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This research attempts to examine how customer relationship management and customer experience influence customer satisfaction in Lampung Province retail complexes. Data was taken using non-random sampling method with purposive sampling technique and used to meet the number of samples as many as 135 respondents. Validity, reliability, construct reliability, and variance extraction were used to evaluate the quality of the data. Prior to data analysis, the Liliefors normal requirements, homogeneity, linearity, and significance of regression were examined. Structural Equation Modeling is a structural equation used to analyze the model. The research findings are that there is a direct positive effect of customer relationship management on customer experience, customer relationships have a direct positive effect on customer satisfaction, and customer experience has a direct positive effect on customer satisfaction.
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1. Introduction

Previous researchers have mainly researched consumer satisfaction and use customer responses and service quality to the output produced by the company (Al-Azzam, 2015; Faraj Aldaihani, Bin Ali, Hashim, & Basha, 2020; Tohara, Dewi, Faizah, Nugraha, & Andi, 2020). In contrast to previous studies, this study examines customer relationship management, which is expected to accommodate different customer experiences, increasing customer satisfaction. This research is based on the arguments of (Imbug, Ambad, & Bujang, 2018), which says that the treatment given to the organization to customers who have different experiences is a strategy to obtain a positive customer response to the organization.

Positive consumer response is one indicator of customer satisfaction (Ban & Kim, 2019). Customer satisfaction is maintained in a good way, is a success for every company. Because if the customer is satisfied after consuming the goods or services provided by the company, it means that the company can meet consumer needs following expectations. According to (Othman, Harun, Rashid, & Ali, 2019), customer satisfaction is the key to long-term business success. The company must offer a product or service based on quality to outperform its competitors to get the satisfaction of its customers to protect, gain, and maintain market share. Customer satisfaction is one of the main goals that any company looks for in the long term, with customers being considered a top priority (Minh & Huu, 2016).

Companies can create customer satisfaction through several factors, such as maintaining relationships with customers, providing quality services, and according to customer desires. Maintaining relationships is a priority factor because it is considered to have a comfortable impact on the minds of customers (Faraj Aldaihani et al., 2020). Customer relationship management is a strategy where companies try to maintain relationships with customers.

Customer relationship management is considered a broad-based approach that builds and expands customer relationships. It is an entrepreneurial strategy that aims to provide understanding, anticipation, management, and personalization of current and potential customers (Jermsittiparsert, Sutduean, & Sriyakul, 2018). According to (Memon, 2018), customer relationship management is a systematic technique designed to manage customer interactions utilizing various technologies to gather and coordinate business sales, marketing, customer support, product development, and performance management information.

Customer experience is a broad concept that includes customers and companies that provides for customers physical and emotional experiences when interacting with company products and services. Customer experience is subjective because it involves customer opinions until the post-consumption stage (Bascur & Rusu, 2020). Customer experience is considered a unique concept superior to services and products, specifically customer experience, divided into four categories, namely entertainment, education, quotes, and aesthetics (Lee, Ka-hyun Lee, & Choi, 2018).
Based on above explanation, we formulate a research problem as follows: the extent to which Customer Relationship Management and Customer Experience influence Customer Satisfaction.

2. Literature Review

Customer satisfaction is an attitude customers show because the company has succeeded in fulfilling customer wants and needs. Customer satisfaction requires meeting customer expectations for products and services. When the company's performance responds to customer desires, consumers will feel satisfaction (Afthanorhan, Awang, Rashid, Foziah, & Ghazali, 2019; Al-Azzam, 2015). The concept of consumer satisfaction is described as a personal sensation, joy (or displeasure), arising from comparing the perceived performance of a firm to customer expectations (Aymar & Joseph, 2019; Felix, 2017; Tohara et al., 2020). Customer satisfaction is the customer's feeling towards product performance where the customer has product expectations and is satisfied if the product performance matches or even exceeds customer expectations (Pakurár, Haddad, Nagy, Popp, & Oláh, 2019).

Customer relationship management is considered as one of the strategies to obtain customer satisfaction because, in this strategy, the company seeks to maintain relationships with customers. According to (Amuna, Al Shobaki, Naser, & Badwan, 2017; Hendriyani & Auliana, 2018; Suharto, 2016), customer relationship management is a process and strategy that provides opportunities for companies to maintain, identify and maintain profitable customers for sustainable relationships. Customer relationship management is defined as an overall organizational process of treating different customers in different ways to increase value for customers and organizations.

Customer experience is the customer's impression of the output and services offered by the company as a whole. According to (Situmorang, Rini, & Muda, 2017), customer experience is an event that occurs and binds each individual personally. An unforgettable experience and always remembered will determine the behavior of the next customer can form. Companies that are able to give a memorable experience will form strong relationships with their clients; therefore, these bonds will cause customers to become fascinated with the items supplied. Customer experience encompasses both the interaction with the business and the achievement of value made possible by the firm's product or service offering. Due to the subjectivity of customer experiences, they serve as the key source of competitive advantage and distinction (Beyari & Ghouth, 2018; Imbug et al., 2018).

Following is a step-by-step explanation of the hypothesis based on the previous overview of the literature:
Customer Relationship Management and Customer Experience

Customer relationship management includes knowledge about customers to manage and serve customers better and use an approach based on customer needs and interests (Yerpude & Singhal, 2018). Suppose the company can manage and serve customers through a process based on customer needs and interests. In that case, this will positively impact the customer experience when using the products and services provided by the company. Customer experience is quality as excellence and the customer's subjective reaction to a strange and direct experience full of the company (Nobar & Rostamzadeh, 2018).

H1: There is a positive direct relationship between customer relationship management and customer experience

Customer Relationship Management and Customer Satisfaction

Customer relationship management is the practice of preserving and creating lucrative customer connections by giving a high level of customer satisfaction in order to enhance customer loyalty through three actions, namely obtaining, maintaining, and developing (Juanamasta et al., 2019). Maintaining relationships with customers needs to be applied in a company because a harmonious relationship in the long term will be profitable for the company and achieve customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction, according to (Chinomona & Dubhilela, 2014; Tohara et al., 2020; Uma, 2015), is defined as the result of expectations for perceived quality, the extent to which the perceived service performance meets customer expectations or fails to meet previous expectations.

H2: There is a positive direct relationship between customer relationship management and customer satisfaction

Customer Experience and Customer Satisfaction

Customer experience, according to (Bhattacharya, Srivastava, & Verma, 2019; Nasermoadeli, Ling, & Maghnati, 2013), stems from a series of relationships between customers and company services that lead to responses. These highly personal experiences reveal different amounts of customer involvement (rational, emotional, sensory, physical, and spiritual). The relationship between customers and customer service will lead to a positive response to customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction may be seen as an encounter based on a particular service and contributes to customer loyalty, repeat purchases, word of mouth promotion, and higher profitability (Ban & Kim, 2019).

H3: There is a positive direct relationship between customer experience and customer satisfaction.

Based on this brief description, the next constellation of research to be carried out can be described:
3. Research Methods

This research follows a descriptive and quantitative flow and uses a survey method. The study was conducted on respondents in a shopping center in Lampung Province and used a sample of 135 respondents. Obtaining data using non-random sampling method, and the technique used is purposive sampling. Using a closed design and instrument, the response rate is calculated and sent directly to the responder. This design is intended to boost the response rate. The instrument is evaluated using validity, reliability, construct reliability, and variance retrieved using Lisrel 8.8 on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5.

The analysis requirements test in the structural model applies homogeneity, linearity, and normality (Tommasetti, Singer, Troisi, & Maione, 2018). In addition to preparation, compilation, and finalization, the authors predicted whether respondents would be interested in participating in the study and would be able to complete the questionnaires. After conducting the research, of the 200 questionnaires given, the authors obtained a response of 150 (75%) respondents which then could be processed by 135 respondents (67.5%) of the total respondents. Data analysis used Structural Equation Modeling (Khunsoonthornkit & Panjakajornsak, 2018).

4. Results

Testing Requirements Analysis

Normality test.

The normality test of the data comprises the collection of distribution-related data, regardless of whether the data are normal or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value α</th>
<th>Value Sig.</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationship Management(ξ₁)</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,571</td>
<td>Fulfil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience (η₁)</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,449</td>
<td>Fulfil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction(η₂)</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td>Fulfil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)
Homogeneity Test
The homogeneity test aims to discover whether the variance of a portion of the tested data is derived from a population with the same variance, or if the variance is heterogeneous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value α</th>
<th>Value Sig.</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>η₁ over ξ₁</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,813</td>
<td>There are data similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₂ over ξ₁</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,102</td>
<td>There are data similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₂ over η₁</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,050</td>
<td>There are data similarities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

Linearity and Regression Test
The goal of linearity and regression tests is to establish the relationship between variables by considering whether or not each variable forms a significant linear and regression line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sig. Regression</th>
<th>Regression Significance</th>
<th>Lin. Regression</th>
<th>Linearity Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>η₁ over ξ₁</td>
<td>1,20 2,67</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>3,39 1,65</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₂ over ξ₁</td>
<td>2,15 2,67</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>4,15 1,65</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η₂ over η₁</td>
<td>1,47 2,67</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>3,94 1,65</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

Construct Reliability and Variance Extracted Test Customer Relationship Management (ξ₁)
The construct's capacity to assess the exogenous latent variable (ξ₁) was determined by examining the manifest variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Std Loading</th>
<th>Std Loading²</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>0,74</td>
<td>0,55</td>
<td>0,46</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,24</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,92</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>1,69</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

According to the table's calculations, the value of the construct Relationship Management is 0.57 less than 0.70 (CR 0.70), while the variance of the average extracted value is 0.83 more than 0.50 (VE > 0.50). This demonstrates that the four manifest variables consistently assess the variable ξ₁ 1.
Construct Reliability and Variance Extracted Test Customer Experience ($\eta_1$)
The capability of the construct to evaluate the endogenous latent variable ($\eta_1$) was determined by examining the manifest variable.

Table 5. Calculation of Construct Reliability and Variance Extracted ($\eta_1$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Std Loading</th>
<th>Std Loading²</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1$</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_2$</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_3$</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_4$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.92</strong></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

According to the test findings shown in the table above, the customer experience construct value is 0.52 less than 0.70 (CR 0.70), while the average value extracted variance is 0.81 more than 0.50 (VE > 0.50). This demonstrates the congruence of the four manifest variables used to evaluate the variable $\eta_1$.

Construct Reliability and Variance Extracted Test Customer Satisfaction ($\eta_2$)
The ability of the construct to evaluate the endogenous latent variable ($\eta_2$) was assessed by evaluating the manifest variable.

Table 6 Calculation of Construct Reliability and Variance Extracted ($\eta_2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Std Loading</th>
<th>Std Loading²</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_5$</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_6$</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_7$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.45</strong></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

The calculated value (Customer Satisfaction) is 0.52 less than 0.70 (CR0.70), while the extracted average value variance is 0.73 more than 0.50 (VE>0.50) based on the preceding table of test results. This indicates that the three manifest variables measure the variable $\eta_1$ consistently.

T-value Coefficient Calculation Results
After evaluating the requirements analysis, the next step is to compute and test each coefficient route as shown in the table below:
Table 7. Path Coefficient Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ($\xi$ and $\eta$)</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$\eta_1$ over $\xi_1$</td>
<td>$0.40$</td>
<td>$3.74$</td>
<td>$H_1$ accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$\eta_2$ over $\xi_1$</td>
<td>$0.15$</td>
<td>$1.96$</td>
<td>$H_2$ accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$\eta_2$ over $\eta_1$</td>
<td>$0.60$</td>
<td>$6.01$</td>
<td>$H_3$ accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

Substructure Path Coefficient 1

$\eta_1 = \gamma_{11} \xi_1 + \zeta_1$ is the form of the obtained path coefficient analysis model for substructure 1. This test will answer the question of whether to test hypothesis 1.

Figure 2. Substructure Path Coefficient 1

Based on the results of testing substructure 1, the path coefficient is obtained ($\gamma \eta_1 \xi_1$), the value is $0.60$, $t_{\text{statistics}}$ value = $6.01 > t_{\text{-list}}$ (0.05: 1.65) = 1.65, so $H_0$ is rejected and the path coefficient $\gamma \eta_1 \xi_1$ is significant.

Substructure Path Coefficient 2

$\eta_2 = \gamma_{21} \xi_1 + \beta_{21} \eta_1 + \zeta_2$ is the form of the obtained path coefficient analysis model for substructure 1. This test will offer an answer to the question of whether to test hypotheses 2 and 3.

Figure 3. Path Coefficient of Sub Structure 2

Source: Processed data (2022)
In the sub-structure test 2 findings, the path coefficient (γη2ξ1) is 0.15 and the value of t-statistics = 1.96 > t-list (0.05: 135) = 1.65; hence Ho is rejected and the path coefficient γη2ξ1 is significant. The path coefficient (βη2η1) is 0.40, and the value of t-statistics = 3.74 > t-list (0.05: 135) = 1.65; hence, Ho is rejected, and the path coefficient βη2η1 is significant.

Calculated using the path coefficient and t-statistic value for testing hypotheses. The explanation is provided that the standardized loading factor value of all route coefficients is more than 0.05 and t-statistics is greater than 1.65; thus, Ho is rejected and three lines are statistically significant. The following simultaneously describes the conventional solution method for each variable based on a linear program's structural connection.

In Figure 3, the link between exogenous variables (ξ) and endogenous variables (η) is impacted indirectly and globally by the standardized solution trajectory scheme and the direct influence, respectively. On the basis of the output of the linear structural connection regarding the standardization of the whole impact. It states that: (1) the amount of the impact ξ1 to η1 and ξ1 to η2 is equal to the size of the direct effect of each variable since there are no other mediating factors; and (2) the indirect effect of ξ1 to η2 through 2 is 0.40 x 0.60 = 0.24, while the overall effect is 0.24 + 0.15 = 0.39.

Figure 4. Standardized Solution Path Diagram
Source: Processed data (2022)

Figure 5. T-value path diagram
Source: Processed data (2022)
Overall Model Fit Test
Following is a list of the goodness-of-fit conclusions based on the structural model test results.

Table 8. Summary of Model Fit Test Results (Goodness of Fit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Recommended Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$X^2/df$</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“RMSEA”</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“AGFI”</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.90</td>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“GFI”</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>&gt;0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“CFI”</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>&gt;0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“NFI”</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>&gt;0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“NNFI”</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&gt;0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“IFI”</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>&gt;0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>“RFI”</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>≥0.90</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>“ECVI”</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Suitable Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed data (2022)

Based on Lisrel's output, the overall fitness of the model using $\chi^2$ test (chi-square) yielded a Weighted Least Squares chi-square value of 70.73 with a p-value of 0.008 <0.05; hence, it was determined that the overall $\chi^2$ test results did not match. Moreover, the value of $\chi^2$ divided by the degree of freedom ($\chi^2 / df$) is 70.73/38 = 1.86 <0.05. Therefore, It may be extrapolated that the control of the model's completeness, represented by the number of pressures of freedom, has a decent fit.

RMSEA must be less than 0.08 for the constructed model to be deemed satisfactory. GFI, CFI, NFI, NNFI, IFI, RFI, and ECVI all exhibit test results with magnitudes more than 0.90, thus it can be determined that the model has a good fit. In contrast, AGFI demonstrates test findings that are less than 0.90, so it can be agreed that the model has a bad fit.

Positive Direct Effect of Variable Customer Relationship Management ($\xi_1$) on Variable Customer Experience ($\eta_1$)
Customer relationship management ($\xi_1$) has a direct beneficial influence on customer experience ($\eta_1$). The results of this research indicate a direct positive influence of variable $\xi_1$ on variable $\eta_1$ with a value of $t_{\text{statistics}} > t_{\text{list}}$, which is 3.74 > 1.65, hence hypothesis 1 is approved. The outcomes of this investigation are consistent with the conclusions drawn by (Badwan, Al Shobaki, Naser, & Amuna, 2017).

The meaning of this hypothesis test explains that if the indicators of customer relationship management are improved, including improving the management of relationships with consumers, improving activities before and after transactions, improving the analysis of information obtained about customers, and improvements
in handling consumer complaints, then the quality of transactions, reviews positive attitudes about products also services, the desire to recommend products and services to others, and the intensity of business strategies and social communities for the better.

**Positive Direct Effect of Variable Customer Relationship Management (ξ₁) on Variable Customer Satisfaction (η₂)**

Customer relationship management (ξ₁) has an immediate, positive effect on customer satisfaction (η₂). The results of the research reveal that variable ξ₁ has a direct positive impact on variable η₂ with a value of t_{statistics}>t_{list}, precisely 1.94>1.65, hence it is reasonable to conclude that hypothesis 2 is correct. This study's results are consistent with the conclusions reached by (Faraj Aldaihani et al., 2020).

The findings from this hypothesis test explain that if the approach taken by management in managing relationships with consumers is improved, activities when making transactions and activities after making purchases are increased, there are efforts to improve the management of information about customers, and improvements are made in handling consumer complaints. Then the emotional reasoning power of consumers when comparing products received and expected to be better, better attitudes and emotional reactions to service providers, increased desire to return to using products, and increased loyalty to the use of company products or services.

**Positive Direct Effect of Variable Customer Experience (η₁) on Variable Customer Satisfaction (η₂)**

Customer experience (η₁) has a direct beneficial influence on customer satisfaction (η₂). The findings of this research reveal that variable η₁ has a direct positive impact on variable η₂ with a value of t_{statistics}>t_{list}, which is 6.01>1.65, therefore supporting hypothesis 3. This study's results are related to the conclusions reached by (Klaus & Maklan, 2013; Ristawati, Saufi, & Rinuastuti, 2019).

The findings of this study explain that if the customer experience indicators are improved, namely the quality of interactions with customers, positive reviews about products or services, an emotional desire to provide product and service recommendations to others, and an increase in the quality of business strategies, consumers will feel a sense of conformity, between the product received and what is expected, so that the desire to provide recommendations to others becomes stronger.

**5. Conclusions and Suggestions**

Research indicates that customer relationships have a direct impact on consumer satisfaction or experience. Customer relationship management significantly influences customer satisfaction in a direct manner. Customer experience has an immediate positive impact on customer satisfaction. It can be interpreted that the company's strategy in maintaining, managing, and maintaining relationships with customers can have an excellent effect and even impress to improve the customer
experience in using the products and services provided by the company. Maintenance of relationships with customers carried out by the company with an approach based on customer needs and interests greatly influences customer expectations of the company's products and services so that customers can feel satisfaction. The memorable experience obtained by customers in using a company's product or service can achieve customer satisfaction. It significantly affects the company's profitability.

Based on the conclusions we made, the implication is that there must be efforts made by management to improve the management of relationships and transactions with consumers, both when consumers make purchases or after making purchases. Management can manage important information about consumers when purchasing activities occur, and handle complaints that arise as a result of process weaknesses when conducting transaction activities.

Improvements in customer relationship management by the company will lead to an increase in business strategy in the process of interaction between companies and consumers. Consumer reviews of products and services received will also be more positive. So that Consumers will endorse the company's goods and services without hesitation to other people or social communities.

Improvements made by management regarding relationship management and consumer experience will lead to better customer satisfaction. Consumer attitudes are related to emotional reactions about the product or service received, and the urge to reuse the products and services of the company for the better. Although in the context of this research, other studies are still needed that use variables that have not been used in this study.

No research is without weaknesses. Of course, this study also has limitations. The first relates to the sampling technique. As previously mentioned, purposive sampling is the sampling method used to identify the sample based on particular features. Of course in this technique, the number of samples selected is not fully representative of the other samples. Therefore, to generalize this research to consumers in similar industries or other industries, it must be done carefully.

The second limitation relates to the individuals surveyed, namely the visitors to the shopping center. Meanwhile, on the other hand, the market's ability to absorb products or services produced by the company is also determined by the competence and communication skills of employees or marketers, so research on attitudes and behavior using employees or marketers also needs to be done.

Currently, the competence of marketers to support marketing performance is complemented by the ability to use technology in internet communication media. So that the ability of a product or service on the market is not only supported by the quality of products and services but is also determined by the ease of access to information using internet technology when making a purchase transaction. So
research on internet communication in supporting the sale of a product or service still needs to be done.
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