as antecedents to innovation and customer value. These studies agree that by using social media, companies encounter excellent opportunities to gain an in-depth understanding of their customers’ needs, preferences, and expectations. Moreover, they receive valuable suggestions for product and service developments, which provide businesses with a basis for new entrepreneurial activities.

Despite increasing efforts to tackle the drivers of SCRM acceptance and adoption in organizations, far less attention has been paid to exploring the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship. The most commonly used theories in the adoption of IT innovation at the firm level are the diffusion of innovation theory, institutional theory, and the technology-organization-environment (TOE) framework. A major limitation of the diffusion of innovation theory is that it does not consider the impact of environmental context on innovation adoption (Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011). Conversely, institutional theory focuses on environmental factors and pressures, ignoring the technological and organizational contexts. The TOE framework proposes three contexts that determine IT innovation adoption: technology, organization, and environment. Many scholars (Chen et al., 2018; Duan et al., 2012; Qashou & Saleh, 2018) have suggested that the TOE framework provides an appropriate starting point for studying the adoption of any new e-business innovation.

Although the TOE framework has been widely employed to investigate what drives the adoption of IT innovation at the organizational level. The major challenge that scholars face is establishing identical factors to measure the three constructs of this framework. Many scholars (Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2018; Teo et al., 2006) agree that the TOE framework is applied differently from study to study. The constructs of organization and environment are described using many disparate measures. This flaw has prompted many scholars ([Ahani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217303539#!) et al., 2017; Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2018) to combine the TOE framework with institutional theory. They thus include the influence of the environment on the adoption of e-business applications. In institutional theory, it is assumed that organizations are shaped by the characteristics of their environment. According to institutional theory, a firm is embedded in a larger system of relations and actors, including partners, owners, customers, suppliers, and competitors.

The literature review reveals that insufficient attention has been paid to the study of SCRM entrepreneurship. Given this gap in the literature, the main focus of the present study is to develop an empirically supported conceptual model for the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship based on the TOE framework and institutional theory. This study also examines the impact of e-business entrepreneurship on CRM performance.

**3. Research model and hypotheses**

The research model (Fig. 1) proposes that the organizational context, technological context, and institutional coercive pressures, mimetic pressures, and normative pressures have a direct impact on the extent of SCRM entrepreneurship. The research model suggests that the extent of SCRM entrepreneurship has a significant impact on CRM performance.

---INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE---

**3.1. SCRM entrepreneurship**

Advances in social media applications are constantly providing businesses with innovative entrepreneurial opportunities. The literature (Duhan & Singh, 2014; Dutot & Bergeron, 2016; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018) indicates that social media capabilities may be an entrepreneurial resource in the successful pursuit of CRM. However, the literature (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Miller, 1983) also reveals three supposedly essential dimensions in determining the extent of SCRM entrepreneurship: innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness.

Innovativeness is a component of entrepreneurship that reflects a firm’s ability to encourage original ideas (Hanif et al., 2018). It also describes the extent to which a company introduces novel goods, services, processes, or technology (Miller & Friesen, 1982). According to Bahrami et al. (2012), using CRM to build and maintain a long-term relationship with customers is an essential strategy for fostering innovative capabilities. Prior research (Yong & Hassan, 2019; Yunis et al., 2018) describes social media as an open source for innovation in providing products and services depending on customers’ needs. Previous studies (Gu et al., 2017; Woodcock et al., 2011) have confirmed that the actions of implementing SCRM and fostering social networks affect the innovation of products and services and consequently influence organizational performance, customer contentment, and organization branding.

Risk-taking is the ability to make reasonable but daring decisions under uncertainty by systematically alleviating aspects of risk (Miller & Friesen, 1982). It includes the willingness of management to provide vital resources to opportunities with a significant probability of expensive failure (Scheepers et al., 2007). There is widespread agreement in the literature that the implementation of CRM technology is likely to be essential when market conditions are characterized by high uncertainty and firms are endeavoring to gain competitive advantages through innovation (Askool & Nakata, 2011; Nasution et al., 2014). Previous studies have discussed the potential risks of putting all of the firm’s eggs in one basket by replacing the traditional CRM approach with SCRM. Askool and Nakata (2011) stressed that using SCRM applications in the wrong circumstances may destroy the relationship with customers. Previous studies ([Ahani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217303539#!) et al., 2017; Askool & Nakata, 2011; Woodcock et al., 2011) have shown that a lack of trust, privacy, and security concerns have an adverse influence on customers’ willingness to interact and share information resulting in lower responsiveness and value creation for both the business and the customer.

In line with several other authors, Morgan and Strong (1998) describe proactiveness as continuous efforts to exploit and seize opportunities ahead of competitors in response to changing market conditions. It captures the dimension of seeking new business opportunities in the face of dynamic environmental challenges and consistently introducing new products, services, and processes to meet future customer needs and market demands (Hanif et al., 2018). Adding the social component to the existing CRM model has brought new opportunities for entrepreneurial firms to be more proactive than competitors in terms of communication, interaction, and collaboration between target consumers and the brand (Sashi, 2012). The literature (Dutot & Bergeron, 2016; Yunis et al., 2018) confirmed that SCRM is a business strategy that creates novel opportunities for sales, marketing, and customer service, increasing advocacy, retention, and market penetration and allowing companies to gain more in-depth customer insights. Woodcock et al. (2011) asserted that SCRM creates innovative opportunities for organizations to access more customer data and make interactions more effective and cost-efficient than with traditional CRM methods.

**3.2. Organizational context**

Organizational context refers to the internal contextual aspects that affect how organizations adopt and implement technological innovation, including top management support, managerial structure, firm size, scope, and financial resources ([Ahani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217303539#!) et al., 2017; Oliveira & Martins, 2010). These factors shape the organizational environment, which determines an organization’s attitude toward and interest in entrepreneurship (Scheepers et al., 2007). Prior research (Bahrami et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2018) suggests that the organizational context sends an implicit message regarding entrepreneurial orientation and support for innovation, openness to change, proactiveness and risk-taking, which in turn would support creating more active roles for employees to participate in decision making and generate new creative ideas.

Human capital characteristics of top management play a critical role in the entrepreneurial orientation of corporations pursuing new ventures with a high-technology focus because of the position of business managers as key decision makers and contributors to the organization (Hayton, 2005). It is well documented that top management support is a key factor for the successful adoption of IT in organizations (Chen et al., 2018; Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2017). The literature (Harrigan et al., 2015; Hasani et al., 2017) also confirms that top management support is highly important in sponsoring and directing SCRM investments appropriately to meet customers’ needs and the business’s requirements.

The literature has emphasized the impact of a firm’s scope and size on IT adoption (Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011). Kantorová and Bachmann (2018) suggest that the significant influence of the organizational characteristics of size and scope on SCRM use is an important area for future research into geographical comparisons or comparisons over time. Prior research on IT adoption found that organizations with a greater scope of business show more readiness to implement new e-business innovations (Oliveira & Martins, 2011; Qashou & Saleh, 2018). Social media enhance the opportunity for cross-border information flows, promote faster new market penetration, and make it possible to acquire a whole new set of customers who were inaccessible or too expensive to reach (Ahmad et al., 2018; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018).

Firm size is widely regarded as a facilitator of IT adoption (Soares-Aguiar & Palma-dos-Reis, 2008). Recent studies (Kantorová & Bachmann, 2018; Qashou & Saleh, 2018; Sun et al., 2018) have shown that larger firms have more organizational assets, resources, and competencies and can accept higher risk than others in their attempts to become early adopters of novel IT innovations, particularly in terms of investing in SCRM. The literature (Harrigan et al., 2015; Kantorová & Bachmann, 2018; Wang & Kim, 2017) also explains that SCRM practices are more frequently employed as organization size increases.

The innovative adoption and use of IT is associated with an organizational culture that constantly guides organizational members to identify, assess, and take advantage of these innovations (Qashou & Saleh, 2018; Yunis et al., 2018). Miller and Friesen (1982) revealed that an organizational culture that embraces initiatives, innovative thinking, and risk-taking and rewards employees for newly acquired knowledge and creative ideas is a crucial ingredient of corporate entrepreneurship. Marolt et al. (2018) confirmed that organizational culture must be considered when intensifying the use of SCRM.

According to the preceding discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: The organizational context has a significant impact on SCRM entrepreneurship.

**3.3. Technological context**

The technological context describes both the existing technology that has already been adopted and that is used in the firm and the set of technologies that are not currently in use (Oliveira & Martins, 2011). Technological context is evaluated based on a set of characteristics such as IT infrastructure, technology readiness, technological compatibility, and organizational IT competencies (Hasani et al., 2017; Oliveira & Martins, 2011). In the context of the TOE framework, technology readiness is the strongest determinant for e-business value (Zhu et al., 2006). The degree of technology readiness refers to having a rich and scalable infrastructure, including telecommunications and networking, technical infrastructure, business intelligence applications, and facilities to support innovative IT adoption (Gibbs & Kraemer 2004; Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011). Many previous studies (Ahani et al., 2017; Askool & Nakata, 2011) have shown that ICT infrastructure plays a vital role in CRM adoption and use. Marolt et al. (2018) confirmed that IT infrastructure readiness influences the intensity of SCRM.

E-business innovation is adopted more smoothly and quickly if it is compatible with a firm’s existing IT infrastructure and platforms (Chen et al., 2018; Qashou & Saleh; 2018). Prior research (Hasani et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2015) has shown that the compatibility of CRM solutions with privilege firm technology and infrastructure is a vital factor in the adoption process. Furthermore, recent research (Guha et al., 2017; Hasani et al., 2017; Marolt et al., 2018) has described technological compatibility as one of the most decisive determinants in the adoption of SCRM.

Technological competencies are described as the core ingredients of e-business adoption (Gibbs & Kraemer 2004; Oliveira & Martins, 2011; Soares-Aguiar & Palma-dos-Reis, 2008). These competencies include IT management, expertise, skills, best practices, and knowledge of adopting and using IT-based innovations. Chen et al. (2018) emphasized the role of technological distinctive competencies in extracting and exploiting new technological opportunities as an early stage of entrepreneurial initiatives. Prior research (Hasani et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2015) confirmed that managers and employees need to optimize training and enhance their social media competencies ahead of competitors to achieve leading market positions. Recently, technological competence was found to be a major contributing factor to the adoption of SCRM (Chierici et al., 2018; Trainor et al., 2014).

Following the previous discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Technological context has a significant impact on SCRM entrepreneurship.

**3.4. Institutional pressures**

**3.4.1. Coercive pressures**

Coercive pressures can be described as both informal and formal pressures stemming from the society in which the focal organization exists or other organizations that the focal organization relies on for resources (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). These pressures may be encountered in the form of threats, persuasion, or invitations to participate in collusive activities. According to this view, firms strive to gain not only resources and customers but also institutional legitimacy and economic and social superiority (Gibbs & Kraemer 2004; Hasani et al., 2017). Therefore, businesses in a more competitive environment are more likely to engage in constant exploration of the new trends in IT innovations and implement them to obtain a competitive edge. Previous studies (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011) have shown a significant impact of coercive pressures on the adoption of e-business innovations. The recent literature (Ahani et al., 2017; Marolt et al., 2018) emphasizes that competitive pressures could drive firms to employ SCRM to maintain their competitive edge.

Recent studies (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Qashou & Saleh, 2018) have confirmed that companies tend to be pushed to use technological innovations by isomorphic pressures from customers. According to Hasani et al. (2017) and Gu et al. (2017), competitive pressures from other adopters may coerce start-up firms to use SCRM applications. The extraordinary change in customer behavior and practices as a result of the development and wide use of social media by society has forced companies to be active on these platforms if they want to stay close to their customers and remain competitive (Trainor et al., 2014). The rise of social media platforms has imposed additional pressures on companies to use SCRM to reach new markets while retaining existing customers (Hasani et al., 2017; Marolt et al., 2018).

Following the above discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Coercive pressures have a significant impact on SCRM entrepreneurship.

**3.4.2. Mimetic pressures**

The concept of mimetic pressures implies that firms respond to uncertainty and change in the environment by copying the actions, technologies, practices, or structures of successful competitors or mimicking those that are common in their industry (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Mimetic pressures are related to the ability of firms to imitate the behavior and innovation of first movers and high-performing firms that are exemplary models, carry high prestige, or have successfully adapted to their environment (Teo et al., 2006). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) explained that firms struggling with ill-defined and poorly understood technologies are more likely to mimic other firms, such as competitors or partners, than to take decisions based on a rational analysis of their objectives. Moreover, mimetic models may emanate indirectly through knowledge transfer, consulting firms, industry trade associations, or professional associations (Teo et al., 2006; Mignerat & Rivard, 2009). Previous studies (Soares-Aguiar & Palma-dos-Reis, 2008; Teo et al., 2006) have emphasized the significant impact of mimetic pressures on e-business adoption. Furthermore, Al Omoush et al. (2018) revealed a significant role of mimetic pressures in achieving e-business entrepreneurship. However, responding to mimetic pressures is unlikely to itself establish a business as a corporate innovator or an early adopter of technology with a competitive advantage or special entrepreneurship.

The industry pressures stemming from the widespread use of social media applications have increased the adoption of SCRM (Dewnarain et al., 2018; Gu et al., 2017). Imitation of the actions of industry leaders and competitors is considered a major contributing factor to companies’ decisions concerning the adoption of SCRM solutions (Latuny, 2018; Marolt et al., 2018). According to the recent literature (Ahani et al., 2017; Chierici et al., 2018; Guha et al., 2017), observing the performance and relative advantage of other firms adopting social media usage is an important factor influencing SCRM adoption in the same or different industries. Dewnarain et al. (2018) affirmed that a focal organization may adopt SCRM if it knows that its competitors have adopted similar innovations. In the context of SCRM drivers, Dutot and Bergeron (2016) and Woodcock et al. (2011) confirmed that the imitation of social media activities in CRM can inspire a firm to develop new capabilities and, eventually, new ways of implementing social media. The above discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

H4: Mimetic pressures have a significant impact on SCRM entrepreneurship.

**3.4.3. Normative pressures**

Normative pressures stem from the membership of social networks and alignment with professional rather than organizational values regarding how work should be performed (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). These pressures are determined by attitudes, perceived expectations, norms, culture, and values of the society that hosts the operations of the firm (Oliveira & Martins, 2011). Such pressures come from different institutional agents such as the government, business partners, interest groups, trade, and professional associations where firms share some information, rules, and norms (Son & Benbasat, 2007).

Organizational social networks have long been described as effective mechanisms for the transfer and exchange of explicit and tacit knowledge (Hayton, 2005). Organizations with high levels of social networking have more knowledge-management abilities than those with fewer social networks (Hayton, 2005). Through effective organizational learning from other firms and asset accumulation from complementary sources, a company can build its knowledge capacity and quickly draw upon its prior learning in sensing market imperfections, discovering arbitrage opportunities, and shaping strategic innovative moves (Bahrami et al., 2012). Puhakka (2010) suggests that the innovative aspect of entrepreneurship may come from recognizing new business opportunities that result from new technological knowledge. Additionally, many previous studies (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011; Son & Benbasat 2007) have emphasized the impact of normative pressures on a firm’s decision to adopt new e-business innovations.

Recently, many scholars (Gu et al., 2017; Hasani et al., 2017) have pointed out that when a firm’s industry and professional business partners use SCRM, then the tendency to use is essential. A considerable body of research (Crammond et al., 2018; Lagrosen & Josefsson, 2012; Nguyen et al., 2015) has focused on the importance of SCRM in entrepreneurial learning and knowledge acquisition as an emerging impetus for innovation and customer value. Scholars (Duhan & Singh, 2014; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Nasution et al., 2014) agree that by using SCRM, companies exploit excellent opportunities to gain valuable and in-depth knowledge about their customers’ needs, preferences, and expectations, which provides businesses with a basis for entrepreneurial activities. SCRM can be a powerful tool for collecting, analyzing, and sharing information and knowledge to sense and identify dynamic needs, values, and norms of society and to respond to customer expectations and requirements in innovative ways (Woodcock et al., 2011). Following the previous discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H5: Normative pressures have a significant impact on SCRM entrepreneurship.

**3.5. CRM processes**

The extent of IT application usage has been widely adopted to investigate the business value of innovative technology (Oliveira & Martins 2011). According to Ranganathan et al. (2011), the actual usage of technology by an organization is a major determinant of the relationship between technology implementation and the expected outcome. The literature (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2011; Teo et al., 2006) suggests that the extent of e-business adoption and use is influenced by firms’ perceptions, which translate institutional and organizational pressures into different levels of adoption and use. According to Al Omoush et al. (2018), it is more meaningful to link the entrepreneurial orientation and the level of innovative e-business usage than to consider only the effect of e-business entrepreneurship on performance.

Social media are a set of Internet-based services supported by Web 2.0 technologies, including social networking platforms, blogs, YouTube, Wikis, RSS, and many other applications that depend on the Internet and ICT (Dewnarain et al., 2018). Prior studies ([Ahani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217303539#!) et al., 2017; Askool & Nakata, 2011) have suggested that Web 2.0 features may offer a valuable approach for analyzing the potential adoption of SCRM. Furthermore, many scholars have investigated the direct impact of Web 2.0 technologies on corporate entrepreneurship. For example, Jones (2010) argued that Web 2.0 acts as an essential element in the maintenance and delivery of entrepreneurship. Jones and Iredale (2009) affirmed that organizations use Web 2.0 as an instrument for extra entrepreneurial business education. Dutot and Bergeron (2016) investigated entrepreneurial orientation in organizations and in terms of Web 2.0 performance. Many scholars (Nguyen et al., 2015; Yunis et al., 2018) have confirmed that the adoption of Web 2.0 technologies by organizations impacts effective decision-making regarding organizing services and products around customers’ needs. Drawing on the preceding discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H6: The extent of SCRM entrepreneurship has a significant impact on the performance of CRM processes.

**4. Research method**

**4.1. Measurement and instrument development**

The measurement instrument of this study was derived from the literature on the TOE framework, institutional theory, CRM drivers, corporate entrepreneurship, e-business entrepreneurship, and SCRM. Empirical data were obtained using a self-administered survey. The questionnaire included 46 items, as presented in Table 1. These items represented the constructs of the research model.

---INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE---

**4.2. Sampling and questionnaire distribution**

The population was the banking industry. Entrepreneurship is an urgent part of today’s banking industry in light of the current dynamic and active business environment (Aldaihani & Ali, 2018; Chai & Entebang, 2013; Ijeoma & Onuoha, 2018). Furthermore, recent research (Aldaihani & Ali, 2018; Hallikainen et al., 2017) has suggested that banks that have an entrepreneurial orientation should place more emphasis on the use of SCRM systems to enhance CRM processes. Aldaihani and Ali (2018) observed that social media can dramatically influence a bank’s reputation and public image, where customer behavior in this context is strongly affected by word of mouth communication. Therefore, the banking industry was deemed an appropriate population to address the study aims.

At the time of the study, 26 banks were operating in Jordan. Of these, 19 banks agreed to participate in the study, consisting of eight domestic banks, six regional banks, and five international banks. Implementing SCRM entails using a variety of processes related to IT, sales and marketing, customer relations, customer services, and other organizational functions related to CRM (Yawised et al., 2017). Respondents for the survey were selected from the top and middle managers. The study’s focus on mid-level management is consistent with the growing role of middle managers in fostering or inhibiting entrepreneurial efforts (Eren & Kocapinar, 2009). Managers of bank branches were also in an ideal position to respond to the questionnaire because they could efficiently explain the CRM strategies implemented by their banks. As leaders in executive positions, branch managers were best able to describe the implementation level of SCRM in their organization. Overall, 285 questionnaires were distributed. After the responses had been received, 23 incomplete questionnaires were removed from the analysis. Therefore, 183 valid questionnaires were collected. This number represents a response rate of 64.2%. Table 2 illustrates the distribution of the sample.

---INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE---

**5. Results**

Smart PLS version 2.0 was used for data analysis. This technique is a regression-based approach for testing original research models, including multiple constructs and measures. Fornell and Larcker (1981) confirmed that PLS is a powerful method in that it does not require a large data sample or the normal distribution of the data. PLS has two dimensions. The first is an outer model (or measurement model), which provides an assessment of internal consistency and convergent and discriminant validity. The second is the inner model (or structural model), which represents the structural relationships (paths) between the latent constructs of the research model.

**5.1. Measurement model results**

The measurement model was examined for internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Factor loading analysis was used to filter scales and improve their measurement. The factor loadings of some items were lower than 0.50 on their own constructs and had to be eliminated from the analysis. Specifically, two items were excluded from the organizational context scale (OC1, OC3), one from the normative pressures scale (NP2), three from the SCRM entrepreneurship scale (INN3 P-A4, R-T1), and two from the CRM processes scale (CR3, RI2). In all cases, the item loading was low (at level α = 0.05). Cronbach’s alpha, Rho A, and composite reliability (CR) were used to measure internal consistency. As shown in Table 3, all constructs had a value greater than the suggested threshold of 0.70. Furthermore, all values of average variance extracted (AVE) were greater than 0.5, which suggests convergent validity.

---INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE---

Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the square root of the AVE for each construct with the correlations between constructs in the research model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In Table 4, none of the off-diagonal elements are greater than the corresponding diagonal element, indicating the presence of discriminant validity.

---INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE---

**5.2. Structural model assessment and hypothesis testing**

Fig. 2 depicts the outcomes of the PLS analysis, showing the significant relationships between the constructs in the research model. The path coefficient (β) and t value for each relationship were used to test the six hypotheses. A rule of thumb is that a standardized β coefficient greater than 0.1 with a t value greater than 1.96 is significant at p < .05. Table 4 presents the results of the hypothesis testing.

---INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE---

Table 5 shows the standardized coefficient, t value, and p value of each path. The results reveal that organizational context, technological context, coercive pressures, and normative pressures have significant positive impacts on SCRM entrepreneurship. Accordingly, most of the proposed hypotheses related to drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship (H1, H2, H4, H5) are supported.

---INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE---

The results also indicate that SCRM entrepreneurship has a significant impact on the performance of CRM processes.

**6. Discussion**

Rapid progress in social media development has introduced new channels of communication between companies and customers and has provided the potential to create and maintain deeper and more sustained relationships. The increasing power of social media has given rise to new CRM horizons to reach customers more quickly, directly, and personally (Gu et al., 2017). SCRM is a new and emerging view of the possibilities of CRM that provides an entrepreneurial platform to manage relationships with customers through social media.

Despite growing scholarly interest in the adoption of social media by businesses, there is minimal knowledge of how SCRM can be integrated into corporate entrepreneurship to increase an organization’s customer focus. Much less is known about the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship and the evaluation of its impact on CRM performance. Therefore, this study examined the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship and its impact on CRM performance.

The results confirm that the organizational context of a company significantly and positively affects its SCRM entrepreneurship. The impact of organizational context on e-business adoption and implementation success has been confirmed extensively in the literature (Chatzoglou & Chatzoudes, 2016; Zhu et al., 2006). This study’s results are in line with prior findings (Al-Swidi et al., 2012), indicating that organizational characteristics are crucial in determining an organization’s entrepreneurial orientation and response to innovations. Recent studies (Kantorová & Bachmann, 2018; Mohtaramzadeh et al., 2017; Qashou & Saleh, 2018) have shown that the nature of SCRM is often affected by organizational context, which includes top management support, firm scope, and the strategic alignment of SCRM with organizational goals and objectives.

The results reveal a significant impact of technological context on SCRM entrepreneurship. These findings are consistent with the TOE framework, which underlines the role of technology readiness as one of the most powerful determinants in creating e-business value (Zhu et al., 2006). These findings are also in line with those of other scholars (Chatzoglou & Chatzoudes, 2016; Zhu et al., 2006), who have confirmed the importance of technological factors in successful e-business adoption. Many researchers (Hasani et al., 2017) have emphasized the importance of compatibility of SCRM applications with the existing IT infrastructure. Furthermore, recent studies (Ahani et al., 2017; Guha et al., 2017; Marolt et al., 2018) have confirmed that technology readiness plays a key role in SCRM adoption. Additionally, technological competence is considered a significant contributing factor to the adoption of SCRM (Ahani et al., 2017; Chierici et al., 2018; Trainor et al., 2014).

The results show that coercive pressures significantly affect SCRM entrepreneurship. Previous studies (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2010; Teo et al., 2006) have shown that coercive pressures positively influence the adoption of e-business innovations. These findings are also compatible with the related literature (Ahani et al., 2017; Marolt et al., 2018), suggesting that competitive pressures could drive firms to employ SCRM as a way of maintaining their competitive edge. Hasani et al. (2016) and Gu et al. (2017) affirmed that the competitive pressure of other adopters may coerce start-up firms to innovate new SCRM applications.

The results do not support the hypothesized impact of mimetic pressures on SCRM entrepreneurship. These findings are consistent with the view that such pressures are not expected to lead a company to become an entrepreneur or an early adopter of e-business. These positions could provide a competitive advantage and a model of entrepreneurship. The literature suggests that institutional pressures and their relative importance may vary according to the organizational field, the sector, and time (Al Omoush et al., 2018). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) confirmed that organizations with ill-defined and poorly understood technologies find it easier to mimic other firms (Soares-Aguiar & Palma-dos-Reis, 2008). Therefore, the nature of this type of pressure does not seem conducive to promoting an entrepreneurial orientation that enables organizations to differentiate themselves, innovate, and achieve superiority over competitors rather than imitate them.

The results indicate a significant positive impact of normative pressures on SCRM entrepreneurship. These results are clearly compatible with the growing body of literature (Al Omoush et al., 2018; Oliveira & Martins, 2010; Son & Benbasat, 2007) emphasizing the impact of normative pressures on implementing entrepreneurial e-business innovations. They also agree with previous research findings (Bahrami et al., 2016; Hayton, 2005) confirming the role of internal and external social networks in shaping entrepreneurial attitudes and activities. Furthermore, the results support those of recent studies (Crammond et al., 2018; Fraccastoro & Gabrielsson, 2018; Gu et al., 2017) suggesting that when the environment and professional business partners and customers use social media, then the tendency to use SCRM is essential.

The results of the present study support the hypothesized relationship between the extent of SCRM entrepreneurship and the performance of CRM processes. These findings support those of earlier studies (Agnihotri et al., 2016; Ahmad et al., 2018; Durkin et al., 2013; He et al., 2014) confirming that the rapid progress in social media tools presents new entrepreneurial methods of collaboration between companies and customers. These platforms help organizations sense and respond to customers’ dynamic needs and expectations and to sustain deep and long-term relationships. These results also agree with those of recent research (Aldaihani & Ali, 2018; Chierici et al., 2018; Latuny, 2018; Wang & Kim, 2017) showing the contribution of SCRM usage to improving CRM processes and organizational performance as a whole.

**7. Conclusions and limitations**

The remarkable change in customer behavior attributed to the growth and rapid adoption of social media has forced companies to be active on these platforms and to adopt SCRM to stay close to customers and remain competitive. This study explored the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship and its impact on the performance of CRM processes. The originality lies in the notion that SCRM has not been investigated empirically from an entrepreneurial perspective. The results show that organizational and technological contexts and institutional pressures have a significant and positive impact on SCRM entrepreneurship. The results also indicate that the extent of SCRM entrepreneurship has a direct impact on the performance of CRM processes.

This study is one of the first to address SCRM from an entrepreneurial perspective by theorizing and empirically verifying the internal and external drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship based on institutional theory and the TOE framework. This study makes a major contribution to the growing body of SCRM literature by offering a deeper understanding of the impact of social media on CRM entrepreneurship and the mechanisms for evaluating its performance. In essence, the findings of this study add to the literature by confirming that external institutional pressures and internal organization and technological contexts can interact to create SCRM entrepreneurship. The findings provide a unique contribution to the scholarly understanding of how the outcomes of SCRM entrepreneurship can be measured by examining its impact on the performance of CRM processes. Such an evaluation is useful for gaining new theoretical insights for future studies that seek to provide further knowledge of the value and performance of SCRM.

From a practical point of view, the present study addresses the significance of SCRM for organizations in an entrepreneurial context. The findings demonstrate that the strategic adoption of SCRM is indispensable to enhance the performance of CRM processes in the modern era. The research model presents a complementary paradigm of SCRM entrepreneurship, providing guidance for business organizations in implementing successful SCRM initiatives. The key to SCRM entrepreneurship is refining the attitudes and promoting the positive subjective norms of top management for social media usage. The study helps evaluate various decisions surrounding SCRM entrepreneurship by advancing managers’ understanding of why and how SCRM should be adopted and evaluated. An understanding of the pivotal role of organizational and technological contexts and institutional pressures in SCRM entrepreneurship and their relationships with CRM processes provides managers and executives with valuable insights into managing SCRM entrepreneurship. This study provides policymakers with the attributes that should be analyzed to evaluate attitudes toward SCRM entrepreneurship. The variety of adoption and actual usage of social media tools in achieving CRM processes are key indicators of the extent to which an organization exploits SCRM entrepreneurial opportunities.

The present study has some limitations that highlight opportunities for further research. In the context of CRM, there are two ends to the business–customer dyad. The present study used data from the organization side. Future research could adjust the present research model to investigate the drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship from the customer perspective. Additionally, the study did not include all attributes of SCRM entrepreneurship that have been examined in previous studies. Attributes that were not examined in this study include resource orientation, the intensity of competition, growth strategies, and self-renewal orientation. Another limitation is that the sample population only involved the banking industry, which limited the identification of different patterns concerning the application and added value of SCRM entrepreneurship across industries. Future research could adapt and apply the present research model to examine SCRM entrepreneurship in other industries.
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**Figure 1. Research model**
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**Table 1. Constructs and measurement items of the research model**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Construct** | **Code** | **Measurement items** |
| The drivers of SCRM entrepreneurship  |
| Organizational context | OC1 | Size:Number of employees: <100, 100–500, 501–1000, 1001–2000, >2000 |
| OC*2* | Scope:National, regional, international |
| OC*3* | SCRM technology has a strategic alignment with our goals and objectives. |
| OC4 | Our organizational culture encourages innovation, creativity, and risk-taking. |
| OC5 | My firm is committed to providing essential resources for SCRM adoption. |
| Technological context | TC1 | We have adequate IT infrastructure to implement any new SCRM innovations. |
| TC*2* | We have adequate technological knowledge and competencies to absorb and implement SCRM innovations. |
| TC*3* | We use various advanced security technologies to protect and support SCRM applications and services.  |
| TC4 | We have the capability to monitor, evaluate, and adopt the new innovative SCRM technology trends. |
| Coercive pressures | CP1 | Using SCRM is in conformity with other firms’ practices. |
| CP2 | Competitors in our industry that have adopted SCRM are more competitive. |
| CP3 | SCRM adoption meets the expectations of members of our society. |
| CP4 | SCRM is in conformity with the requirements of our customers. |
| Mimetic pressures | MP1 | Our business partners are extensively adopting SCRM solutions. |
| MP2 | Our competitors are widely using SCRM applications. |
| MP3 | Early adopters have gained a substantial competitive advantage from their adoption of SCRM. |
| MP4 | Most firms will ultimately end up adopting SCRM applications. |
| Normative pressures | NP1 | Our business partners may consider us to be forward if we apply SCRM applications. |
| NP2 | SCRM confirms the expectations of professionals on how CRM should be implemented. |
| NP3 | It is essential that we are seen as a cutting-edge business that uses innovative SCRM. |
| NP4 | Our industry, business partners, and professional associations encourage the adoption and use of SCRM. |
| SCRM Entrepreneurship |
| Innovativeness | INN1 | We invest heavily in new SCRM applications. |
| INN2 | We continuously emphasize introducing unique SCRM processes and services. |
| INN3 | We are open to any source of innovative ideas concerning the adoption of new SCRM applications. |
| INN4 | We put a strong emphasis on R&D, technological leadership, and innovations. |
| Proactiveness | P-A1 | In general, we always foresee potential environmental changes ahead of competitors. |
| P-A2 | We continuously try to discover new emerging SCRM opportunities ahead of competitors. |
| P-A3 | We are leading in introducing new SCRM applications and services. |
| P-A4 | We support the path of recognition and detection of new SCRM entrepreneurial opportunities. |
| Risk-taking | R-T1 | We are engaged in risky social media investments. |
| R-T2 | We have an entrepreneurial tendency toward high risk SCRM initiatives if high returns are expected. |
| R-T3 | My firm dedicates strategic resources to supporting SCRM ventures in an uncertain environment. |
| R-T4 | We strive to be a leader in adopting new SCRM applications and services while the future remains unknown. |
| Performance of CRM processes |
| Customer acquisition  | CA1 | Targets the right segments and boosts the personalization of the marketing message for potential customers. |
| CA2 | Enables superior attraction, retention, and loyalty of target customers. |
| CA3 | Minimizes acquisition costs and the cost of targeting high-value customers. |
| CA4 | Reinforces marketing operations intended to build deep customer intimacy. |
| Customer retention  | CR1 | Fosters an interactive two-way communication with customers. |
| CR2 | Improves customer commitment, satisfaction, and loyalty. |
| CR3 | Provides prompt responses to customer requests and complaints. |
| CR4 | Maintains regular contact and builds long-term relationships with high-value customers.  |
| Customer expansion  | CE1 | Makes additional purchase suggestions that enhance the customer experience. |
| CE2 | Encourages customers to refer our products to others. |
| CE3 | Leverages innovative insights by requesting customers’ individual opinions, tastes, or beliefs. |
| CE4 | Reestablishes a relationship with valued inactive customers. |
| Relational Information Processes | RI1 | Captures customer information from online communities. |
| RI2 | Integrates customer information from different online communication channels. |
| RI3 | Accesses up-to-date customer information and provides the information required to manage customer relations. |
| RI4 | Learns about wider customer needs, preferences, attitudes, lifestyles, and shopping patterns. |

**Table 2. Distribution of the sample**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondents** | **No.** | **%** |
| Chief Executive Officer | 4 | 2.2 |
| Deputy Chief Executive Officer  | 7 | 3.8 |
| Chief Technology Officer | 17 | 9.3 |
| Marketing Director | 15 | 8.2 |
| Retail Banking Director | 11 | 6 |
| Chief Operating Officer | 13 | 7.1 |
| Head of Internal Audit | 7 | 3.8 |
| Head of Branding | 6 | 3.3 |
| Chief Strategy Officer | 9 | 4.9 |
| Customer Service Director | 17 | 9.3 |
| Commercial Director | 10 | 5.5 |
| Innovation & Development Director | 7 | 3.8 |
| Branch Manager | 39 | 21.3 |
| Other | 21 | 11.5 |
| Total | 183 | 100 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Construct** | **Cronbach’s****alpha** | **rho\_A** | **CR** | **AVE** |
| Organizational context | 0.701 | 0.711 | 0.829 | 0.619 |
| Technological context | 0.784 | 0.834 | 0.845 | 0.578 |
| Coercive pressures | 0.815 | 0.831 | 0.878 | 0.645 |
| Mimetic pressures | 0.939 | 0.980 | 0.956 | 0.845 |
| Normative pressures | 0.863 | 0.863 | 0.916 | 0.785 |
| SCRM entrepreneurship | 0.881 | 0.886 | 0.904 | 0.512 |
| CRM processes | 0.962 | 0.969 | 0.968 | 0.757 |

**Table 3. Validity and reliability estimates of research constructs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Construct** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | Organizational context | **0.786** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Technological context | 0.568 | **0.760** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Coercive pressures | 0.542 | 0.472 | **0.803** |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Mimetic pressures | 0.499 | 0.386 | 0.275 | **0.919** |  |  |  |
| 5 | Normative pressures | 0.476 | 0.615 | 0.400 | 0.297 | **0.886** |  |  |
| 6 | SCRM entrepreneurship | 0.635 | 0.643 | 0.654 | 0.324 | 0.607 | **0.716** |  |
| 7 | CRM processes | 0.487 | 0.501 | 0.443 | 0.202 | 0.643 | 0.523 | **0.870** |

**Table 4. Discriminant validity**

**Figure 2. Path coefficient analysis**

**

**Table 5. Results of the hypothesis testing**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **H** | **β** | **t value** | **Sig.** | **Result** |
| 1 |  0.224 | 2.164 | 0.027 | Supported |
| 2 |  0.260 | 4.200 | 0.002 | Supported |
| 3 |  0.334 | 4.785 | 0.000 | Supported |
| 4 | -0.046 | 0.461 | 0.645 | Not Supported |
| 5 |  0.514 | 3.213 | 0.001 | Supported |
| 6 |  0.499 | 20.791 | 0.000 | Supported |