CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS OF CRM PRACTICES IN CORPORATION BANK: CUSTOMERS’ PERSPECTIVE

7.1 PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW:

The purpose of this chapter is to present the perspective of customers on the efficiency of CRM practices of Corporation Bank. This chapter is very important as it presents the view of the kingpin of a business relationship i.e., the customer. The previous chapter presented the Bankers’ opinions with regard to their own practices. But the real test of the efficiency is reflected in the opinions of the customers.

The broad areas evaluated are similar to those of the bankers though they are evaluated from the angle of the customer. The efficiency of CRM practices in widening relationships is evaluated under two broad categories, i.e., the marketing practices and employee empowerment and other practices in widening relationships. The efficiency of CRM practices in lengthening customer relationships is evaluated under seven broad categories, i.e., segmentation practices, competitive practices, channel management practices, employee empowerment practices (through evaluation of the employee skills, bank’s general as well as data management strategies in employee empowerment and the job satisfaction experienced by the employees), customer data management practices, customer complaint management practices and other practices in lengthening customer relationships. The deepening practices are evaluated under two broad categories namely through the segmentation and, channel management and other practices in deepening customer relationships. Finally the efficiency of the competitive strategy of the bank is evaluated from the customers’ perspective.

Just as in the case of Chapter 6, the primary data is first described using mean, sum, average and percentiles and is further analysed for the testing of the hypotheses using ‘t/z’ test of mean. In addition, under sub-section 7.2 point no. 5, data management practices are also evaluated applying correlation (Pearson’s R) with regard to the importance given by a customer to a particular factor and the extent to which the bank has fulfilled his expectations about it. The three broad groups of
factors, i.e., personnel, service environment and the products, were evaluated through correlation. The results of all the tests applied clearly indicate that the customers' perspective does not find the practices to be of the efficiency required under CRM as all the null hypotheses have been rejected.

7.2 EVALUATION OF CRM PRACTICES OF CORPORATION BANK: THE CUSTOMERS' PERSPECTIVE:

In this section the customer perspective of the efficiency of the bank's CRM practices is evaluated. As noted earlier, customer is the kingpin of relationships and his opinion are the most important in evaluating any practice of the bank especially in modern days of retail banking. Section 6.2 has described the data on CRM practices of the bank from the bankers' perspective whereby they are rated to be substantially efficient in widening relationships and with regard to its competitive strategy, and are found not efficient in case of the lengthening and deepening relationships.

This Chapter presents the customer perspective of the same. How efficiently the practices have been able to meet the customers' expectation, is the major criterion taken into consideration while evaluating the practices from the customers' perspective. It is important to note here that a CRM practice can be considered truly to be efficient when the customer rates that it is has succeeded in pleasing him substantially 'above' his expectations by giving the factor a score of at least 4 (practice is rated to be generally above their expectations) out of the maximum score of 5 (practice is rated to be always above his expectations).

As can be seen from the conceptual survey in chapter III, a customer who cares for his bank is knowledgeable of the bank and its products and is interested in a closer relationship with the bank. Thus a score of at least 2 (which denotes substantial knowledge) out of a score of three (which denotes a thorough knowledge regarding the bank) is considered to be an efficient rating in case of evaluation of knowledge of customer of the bank and its products. Since the knowledge factors differ in scale to range from 1 to 3, they are shown with emphasis. However the mean score on the knowledge factors have been converted to be out of 5.
7.2.1 CRM PRACTICES OF THE BANK IN WIDENING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS (Customers’ Perspective)

Two practices are evaluated with regard to the efficiency of practices in widening customer relationships, i.e., marketing, and employee empowerment and other practices. These factors are gauged from the existing-customers’ perspective since they are in a better position to evaluate them on behalf of non-customers as they have experienced these factors, thus are likely to give a considered opinion than the non-customers.

a. Efficiency of Marketing Practices of the Bank in Widening Customer Relationships:

The factors that were evaluated from the customer perspective in widening customer relationships are presented in table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.1</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.2</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.3</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.6</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.7</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.8</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.9</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1.10</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>17049</td>
<td>11731</td>
<td>Proportion=.6881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Factors evaluated are 1. **W1.1 General knowledge of the existing customers of the social service activities of the bank during the year** (especially in view of it being the Centenary year of the bank and also being head-quartered in D.K.). 2. Extent to which the bank is able to meet expectations of customers regarding
W1.2 Location of the service branches and their convenience; W1.3 Cleanliness and the physical set-up of branches. 3. Extent to which the bank is found superior to the other banks regarding W1.4 Location of the service branches; W1.5 Cleanliness and physical set-up of the service branches; W1.6 effectiveness of bank’s Advertisement effort; W1.7 Bank’s ability to meet needs of the public; W1.8 Quality of High-tech Banking; W1.9 Overall performance when compared to other banks in the locality; W1.10 Position of the bank at the National level compared to the best.

Table 7.1 strangely discloses that the existing customers’ awareness of the social service activities of the bank (W1.1) scores very low among all the other factors evaluated even in spite of the bank being in news all through the year through its many social service activities in view of its centenary celebrations. Even if not for its centenary year, the bank’s presence in D.K., where it is headquartered, is clearly seen in the district.

A walk through the district makes anyone notice the various social service activities of the bank by way of maintaining road dividers, bus-stands and the like in most prominent places. Even the other parameters evaluated are rated just ‘as per’ the customers expectations. However the branches of the bank seems to score well regarding their location, (W1.2 and W1.4) which is also one of the reason why 50% of the sample customers have chosen to bank with it.

Table 7.2 Type of Facility Availed by the Customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of facility availed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATM/Debit Card</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM &amp; Locker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not availed any Facility</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Table 7.3 Frequency of ATM visits* by the Customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once in 3 months</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in 3 months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between once a month and Once a week</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never know to operate ATM</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

* Some hold ATM cards of other banks.
Further the bank is rated to be one among the best banks (W1.10) in India by most of the respondents. ‘Quality of high-tech banking’ (W1.8) has a larger ‘no comment’ response as many do not have experience of using the bank’s ATMs, which is supported from the data in table 7.2 and 7.3. Less than 50% of the sample respondents hold a ATM card of the bank and even among those who hold it, it is found that very few make use of it optimally. However they were asked to rate the facility, if possible, from either their family/peers experience, due to which some have given a rate to the factor. ‘Position of the bank at the all India level’ (W1.10) and the ‘bank’s advertisement effort’ again evokes a larger ‘no comment’ response, as these customers were unaware of the fact that the bank has advertised its products and were unable to recall any such details. The opinions of the customers seem to be fairly common on most of the factors stated above as can be seen from the percentiles.

b. Efficiency of Employee Empowerment and other Practices in Widening Customer Relationships:

The following other practices were evaluated under this parameter:

1. Superiority of the bank over other banks W2.1 in the overall performance when compared to other bank; W2.2 in the overall position of the bank at the national level.
2. W2.3. Extent to which the customers are likely to recommend the bank to others.
3. Bank’s ability to meet customers’ expectation with regard to W2.4 Interest rates on Deposits; W2.5 Interest rates on Loans; W2.6 Fees and Service Charges; W2.7 Attractiveness of Deposit Schemes.

Table 7.4 Analysis of the Efficiency of Other Practices in Widening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.2</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.3</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.5</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.6</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2.7</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>11185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey data
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Table 7.5 Type of Deposit account/s held by the Customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of accounts held</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings Bank Account (SB)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Bank &amp; Current A/c (SB &amp; CA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Current and FD Account</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB, CA, FD &amp; RD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB, CD &amp; RD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB &amp; FD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB, FD &amp; RD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB &amp; RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Account (CA)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current &amp; FD Account</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current &amp; RD Account</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Deposit Account</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD &amp; RD Account</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Deposit Account</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 7.4 depicts the other practices in widening Customer relationships to be just efficient in meeting the customers’ expectations. On an average the lowest scores are allotted to the product features of the bank (W2.4 to W2.7). This is mainly because of lack of flexibility in providing competitive interest rates to customers under the regulations of the RBI. The factor W2.2 scores ‘highly’ and also the factor regarding the likelihood of customers’ recommending the bank to others scores ‘substantially’ and both these factors are allotted the best score by at least 25% of the customers. There is a larger number of ‘no comment’ answers found in this section, especially W2.5 to W2.7, as many customers have not availed the facilities and products offered by the bank as can be seen from table 7.2 and 7.5 and hence, unable to score the facilities/services that were not experienced by them. The largest among these are found for the responses for ‘interest rates on loans’ (W2.5), since 65% customers do not hold a loan account with the bank. Some customers have given their opinion either because of their experience of the service in the past or from the experience of their family members and peers. Again it is found that the customers are fairly consistent in their opinion that the bank is moderately efficient regarding most of the factors as seen by the statistics on percentiles. The factors W2.2 and
W2.3 (‘Position of the bank at the national level and, the extent to which the customers are likely to recommend the bank to others) have evinced a greater dispersion in opinion than otherwise.

Table 7.6 Number of family members of customer respondents who hold an account with Corporation Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family members holding an Account with Corporation Bank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other family member holds Account</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
* This is a convent house

Further efficiency of the widening practices can be gauged from table 7.6 regarding the family members of customers who hold an account with the bank. It is seen that on an average one family member holds an account with the bank in around 35% of the respondents and two family members in case of another 23.6% respondents. A look into the reason why the existing customers have chosen to bank with Corporation bank, it was found that around 50% of the customers have chosen the bank because of convenience of location, 12% because of the recommendations of their friends, 10% because of their family influence, 10% because of the bank bankers’ influence, 9% because of bank’s reputation and the remaining due to other reasons.

A question posed to the customers regarding their intention to recommend the bank and enhance their own dealings, has been presented in table 7.7. It is seen that almost 42% customers have expressed their opinion that they are certain regarding their intention to recommend the bank to their peers. Customer advocacy is considered to be a very important factor under CRM.
Table 7.7 Customer intention at Widening and Deepening Relationships with the Bank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certainly</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

c. Testing the hypothesis relating to the efficiency of Widening Practices of the Bank (Customers' perspective).

For the purpose of testing the efficiency of competitive practices of the bank from the customers' perspective, the following hypothesis was formulated:

$H_0$: Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are efficient in widening relationships with customers (i.e., in acquiring new customers).

$H_1$: Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are not efficient in widening relationships with customers (i.e., in acquiring new customers).

The above hypothesis was tested using the ‘t’ test for mean. The values obtained are presented in the table 7.8.

Table 7.8 Efficiency of CRM Practice in Widening Customer Relationships (Customers' perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Tv (sig 2 tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.137</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.6094</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>.4892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Worked out from summary data presented in table 7.1 & 7.3
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From table 7.8 it is observed that ‘t’ value is significant at 5% level of significance and hence mean efficiency is not equal to four. Further with a one tailed ‘t’ test applied, to know whether mean efficiency is greater than four or less than four, it was revealed that the mean efficiency is less than four. Therefore it is concluded that the Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are not efficient in widening relationships with customers (i.e., in acquiring new customers) from the customers’ perspective. Thus the null hypothesis stands rejected at 5% level of significance and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

7.2.2 CRM PRACTICES OF THE BANK IN LENGTHENING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS (Customers’ Perspective):

Seven groups of practices of the bank in lengthening customer relationships are evaluated under this section.


The practices evaluated under this parameter are as follows: 1. Bank’s ability to meet customers’ expectation with regard to L1.1 Interest rates on Deposits; L1.2 Interest rates on Loans; L1.3 Fees and Service Charges. 2. Bank’s superiority over other banks L1.4 in meeting customers’ banking needs; L1.5 regarding service orientation of bank’s employees.

Table 7.9 Analysis of the Efficiency of the Segmentation Practices in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1.1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.4</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.5</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>7995</td>
<td>5136</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion=.6424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

The statistics in table 7.9 depict that the product features score the lowest among the factors evaluated. Even then all the other factor scores portray that the
practices have been just 'on par' with their expectations in meeting customers' need. Least score is allotted to the factor 'interest rates on loans' (L1.1)

b. Efficiency of Competitive Practices of the Bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships:

The following competitive practices were evaluated to gauge the parameter: Superiority of the bank over other banks regarding L2.1 Speed of service; L2.2 Quality of Service; L2.3 Service orientation of bank's employees; L2.4 quality of customer care; L2.5 Quality of high-tech banking; L2.6 Location; L2.7 Cleanliness and physical set up; L2.8 Speed and quality of complaint handling; L2.9 Overall competitive strength when compared to other bank branches in the vicinity of the service branch.

Table 7.10 Analysis of the Efficiency of Competitive Practices in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers' Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic Strategy</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores Max.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2.1</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.2</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.3</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.4</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.5</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.7</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2.9</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>16040</td>
<td>11002</td>
<td>Proportion= .6859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Under the parameter as portrayed in table 7.10, all the factors except for L2.5 and L2.6 (with regard to quality of high-tech banking and location), score up to an average of 3 to denote that they are on par with customers' expectations. It is important to note here that Corporation bank has one of the most convenient and best maintained networks of ATMs compared to any other PSB and its ATM network is larger than its own branch network unlike the other PSBs. At least 50% of the customers have scored the two factors to be 'substantially above' or 'far above' their
expectations. There is greater consistency in the opinions of customers with regard to 
this parameter than any of the previous ones as can be seen from the percentiles.

c. Efficiency of Channel Management Practices of the Bank in Lengthening 
Customer Relationships:

The following factors were evaluated in gauging the parameter. Ability to 
fulfill expectations of customers with regard to: 1. Face-to-face channel: L3.1 
Friendliness and courtesy of staff even at peak hours; L3.2 Speed and promptness of 
service; L3.3 Care and concern of staff to listen and respond to needs; L3.4 
Recognition as valued customer; L3.5 Dress Code and appearance; L3.6 Staff ability 
guide regarding bank and products; L3.7 Overall rating of the channel. 2. Other 
(ATMs/internet) channels: L3.8 Convenience of high-tech banking; L3.9 Reliability 
of ATM/Internet Banking; L3.10 Training need to use ATM. 3. Knowledge of the 
customer regarding L3.11 Facilities offered by the bank.

Table 7.11 Analysis of the Efficiency of Channel Management Practices in 
Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L3.1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1835 1231</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1835 1222</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.3</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1845 1225</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.4</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1840 1211</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1820 1164</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.6</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1845 1161</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.7</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1830 1177</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.8</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1285 940</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1170 808</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.10</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1730 1150</td>
<td>2.00 3.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3.11</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
<td>1101 623</td>
<td>1.00 2.00 3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Values: 3.18 18136 11688 Proportion=.6445

Source: Field survey

Table 7.11 again places the average score of the customer regarding efficiency 
of the bank’s channels to be on par with their expectations. However with regard to 
the training need in using ATMs, a diversified view is found as presented by the
statistic on percentiles. The factor, 'convenience of ATMs', scores to be 'substantially above' their expectations. Though internet banking is included in the evaluation of the channels, it is important to note that other than face-to-face and ATMs as channels of service, internet banking has not at all been popular with the customers of D. K. district as can be seen from table 7.2. Only one respondent has been found using the facility. Therefore the opinions regarding high-tech banking can be considered only with regard to ATMs. A query to know the reasons for non-migration to the most cost effective and convenient channel - internet banking, received the following responses: fear of using the channel due to the woeful stories often aired, lack of personal computer facilities with the customers, lack of interest in such facility, lack of knowledge of operation and awareness of the facility, faith in across-the-counter service and the like.

d. Efficiency of Employee Empowerment Practices of the Bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships:

Factors that were evaluated under this parameter are presented in two parts in table 7.12 and 7.13 i.e., efficiency of banker skills in meeting customer expectation; and the likely constraints experienced by bankers as seen from the customers’ perspective.

The factors evaluated in table 7.12 are: 1. Efficiency of the service orientation of the banker in meeting customer expectations: L4.1 Friendly and courteous dealings even at peak hours; L4.2 Speed and promptness of service; L4.3 Care and concern to listen and respond to customers’ needs; L4.4 Recognition of the customer as valued customer of the bank; L4.5 Dress Code and appearance; L4.6 Ability to guide and educate customers regarding bank and products; L4.7 Overall rating of the of the bankers’ service orientation. 2. Extent to which the customers feel that L4.8 service is pleasing and personal.

Constraints evaluated in table 7.13 are: Extent to which the customers feel that L4.9 Transfer of officials is a constraint in maintaining customer relationships. L4.10 employees are over worked and thus cannot give expected attention to customers; L4.11 employees are pressurized by higher officials.
Table 7.12 Analysis of Efficiency of Bankers’ Skills in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L4.1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.3</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.4</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.6</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.7</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.8</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Values | 3.26 | 19725 | 13425 |

Source: Survey data

A look at table 7.12 shows that factor L4.8, regarding the extent of service personalisation, shows a greatly diversified opinion with a minimum of 25% customers opining it to be even above their expectations and another 25% stating it to be below or far below their expectations. All the factors are in fact rated to be just ‘on par’ with the customers’ expectations.

Table 7.13 Analysis of Constraints Faced by Bankers in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L4.9</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.10</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4.11</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of values | 3.82 | 5045 | 3851 |

Aggregate Values (Tables 8.21 & 8.22) | 3.54 | 24770 | 17256 |

Proportion = .6806

Source: Field survey

All the three factors that are described in table 7.13 indicate that the customers feel that there is neither a change in the service orientation of bankers with the frequent transfer of officials, nor do they feel that the employees are burdened in their work to give the necessary attention that is due to customers nor that the employees are pressurized by higher officials. In fact the score on this count is the highest to say that the bankers have very low level of constraints in optimizing their service.
orientation. It is interesting to note that the customers have rated the bankers service orientation to be just ‘on par’ with their expectations with regard to the factors mentioned in table 7.12 but at the same time, in their opinion, the above mentioned constraints evaluated in table 7.13 are not likely to be the cause for the marginal service orientation of the bankers. It is seen that around 50% of the customers opine that the employees are never burdened with work.

e. Efficiency of Customer Data Management Practices of the Bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships:

Efficiency of this parameter is gauged correlating the data collected on the degree of importance given by the customer to a factor in forging closer relationship with a bank, and the degree to which the bank has been able to fulfill the customers’ expectation on the factor. This is based on the premise that if the bank has collected and evaluated information on importance given by the customer to a particular factor in forging a closer relationship, then it would give the attention in fulfilling those expectations of the customers on priority basis. Thus there is likely to be a close relationship in the scores allotted to the importance given by the customer to the factor and extent of fulfillment experienced. The three aspects evaluated are the extent of fulfillment of expectations of the customers regarding bank’s services orientation, bank’s environment and the bank’s products.

Tables 7.14, 7.15 and 7.16 describe the data (weighted average of the factors under each parameter under the three main questions in Section 2 of the questionnaire) on the efficiency of Data Management strategies of the bank by correlating the importance given by a customer to the service orientation (7.15), bank’s environment (7.16) and products (7.17) in forging closer relationships, as compared to the extent to which the bank has been able to meet his expectations in lengthening relationships.

1. Service Orientation:

Table 7.14, shows that while considering the service environment as a whole (last row), though there is a relationship between the importance given and the bank’s ability to meet their expectation (column 5), nothing much has been done by the bank in meeting these expectations which is seen by the extremely low values in the second column. However the data on individual factors shows that the staff ability to guide
the customer regarding the bank and its products, dress code of the banker and the
bankers’ recognition of the customer to be valuable to the bank are three factors
which show the existence of a relationship (column 5) even though it is at a very low
level (Column 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Factors</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error(a)</th>
<th>Approx. T(b)</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly and courteous manner</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Promptness of Service</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern to listen and respond to needs</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition as a valued customer</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresscode and appearance</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff ability guide regarding bank and its products</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5.312</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficiency of Service Orientation</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

But the factors friendliness and courtesy of the banker at peak hours, speed
and promptness of service, care and concern to listen and respond to customers’ needs
show no significant relationship (Column 5) between the importance given by the
customer to these factors in forging closer relationship with the bank and the bank’s
actual ability to meet their expectations as their individual values of significance
exceed .05 to range from .056 to .325, whereas their corresponding values in column
(2) show extremely low figures ranging from .081 to .100. Therefore regarding these
factors it can be concluded that customers have been putting up with the bank in spite
of not experiencing any benign relationship as they may not have a better alternative
bank to switch over to.

2. Bank’s Environment:

The last column of table 7.15 describes a similar fact that, as under service
orientation, a relationship does exist between the bank’s fulfillment of customers’
expectations and the importance given by the customers to the factors.
Table 7.15 Symmetric Measures (Pearson’s R) on Bank’s Environmental Factors (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Factors</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error(a)</th>
<th>Approx. T(b)</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Location</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>6.217</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Effort in convincing on bank and products</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and Physical setup</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>4.657</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of High-tech banking</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>6.116</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security of funds</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>10.153</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to meet banking needs</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>7.611</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Efficiency of Bank’s Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>.636</strong></td>
<td><strong>.057</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.403</strong></td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

However, better attention seems to have been given by the bank to meet the expectations of the customer with regard to the environmental factors that are considered by the customer to be important in forging relationships with the bank as the figures in column 2 to show a stronger relationship. However when factors are considered individually, the safety and security of funds seem to have come nearest to fulfilling the customers need, followed by the bank’s ability to meet the customers banking needs and the factor on convenience of high-tech banking. The least relationship is found between the importance given by the customer for bank’s advertisement effort and the extent to which the bank has actually met his expectation. This shows that the bank has to some extent tried to gauge the importance of the environmental factors in forging a closer relationship with the customers and worked at fulfilling them.

3. Bank’s Products:

Table 7.16 depicts again an overall low significance level .004 denoting the presence of a relationship between customer need of bank’s products and their fulfillment by the bank through the products. However the efforts of the bank in fulfilling the product needs are insignificant as depicted by the figures in column (2) of the table.
### Table 7.16 Symmetric Measures (Pearson’s R) on Bank’s Product Features (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Factors</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error(a)</th>
<th>Approx. T(b)</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rates on Deposits</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.618</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rates on Loans</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Service Charges</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-1.319</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of Deposit schemes</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Processing Loans</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt Updation of Pass book</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2.016</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of ATM/Internet Banking</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Efficiency of Bank’s Product Environment</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

However if individual factors are considered, it is seen that there has been no significant relationship between the need of the customer and the efforts of the bank in fulfilling them with regard to ‘interest rates on deposits’, ‘... loans’ and ‘service charges’, and also the ‘ease of processing loans’. The corresponding values in column (2) depict all-time low values and in fact they show a negative relationship in case of interest rates on deposits, loans and service charges. Attractiveness of deposit schemes and reliability of ATMs show that there is a relationship between the customers need and efforts of the bank at fulfilling them, as their corresponding values in column (5) are below the .05 level of significance though the relationship depicted is again at a very low level (Column 2). Significance of relationship for the factor ‘Prompt updation of passbook’ is just around .05, though its corresponding value in column (2) is low at .1. This shows that among the three factors evaluated so far, the bank has done very little to evaluate the product needs of the customers and in meeting them.

In addition to the above, two factors were evaluated to know the efficiency of the data management practices from the customers’ point of view. They are: Extent to which the customers L5.1 felt that the bank’s service is personal; L5.2 felt that the bank knows them well to meet all their banking needs. The statistics on the data collected is presented in table 7.17.
Table 7.17 Analysis of the Efficiency of the Data Management Practices in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers' Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores Max.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5.1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5.2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>3645</strong></td>
<td><strong>2496</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proportion= .6848</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

From the data on factors presented in table 7.17, it is clear that the customers concur in their opinion regarding the data management practices, the efficiency of which is rated to be moderate. The data depicted through percentiles shows that the customers are varied in their opinion on the factors, especially with regard to the bank’s personalised service. It is seen that around 25% of the respondents feel the service to be ‘rarely-to-very-rarely’ meeting their expected need (L5.1).

f. Efficiency of Customer Complaint Management Practices of the Bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships:

The factors evaluated under this parameter are: 1. Superiority of the bank in: L6.1 customer complaint management. 2. Extent to which the customers L6.2 feel comfortable in bringing problems faced by them to notice of the concerned officials; L6.3 have been questioned by bank regarding their satisfaction; L6.4 feel that service should be more personal.

Table 7.18 Analysis of the Efficiency of Complaint Management Strategies in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores Max.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6.1</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6.2</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6.3</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6.4</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>7230</strong></td>
<td><strong>3956</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proportion= .5476</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey

Table 7.18 indicates very low scores for this parameter, especially with regard to factor L6.2 and L6.3. In fact some respondents were vocal about their fear of
retribution by the banking officials if they voiced their true opinion on certain factors presented in the questionnaire and needed considerable reassurance that none of their personal opinions would be disclosed to point a finger in their direction. Regarding sample respondents who have been questioned by the bank regarding their satisfaction, there were just a handful that were administered a satisfaction survey by the bank so far and a few more that were known closely by the bank officials who were on occasions asked about their problems and satisfaction with the bank. A very great majority said that they have never been questioned about their satisfaction. However the bank has been conducting satisfaction surveys every year. Further the factor L6.4 shows a dispersed customer opinion.

g. Efficiency of Other Customer Relationship Management Practices of the Bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships:

The factors evaluated are given in four tables – 7.19 on the environmental factors, 7.20 on product factors, 7.21 on customer education factors, and 7.22 on other factors in lengthening Customer Relationships.

Factors evaluated under table 7.19 are: ability of the bank in fulfilling the expectations with regard to: L7.1 Convenience of bank’s location L7.2 Convincing customers through advertisement efforts L7.3 quality of Cleanliness and Physical setup; L7.4 Convenience of high-tech banking; L7.5 Safety and Security of funds; L7.6 Meet all the banking needs of customers; L7.7 Overall Environment of the bank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic Strategy</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No. Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores Max.</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L7.1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.2</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.3</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.4</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.5</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>3.00 4.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.7</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>3.00 3.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12170</td>
<td>8606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
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Factors evaluated in table 7.20 are: ability of the bank in fulfilling the expectations of customers regarding: **L7.8** Interest rates on Deposits; **L7.9** Interest rates on Loans; **L7.10** Fees and Service Charges; **L7.11** Attractiveness of Deposit Schemes; **L7.12** Ease of Processing Loans **L7.13** Prompt updation of Passbook; **L7.14** Reliability of ATM/Internet Banking; **L7.15** Overall product efficiency of the bank.

### Table 7.20 Analysis of the Efficiency of the Products of the bank (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.8</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.9</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.10</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.11</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.12</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.13</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.14</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.15</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate Values**

3.24 | 11705 | 7584

Source: Field survey

Customer-education plays a very important role in CRM and it is reflected in the knowledge possessed by the customer on the subject. Factors evaluated in this regard are shown in table 7.21.

### Table 7.21 Analysis of the Efficiency of Management Strategies in Educating the Customers of the Bank (Customers’ Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.16</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.17</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.18</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.19</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.20</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.21</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.22</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.23</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate Values**

2.17* | 8823 | 3825

Source: Field Survey
Following factors were evaluated under table 7.21: The knowledge of the
customer regarding: L7.16 Founder of the Bank; L7.17 Year of Establishment;
L7.18 Chairman of the Bank; L7.19 Types of Deposits and loans offered by the
bank; L7.20 Whom to approach for a need; L7.21 Social Service activities of the
bank; L7.22 Facilities offered by the bank; L7.23 Name of the branch manager.
Since all these factors are evaluated with a three point scale, the mean values were
converted to a five point scale while presenting them in table 7.32.

In table 7.22 the following factors are evaluated: Extent to which the
customers feel that: L7.24 the Bank knows their needs to meet all of them; L7.25
bank Questions them regarding their satisfaction; L7.26 they may increase their future
dealings with the bank.

Table 7.22 Analysis of the Efficiency of Other Customer Relationship
Management Practices of the bank in Lengthening Customer Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.24</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.25</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7.26</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5460</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values (Tables 8.28, 8.29, 8.30, 8.31)</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>38158</td>
<td>23468</td>
<td>Proportion=.6150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors ‘bank’s location’, ‘convenience of high-tech banking’ and ‘safety and
security of funds’, are rated with the expected score (substantially above expectation)
of 4 whereas all the other factors are rated to be ‘on par’. The ‘no comment’ response
on question L6.4 is larger since many customers do not hold either Corporation bank
or any other bank’s ATM/Debit cards (table 7.2) and thus were unable to give their
opinion on the matter.

Table 7.20 clearly shows that all the products and their features are rated on an
average, to be on par with customers’ expectations. Again it should be noted that
factor L7.12 and L7.14 have very high ‘no comment’ response rate as many
respondents have not opted to use ATM/internet facility. At the same time such a
response is found to be generally higher under this parameter than otherwise because many customers do not use the products due to which they have not been able to give their opinion. However, some of the customers have given their opinion in spite of not holding a particular product, on the basis of their experience of either their past product usage or from secondary knowledge based on the feedback of friends and relatives. It is important to note that 'interest rate on deposits' (L7.8) and especially 'ease of processing loans' (L7.12) have been rated to be 'below' or 'far below their expectations' by a minimum of 25% respondents.

It is interesting to note that the customers have very little knowledge about the bank and its products. As pointed out earlier, this is especially surprising because of its Centenary celebrations that year as also because of it being head-quartered in D.K. A zero score denotes that there is no knowledge of the factor expressed therein. It is found that regarding knowledge of the factor L6.16 (Founder of the bank), L6.17 (year of establishment), L6.17 (Chairman of the bank) and L6.21 (the social service activities of the bank) hold very low average score, surprisingly though, they have been greatly highlighted in various ways all through the centenary year of the bank in which this survey was also carried out. The percentiles also depict that there is a high variation in the score with regard to most factors. A minimum of 50% respondents have no knowledge of two (L7.16 and L7.18) among the nine factors evaluated. A least 25% of the respondents have said that they have no knowledge of the bank's products beyond their immediate needs, and the same opinion is given about three more factors (L7.17, L7.21, L7.23) other than those already mentioned in this paragraph.

In addition to the above tables, efficiency of the practices can be further evaluated by referring to table 7.23 regarding the number of years a customer has banked with the Corporation Bank. It can be seen from the table that about 31% of the sample customers have held an account with the bank for more than 10 years and 30% each between 5 and 10 and, 1 and 5 years with only 7.6% are new customers. Though a number of factors like, the lack of strong competition from new generation and foreign banks in the vicinity of the branches may also have been the cause for this, it is important to note that a 10 year period is a fairly good one for a customer to remain loyal to the bank in the present day.
Table 7.23 Number of Years of Banking of the with Corporation Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Years</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 Yrs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to less than 5 Years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

h. Testing the hypothesis relating to the Efficiency of Lengthening Practices of the Bank (Customers’ perspective).

For the purpose of testing the efficiency of competitive practices of the bank from the customers’ perspective, the following hypothesis was formulated and results are shown in table 7.24:

\[
H_0: \text{Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are efficient in lengthening relationships with customers (i.e., in acquiring new customers).}
\]

\[
H_1: \text{Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are not efficient in lengthening relationships with customers (i.e., in acquiring new customers).}
\]

The above hypothesis was tested using the ‘z’ test for mean. The values obtained are presented in the table.

Table 7.24 Efficiency of CRM Practice in Lengthening Customer Relationships (Customers’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig. 2 tailed</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-12.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.8231</td>
<td>3.1769</td>
<td>.5277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Worked out from the data in tables 7.7 to 7.13 and 7.19 to 7.22

Table values show that the ‘z’ is significant at 5% level of significance and hence mean efficiency is not equal to four. Further the one tailed ‘z’ test revealed that
the mean efficiency is less than four. Therefore, it is concluded that the Corporation Bank's Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) are not efficient in lengthening its relationships with customers (i.e., in creating loyal customers) as per the customers' perspective. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance and alternate hypothesis is accepted.

7.2.3 CRM PRACTICES OF CORPORATION BANK IN DEEPENING CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS (Customers' Perspective):

This parameter is evaluated with regard to two sub-parameters:

a. Efficiency of Segmentation Practices of the Bank in Deepening Customer Relationships:

The factors evaluated under this parameter are shown in two tables: Table 7.25 evaluates: the extent to which the customers feel that the bank: D1.1 knows their needs to meet all of them; D1.2 Questions them regarding their satisfaction with the bank.

Table 7.25 Analysis of the Efficiency of Segmentation Practices in Deepening Customer Relationships (Customers' Perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3645</td>
<td>2063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

From the table 7.25 it is evident that the banks efforts in gauging the customer satisfaction have not been efficient whereas the customers are positive about their opinion that the bank has the ability to meet all their needs.

Table 7.26 Bank Patronized by the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major dealings with:</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Bank</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bank</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Table 7.27 Type of Loan account/s Held by the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Loan Account</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Loan account is held</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdraft (OD) and other loans</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Credit (CC) and other loans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Loan and other loans</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan and other loans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Related Loan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Loan Account</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

A further evaluation of the bank’s practices at deepening relationships can be gauged by evaluating the data presented in tables 7.2, 7.5, 7.7, 7.23, 7.26, 7.27. Table 7.23 shows that sample respondents have been the customers of the bank for a fairly long time whereby 31% of the customers have held the bank account for more than 10 years. Table 7.26 shows that 65.6% of the sample respondents hold either an account with Corporation bank alone or have a major share of their financial dealings with the bank. However, a look at table 7.5, 7.2 and 7.27 does not speak well of the bank’s efforts in tapping the wallet share of even its longstanding customers. It is seen in these tables that a majority of the customers hold only a savings bank account, more than 50% customers of the bank do not hold even an ATM card of the bank which is, in fact well commended, and 65% of the respondents do not hold a loan account with the bank. In fact there is a very good scope for the bank to dig into the wallets of its customers if it thoughtfully evaluates and uses its customer data. Among the many benefits of promotion of ATM and internet channel, a few that would enhance customer relationships would be - the cutting down on: time wastage, long queues, and manual errors in data entry, hectic schedules; which would benefit both the customer and the banker alike. It would also ensure a quiet and respectable environment for the needy customer and provide enough time for the staff to interact peacefully and effectively with the customers who truly need their attention.

The Data management practices that are evaluated under point 5 in section 7.2.2 are a further indication that the bank has done precious little in deepening its relationships through its data management practices. The second part (right) of table
7.7 which presents the data on the intention of the customers to enhance their dealings with the bank in future also points to the fact that 26.6% of the customer have opined that they are 'very likely', and 43.4% are likely to increase their dealings with the bank in future.

b. Efficiency of Channel Management and Other Practices of the Bank in Deepening Customer Relationships:

The factors evaluated, in table 7.28, to measure the efficiency are: Extent to which the bank meets the customer expectations through **D2.1** the service environment; **D2.2** the bank environment; **D2.3** the product environment; **D2.4** providing a comfortable platform for voicing complaints; **D2.5** by questioning them regarding their satisfaction; **D2.6** by offering a personalized service **D2.7** through convenient high-tech banking **D2.8** providing reliable ATM/Internet Banking **D2.9** by customers’ education in using ATM/Internet facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>No of Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.7</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.8</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.9</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Values</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>9211</td>
<td>Proportion=.6141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.28 Analysis of the Efficiency of Channel Management and other Practices in Deepening Customer Relationships (Customers’ Perspective)

Table 7.28 shows again that the bank’s other efforts in deepening relationships have been marginally efficient with an average score of 3. However two important factors at deepening relationships, namely, ability of the customer in voicing their grievances (D2.4) and efforts at gauging customer satisfaction (D2.5) have found lowest possible score from a minimum of 25% and 50% of the respondents
respectively, with widely differing opinions expressed on the former (D2.4) as well as on the need for service personalization (D2.6) and customer education in the use of ATM cards (D2.9).


For the purpose of testing the efficiency of competitive practices of the bank from the customers’ perspective, the following hypothesis was formulated and results are shown in table 7.29

\[ H_0: \text{Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are efficient in deepening relationships with customers (i.e., in obtaining more business from existing customers).} \]

\[ H_1: \text{Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are not efficient in deepening relationships with customers (i.e., in obtaining more business from existing customers).} \]

The above hypothesis was tested using the ‘t’ test for mean. The values obtained are presented in the table.

Table 7.29 Efficiency of CRM Practices in Deepening Customer Relationships (customers’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic Value</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. 2 tailed</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-5.252</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.9409</td>
<td>3.0591</td>
<td>.5941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Worked out from the data presented in tables 7.25 & 7.28

From the values presented in the table 7.29 it is clear that the ‘t’ value is significant at 5% level of significance. The fact that the mean efficiency is not equal to four coupled with the statistic obtained from one tailed ‘t’ test which revealed that the mean efficiency is less than four, enabled to draw conclusion that the Customer Relationship Management Practices (CRM) of Corporation Bank are not efficient in deepening its relationships with customers (i.e., in obtaining more business from customers). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance and alternate hypothesis is accepted.
7.2.4 THE COMPETITIVE STRATEGY OF THE BANK (Customers' Perspective):

CRM assumes special importance from the fact that the bank needs to stand the test of global competition. Data collected with regard to the bank’s competitive position are presented in this section.

a. Data presentation on Competitive position:

The following factors are evaluated in determining the efficiency of the competitive practices from the point of view of the customers: Superiority of the bank with regard to C1 Quality of Service; C2 Bank's ability to meet customers’ needs; C3 Bank's Employees; C4 Quality of High-tech Banking; C5 Speed of service; C6 Location of the service branches; C7 Cleanliness and physical set up of the service branches; C8 Safety and Security of funds; C9 Effectiveness of Advertisement Effort; C10 Effective Customer Care; C11 Speedy and Efficient Complaint handling; C12 Overall rating when compared to other bank; C1 All India position compared to the best banks

Table 7.30 Analysis of the Competitive Strategy of the Bank in Managing Customer Relationships (Customers’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

A glance at the table 7.30 places the bank’s competitive practices to be on par with the other banks in the district except for its location, ATM network and overall
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position compared to the banks in India as already noted in the earlier observations. Customer opinion is found to be consistent on this parameter except that a little wider range of opinion is found regarding the Bank’s position at the National level.

b. Testing the hypothesis relating to the Efficiency of Competitive Strategy of the Bank (Customers’ perspective).

For the purpose of testing the efficiency of competitive practices of the bank from the customers’ perspective, the following hypothesis was formulated and results are shown in table 7.31:

\( H_0: \) Competitive strategy of the bank is efficient.

\( H_1: \) Competitive strategy of the bank is not efficient.

The above hypothesis was tested using the ‘t’ test for mean. The values obtained are presented in the table 7.31.

**Table 7.31 Efficiency of Competitive Strategy of Corporation Bank (Customers’ perspective)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. 2 tailed</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-9.866</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.5185</td>
<td>3.4815</td>
<td>.1895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Worked out from Table 7.30

From table 7.31 it is observed that the ‘t’ value is significant at 5% level of significance. Since mean efficiency is not equal to four, a one tailed ‘t’ test was applied which confirmed that the mean efficiency was below four. Thus it is concluded that the competitive practices of Corporation Bank are not efficient from the customers’ perspective. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

**CONCLUSION:** The customers’ perspective presented in this chapter makes it clear that the customers do not consider the CRM practices of Corporation Bank to be substantially to highly efficient in widening, lengthening and deepening customer relationships. Further they consider the bank to be one among the best in India, though at the district level they consider it to be on par with any other bank.

The demographic data on Customer respondents is given in Annexure II. Chapter VIII presents a comparison of the bankers’ and customers’ perspective.