

Survey of Loyalty, Satisfaction and Commitment to create Value for Customers through Relationship Marketing Approach: A Case Study

Ahmad Ali Yazdanpanah^{a*}, Amir Ehsani^b

^a. Department of Statistical Research & Information Technology, Institute for Research & Planning in higher Education, Tehran, Iran

^b. Department of Management, Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, Karaj, Iran

Abstract

This study was conducted to evaluate the relationship between loyalty, satisfaction, and commitment with relationship marketing to create value for customers and has been designed to collect data from the questionnaires used. The questionnaires have been distributed among individuals 193 customers, of Port and Maritime Organization in order to analyze the data and present the results of SPSS software and structural equation is utilized. The results of this study show that between 4 variables (trust, commitment, relationship, loyalty) of the costumers, there are significant relation and correlation. Based on the relationship marketing to component development, hypothesis (customer loyalty) has the highest average (3.5984), hypothesis (There is a significant relation between the organization commitment and create value in Port and Maritime Organization) has the lowest average (3.3871). Finally, by performing a statistical theory test for the whole hypothesis, all of them were approved and accepted.

Keywords: loyalty, satisfaction, commitment, relationship marketing.

1. Introduction

Relationship Marketing is a new-old concept in marketing which aims to retain existing customers. In the literature, there is not any systemized definition and context for relationship marketing concept (Morris et al., 1998). The phrase of “relationship marketing” appeared for the first time in literature of services marketing in the early 80s (Berry 1983) the first definition of relationship marketing belongs to Berry (1983: 26). He defined relationship marketing as “attracting, maintaining, and enhancing customer relationships”. Morgan and Hunt (1994) indicated relationship marketing as all marketing activities/applications for attracting more profitable customers, developing, maintaining relationships with them. Grönroos’s (1994) definition involves rather a specific expression where we can understand the content of relationship marketing instead of its aim. He defined relationship marketing as mutual exchange and fulfillment of promises to enhance and terminate relationships with customers where the goals of both parties are met. Ballantyne (1994) handled relationship marketing in the context of a supply chain. Paravatiyar (1996) focused on the cooperation while defining relationship marketing (Quoted from Caliskan & Esmer, 2019: 2). Over the past 20 years growing interest and active research in relationship marketing are bringing newer and more sophisticated perspectives to the subject, Beck and Palmatier (2012) define it as “the process of identifying, developing, maintaining, terminating relational exchanges with the purpose of enhancing performance.” The goal of relationship marketing is to enhance mutual value by increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of all parties involved in the exchange

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: yazdanpanah@irphe.ir (A.A. Yazdanpanah)

Received 12 April 2020; Received in revised form 3 June 2020; Accepted 30 June 2020

© 2020 Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, University of Mazandaran; All rights reserved.

(Sheth et al., 2015). Relationship marketing has been gaining remarkable importance especially in the service industry since the relationship marketing concept and related studies are mostly about service quality and customer satisfaction (Payne, 1994). It is based on three main principles: trust, mutual value creation, and commitment. Establishing a strong relationship with customers generates an outstanding level of customer satisfaction, which in turn helps gain their trust and their loyalty, thus benefitting the company as a whole (Payne et al., 1995). Several areas of marketing have recently been the focus of relationship marketing including inter-organizational issues in the context of a buyer-seller partnership (Dwyer, Schuur, Oh 1987), networks between firms (Thorelli 1986), working partnerships (Anderson, Narus 1990), Strategic alliances (Day 1995), internal marketing (Berry and Parasuraman 1991) and trust theory (Morgan and Hunt 1994).

In the port industry, there has been growing interest in revealing non-price competition issues to gain competitive advantage while maximizing customer satisfaction (Schellinck and Brooks, 2016; Esmer et al., 2016). The main purpose of relationship marketing efforts is keeping existing customers rather than attracting new customers. Especially in the port industry, it is well known that at the first stage in port selection process, carriers mostly focus on market size of the hinterland, location and the physical condition of the port (Chang et al., 2008), while shippers take into consideration the frequency of sailings and port charges (Slack, 1985). It would be not an efficient way to attract new customers with social marketing programs or by offering structural relationships. So, relationship marketing is different from the 4p or 7p marketing process. There is no need to increase the awareness of the port customers because, in the port industry, which is an industrial market, the level of customers' knowledge is already very high compared to the consumer markets.

This research will investigate the relationship between marketing actions, such as loyalty programs, and the level of commitment and specifically the type of commitment, and the type of loyalty that may be influenced by such a program. Commitment is seen to be an important antecedent to customer retention (Terawatanavong, et.al, 2007). It will also examine the constituent dimensions of commitment and loyalty and how these have been impacted on by a loyalty program. Much of the research that exists provides conflicting or ambiguous empirical findings (Kotler, Philip, 2006). In addition, some of the research is conducted in situations where the switching barrier is high and also where purchase intentions are used as a proxy for buying behavior (Hansen Tarben, 2001). This research will be conducted in a context of low switching barriers and where actual purchases are used to represent buying behavior.

2. Literature Review

The concept of relationship marketing was presented initially in 1983 by Berry in the context of service organizations. It is defined as a business strategy to attract, maintain, improve relations with technology development (Berry, 1983); companies are paying to create beneficial relationships based on optimizing customer perceptions value. Some defined relationship marketing as a process to identify, build, maintain, strengthen, if necessary terminate their mutually beneficial relationships with their customers and stakeholders so that the objectives of all the parties involved are met (Gronroos, 1994). Kotler, et al. (1999) defined relationship marketing as an effort to create, maintain, and enhance strong relationships with target customers and stakeholders. (Abtin & Pouramiri, 2016). Based on a literature review of the field of loyalty, various definitions of the word loyalty have been presented. But with more precise insights, two major approaches can be identified: Behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty. (Venus & Zohori. 2011: 153). Loyalty was defined by Oliver (1999) as the commitment to systematically repurchasing a product or service by repeatedly buying the same brand, type of product or product from a certain company for several times, despite the influence of situations and marketing efforts that aim at leading to behavioral changes. (Alame & Nokte dan, 2010, p.111).

Loyalty refers to a deeply held commitment to rebuy or patronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future, thereby causing same-brand or same organization purchasing, despite influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching (Oliver, 1997). Loyalty is therefore seen as a means of maintaining or increasing a customer's patronage over the long term, thereby increasing the value of the customer to the firm. It is a challenge to determine the order of loyalty to create value from the point of view of the costumers. Consumer loyalty is considered an important key to organizational success and profit (Ennew Christine, Binks R. martin, 1998). A great deal of research attention has focused on the identification of effective

methods of actively enhancing loyalty, including loyalty programs, such as point's rewards schemes (Ndubisi, Nelson-Oly, 2007) Although the importance of customer value has been widely taken into account, there is no clear definition of it because of the lack of specialized research on the concept of customer value. Recent studies on the effects of marketing strategies argue that value is determined by the quality of the product, its price, customer expectations. Woodruff (1997) defines customer value as the customer's perceived (customer-preferred) preference and product evaluation, product performance, product outcomes, and the consequences of using it in terms of customer's goals and objectives. Although these views are different, it is clear that there is a consensus on them in some areas. The value of the customer is related to the use of certain products or services and is understood by the customers. In addition, these perceptual processes include the relationships between what customers receive (including quality, benefits, utility and application), and what they consider to be missing value (including cost, opportunity cost, customer retention costs, and training) (Musa Khani et al. 2012: 152).

Customer value is a comparison of weighted "get" attributes with "give" attributes (Heskett et al., 1994). Customer-perceived value is operationalized as a ratio between total benefits received to total sacrifices made (Buzzell and Gale, 1987). These sacrifices may be based on price, but can also include non-financial aspects, such as time, search costs, and physical or mental effort expended by the customer consuming the service (Chung-Yu Wang et al., 2011, p.60). This is the reason why the hypothesis is: Customer loyalty has a significant effect on create value through marketing relationship in Port and Maritime Organization. Extant service management literature argues that customer satisfaction results from customer's perception of value received, where value equals perceived service quality relative to price (Hallowell, 1996, p. 29). Naturally, a customer's perception of value received from a service provider could motivate the customer to patronize the provider again. Therefore, customer-perceived value is positively related to customer loyalty (Bove and Johnson, 2000; Cronin et al., 2000; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2012; Yang and Peterson, 2004).

Marketing theory and practice has become increasingly customer centered and managers have increased emphases on long-term client relationships because the length of a customer's tenure is assumed to be related to long-run company revenues and profitability (Bloemer, et al., 2002). Total USA loyalty program membership grew 35.5% from 2000 to 2006 and now tops 1.3 billion individual memberships showing an average annual membership growth of 5.93% during this period (Sin, L.Y.M, et al. 2005). One of the key theoretical underpinning of this research is relationship marketing. Relationship marketing is "attracting, maintaining and, in multi-service organizations, enhancing customer relationships" (Wen-Bao Lin, 2007).

The fundamental tenet of relationship marketing is that consumers like to reduce choices by engaging in an ongoing loyalty relationship with marketers. Thus, from a consumer's perspective, reduction of choice is the central tenet of their relationship marketing behavior. Earlier studies have established the purchase behavior and customer loyalty link (Ennew Christine T, Binks R. martin, 1998). Customer satisfaction is an output resulting from purchase or consumption and it emerges from the customers' comparison between the benefits and costs together with the expected consequences. (Churchill and Surprenant, 1982). This is the reason why the hypothesis is: Customer satisfaction has a significant effect on create value through marketing relationship in Port and Maritime Organization.

Commitment is another important determinant of the strength of a marketing relationship, useful construct for measuring the likelihood of customer loyalty and predicting future purchase frequency (Gundlach et al. 1987). Wilson (1995) observed that commitment was the most common dependent variable used in buyer-seller relationship studies. In sociology, the concept of commitment is used to analyze both individual and organizational behavior and mark out forms of action characteristic of particular kinds of people or groups (Wong and Sohal, 2002), while psychologists define it in terms of decisions or cognitions that fix or bind an individual to a behavioral disposition (Kiesler, 1971). In the marketing literature, Moorman et al. (1992) have defined commitment as an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship. This implies a higher level of obligation to make a relationship succeed and to make it mutually satisfying and beneficial (Gundlach et al., 1995). Since, commitment is higher among individuals who believe that they receive more value from a relationship, highly committed customers should be willing to reciprocate effort on behalf of a firm due to past benefits received (Mowday et al., 1982) and highly committed firms will continue to enjoy the benefits of such

reciprocity. Commitment has been defined as “an implicit or explicit pledge of relational continuity between exchange partners”(Tseng, Yi Ming, 2007). This is the reason why the hypothesis is: Organization commitment has a significant effect on create value through marketing relationship in Port and Maritime Organization.

Trust has been defined as “... a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence” (Moorman et al., 1993). A betrayal of this trust by the supplier or service provider could lead to defection. Other authors have defined trust in terms of opportunistic behavior (Dwyer et al.,1987), shared values (Morgan and Hunt,1994), mutual goals (Wilson,1995), uncertainty (Crosby et al.,1990), actions with positive outcomes (Anderson and Narus, 1984) and making and keeping promises (Bitner,1995). Calonius (1988) emphasized that an integral element of the relationship marketing approach is the promise concept. He argued that the responsibilities of marketing do not only, or predominantly, include giving promises and thus persuading customers as passive counterparts in the marketplace to act in a given way, but also in keeping promises, which maintains and enhances evolving relationship. Fulfilling promises that have been given is equally important as a means of achieving customer satisfaction, retaining the customer base, and securing long-term profitability (Reichheld and Sasser,1990), besides fanning the fire of trust. Indeed, one would expect a positive outcome from a partner on whose integrity one could confidently rely (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). This is the reason why the hypothesis is: Customer trust has a significant effect on create value through marketing relationship in Port and Maritime Organization.

3. Framework

The Relational Exchanges in Relationship Marketing Model were identified as follow: a) Relationship termination costs, relationship benefits and shared values impact in commitment; b) Shared values, communication and opportunistic behaviour in trust; c) Trust impact in commitment; d) Commitment impact in acquiescence, propensity to leave and cooperation; e) Trust impacts cooperation, functional conflict and uncertainly (Morgan, and Hunt, 1994). Akarapanich (2006) utilized the Hennig-Thurau et al. (2001) model by positioning satisfaction and commitment as mediators to the understanding of relationship marketing deliverables (loyalty intentions). He investigated the relationship between three constructs (Trust, Satisfaction, Commitment) their impacts on loyalty in MBA programs. (Trust impacts on satisfaction, commitment and loyalty, satisfaction impact on commitment, satisfaction and commitment impact on loyalty. Accordingly, Previous studies clearly indicated that various factors affected on the customer loyalty. Considering this, several models and structures of these factors have been studied. Finally, the proposed framework, which is a combination of all two models used by Morgan, Hunt (1994), Akarapanich (2006). An overview of this study is presented in the framework which is: The effect of loyalty, satisfaction, commitment and trust in relationship marketing and the impact of relationship marketing on value creation.

4. Background

The foregoing, therefore, leads one to the conclusion that Customer Lifetime Value is inextricably tied to efforts aimed at furthering customer retention, such as loyalty programs (Hosseini et al., 2013). Srivastava and Rai (2013) underlined the significant impact of customer loyalty on the success and profitability of a business, while Rai and Srivastava (2014a) opined that organizations with a relationship oriented approach have customer loyalty as their key objective, suggested that customer loyalty “can be understood as the customer’s predisposition to prefer a particular product or service over its substitutes available in the marketplace”. Kincaid (2003) referred to customer loyalty “as a consumer behavior, built on positive experience and value, which leads to buying products, even when may not appear to be the most rational decision”. Pfeifer (2005) emphasized that acquiring a new customer is five times costlier than retaining an existing one. Gee et.al. (2008) posited that the absence of a unanimous definition of customer loyalty is felt in the scholarly work aimed at comprehending the vital factors that engender customer loyalty. Terblanche and Boshoff (2006) agreed that comprehension of antecedents of loyalty is essential to garner the greatest gains of customer loyalty.

Table 1. Summary of the results of the study of research background

| Experts / researchers | Year | loyalty | Trust | Satisfaction | Commitment | create value | Relationship Marketing (RM) |
|---------------------------|------|---------|-------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Kiesler | 1971 | | | | ✓ | | |
| Oliver | 1980 | | | ✓ | | | |
| Churchill and Surprenant | 1982 | | | ✓ | | | |
| Berry | 1983 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Anderson and Narus | 1984 | | ✓ | | | | |
| Schurr and Ozanne | 1985 | | ✓ | | | | |
| Berry | 1986 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Dwyer et al. | 1987 | | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Calonius | 1988 | | | | | | |
| Reichheld and Sasser, | 1990 | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Bolton and Drew, | 1991 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| Moorman et al. | 1992 | | | | ✓ | | |
| Moorman et al. | 1993 | | ✓ | | | | |
| Morgan and Hunt | 1994 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Grönroos | 1994 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Dick and Basu | 1994 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Heskett et al. | 1994 | | | | | ✓ | |
| Morgan and Hunt | 1994 | | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Payne et al. | 1995 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bitner | 1995 | | ✓ | | | | ✓ |
| Paravatiyar | 1996 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Hallowell | 1996 | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Woodruff | 1997 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| Morris et al | 1998 | | | | | | ✓ |
| Oliver | 1999 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Wong and Sohal | 2002 | | | | ✓ | | |
| Kincaid | 2003 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Hellier et al. | 2003 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Yang and Peterson | 2004 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| Sin, L.Y.M, et al. | 2005 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Kotler, Philip, | 2006 | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| Terawatanavong, C. et al. | 2007 | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Tseng, Yi Ming, | 2007 | | | | ✓ | | |
| Gee et al. | 2008 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Lai et al. | 2009 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | |
| Alame & Nokte dan, | 2010 | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| Venus & Zohori. | 2011 | ✓ | | | | | |
| Musa Khani at et.al. | 2012 | | | | | ✓ | |
| Hosseini Mirza, et al. | 2013 | | | | | ✓ | |
| Schellinck & Brooks | 2016 | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Esmer et al., | 2016 | | | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Total votes | | 17 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 12 |

5. Method

We start our scientific approach by developing a series of hypotheses that will be answered based on the developed questionnaire, delivered to 193 of Port and Maritime Organization’s customers so that they can fill it in. Taking into account the fact that the loyalty, satisfaction, and commitment to create value for customers through relationship marketing approach are a new concept we want to find out how much the Port and Maritime Organization’s costumers are familiar with it, referring to relationship marketing as support for future implementation. The research methodology is based on a basic research of the theories related to the relationship marketing in E-payment industrial. The document analysis, the comparative method and the observation method are part of the social science methods used in this approach. We also use the applied research that is included in the deductive accounting theory, through which we wish to test the concepts used in the first part by commitment, loyalty, trust and satisfaction indicators and perceived value in the reality of the Port and Maritime Organization. In this respect we use the investigation technique based on a questionnaire in which we want to combine the open, closed and mixed questions. This questionnaire will be delivered to the 193 of Port and

Maritime Organization’s customers via e-mail. Reliability and validity tests are necessary for questionnaires to make their results applicable. The Reliability is measured by Cronbach alpha and the validity is measured by factor analysis and the factor space analysis. In table I, measurements of alpha for the all the variables and the questionnaire as a whole are exhibited. As it is shown Table 2, the questionnaire’s overall alpha score is 0.6262, so the questionnaire is reliable.

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha values calculated in the study

| Variable | Related questions | Alpha |
|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Loyalty | 1-9 | 0.784 |
| Commitment | 10-19 | 0.824 |
| Satisfaction | 20-29 | 0.798 |
| Trust | 30-39 | 0.801 |

6. Findings

The results of the search in other research of the relationship marketing variables and questionnaires distributed to customers of Port and Maritime Organization reveal possible measures for each perspective of perceived value. These include all measures proposed by other research and all measures that pass the level of 50% based on the opinions of respondents to the questionnaires. This research study utilizes qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis using a survey instrument and case study for primary data collection. Reliance on one method can create issues, for example qualitative research lacks rigid control, while quantitative methods may create pre-determined certainties. Many authors recommend both qualitative and quantitative methods to add context to research, offer an expanded view of the topics, allow validation of findings through more than one methodology. The survey instrument analyzes the research model using formalized methodology; the case study includes interviews and system information and results. The qualitative and quantitative analysis results were triangulated to form discussion points and conclusion outputs. Our sample was selected among Port and Maritime Organization’s costumers and using comprehensive questionnaire indicators of relationship marketing. We show our finding in following tables. According to demographic data, 82 percent of respondents are male. More information is shown in table 3.

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of the statistical population of the study

| Variable | Number | Percent (%) |
|---------------|--------|-------------|
| Sex | | |
| Male | 157 | 82 |
| Female | 36 | 18 |
| Age | | |
| 20-30 | 5 | 14.2 |
| 30-40 | 15 | 42.8 |
| 40> | 15 | 42.8 |
| Degree | | |
| Educator | 18 | 51.4 |
| Assistant | 17 | 48.6 |
| Professor | 0 | 0 |

In This part of the study, we have tried to define the different approaches for relationship marketing and dimensions and parameters of them by analyzing and evaluating obtained from questionnaires given to the respondents. In order to analyze and evaluate the questionnaire data, we have used the amplitude percent method and binomial test and also we have used Friedman test to rank the approaches. The first hypothesis says: "There

is a significant relation between the customer loyalty and create value in Port and Maritime Organization". The required data in order to evaluate this hypothesis obtained from questions in questionnaire. In order to evaluate this hypothesis of the study we shown on as below:

Table 4. Research h Statistical measures to test the hypotheses binomial

| Hypothesis | Error | Level of being meaningful | Test Possibility | Measured Possibility | Result of the test |
|------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| H1 | 0.05 | 0.000 | 0.5 | 0.82 | accepted |
| H2 | 0.05 | 0.000 | 0.5 | 0.73 | accepted |
| H3 | 0.05 | 0.000 | 0.5 | 0.77 | accepted |
| H4 | 0.05 | 0.000 | 0.5 | 0.82 | accepted |

Because that the level of the being meaningful is less than 5 percent, we can conclude H1. Therefore, we can say with more than 95 percent accuracy that H1 is accepted, this conclusion can be more detailed evaluated by average test.

Table 5. Statistical measures to test the hypotheses

| (Hypothesis) | Average | 95% Estimation | | Teat Value | Level Of being Meaningful | Measured t | Average Standard Error | Standard Deviation |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | Upper Limit | Lower limit | | | | | |
| H1 | 3.52 | 0.6144 | 0.4437 | 3 | 0.000 | 12.306 | 4.29 | 0.4146 |
| H2 | 3.3871 | 0.4669 | 0.3073 | 3 | 0.000 | 9.630 | 4.02 | 0.3876 |
| H3 | 3.4259 | 0.4579 | 0.3324 | 3 | 0.000 | 11.508 | 3.365 | 0.4025 |
| H4 | 3.5984 | 0.4579 | 0.3324 | 3 | 0.000 | 12.421 | 3.4587 | 0.3025 |

It seems that some of the research variables are more important than the others. In this way we have used the variance test of Friedman in order to rank the desired variables. The table 6 shows statistical test of Friedman variance method. In this technique we have evaluated the theory of having equal rankings for all of the variables used in the study.

Table 6. Measures of the prioritization statistical research variables

| Measured X ² | Freedom grade | Level of being Meaningful | Error | Hypothesis |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------|---|
| 32.774 | 3 | 0.000 | 0.05 | The Average rankings of all 5 hypothesis are equal |

Because the level of being meaningful is less than error value (0.000<0.05) so we can conclude that there are differences between the average for 5 hypothesis (variables). In the other words, in 95 percent of confidence, we can say that average rankings of each variable (trust, commitment, relationship, customer Perceived value, loyalty) are not the same and some of them have more priority than the others.

7. Discussion and suggestion

In this study according to 5 research variables (trust, commitment, relationship, customer Perceived value, loyalty) the hypothesis and theories of the study were evaluated by SPSS software. Also, the statistical average for all of the variables were measured and evaluated. Hypothesis 5 (There is a significant relation between customer satisfaction and loyalty in Port and Maritime Organization) has the highest average (3.5984). And

hypothesis 2 (There is a significant relation between the organization commitment and create value in Port and Maritime Organization) has the lowest average (3.3871). Finally by doing statistical theory test for the entire hypothesis, all of them were accepted. The results of this research are shown in table briefly.

Table 7. The results of testing hypotheses

| Hypotheses | Results |
|--|----------|
| There is a significant relation between the customer trust and create value in Port and Maritime Organization | accepted |
| There is a significant relation between the organization commitment and create value in Port and Maritime Organization | Accepted |
| There is a significant relation between customer Perceived value and satisfaction in Port and Maritime Organization | Accepted |
| There is a significant relation between customer satisfaction and loyalty in Port and Maritime Organization | Accepted |

In general, the customer's trust in the ports, maritime organizations in the perceived value has a significant effect, it can be said that this factor in the Field of maritime services will play a pivotal role in creating perceived value and subsequent referrals and the level of customer loyalty. If customers trust a service provider, they will be more secure in maintaining and maintaining their assets, this will result in security, value and loyalty. The factor of commitment to the customer in providing his service is one of the factors influencing the perceived value of the customer and should pay attention it and consider its importance in the field of services, maritime industry. Comparing the relationship between the Ports & Maritime Organization and the customer with other variables mentioned above to create the value of this variable has a lesser effect on the perceived value of the customer's port and maritime organization. But this does not mean the importance of knowing the relationship between the Ports, Maritime and Custom Organizations in creating value. The perceived value of the customer, which has been formed from three factors of trust, commitment and communication, can lead to customer satisfaction of the ports and maritime organization of the service and how it is presented.

Regarding that banking Industrial, after-sale services in this industry is important in our country, also because of great importance of this industry, so we should carefully pay attention to individual communication, reactions between managers and employees during offering services as one of the fundamental needs in order to create cooperation and trust between employees. As it is obvious from obtained results from this study, all dimensions of relationship marketing are defined in the levels from medium to high. In this section we present some solutions and recommendations based on the results obtained from the study in order to increase research variables. In the other words, in this section the aim of the researcher is presenting some recommendations based on the results obtained from theory test in order to increase relationship between Port and Maritime Organization and costumers. Surely researcher believes that although these solutions are obtained from results of a scientific research, but because of dominancy of academic view in the study, we need to combine experiences and attitudes of managers and specialist of the organization in order to have a more common and applicable results. Based on the results obtained about dimensions of the study (Accepted Theories), also by considering gathered information from interviews, observations and literature researches, in order to relationship marketing, below topics are recommended:

- Managers of Port and Maritime Organization who want to increase their relationship marketing skills should obtain proper skills in terms of leadership, human communications, group relations, evaluation.
- In order to increase the managers' understanding from empowering, they should behave in a way to have this belief that they are responsible not only for doing works, but also for improving the way the works is done.
- Managers should create a base for employees that they can teach and learn continuously.
- Managers should be selected according to skills, competence, commitment, experience and interest.
- In order to increase efficiency and effectiveness in the organization, managers should use leadership skills of employees.

- Using group or cooperative management in decision-making by help from thought and attitudes of managers and employees in training process.
- Managers should be aware of principles of psychology or sociology and training, should change these principles to skills.
- Managers should have enough knowledge about IT and ICT, they should be up to date.
- In order to empower and improve the management of the organization, managers should have an active and effective role in planning, organizing, cooperation, leadership and evaluation and they should not be only performer of the program.
- There should be enough knowledge and information about updating and optimizing programs according to requirements managers by learning during the work and conferences.
- Managers should have creative thoughts plus the art of management, should present new solutions for irrational decisions.
- Moreover material, moral, social needs and identifying managers and employees should be considered too.

References

- Abtin, A.; Pouramiri, M. (2016). The impact of relationship marketing on customer loyalty enhancement (Case study: Kerman Iran insurance company). *AIMI Journals, Marketing and Branding Research*, 3, 41-49. (In Persian)
- Akarapanich, S. (2006). *Comparing customer loyalty intentions using trust, satisfaction, and commitment of online MBA students versus traditional MBA students*. Dissertation.
- Alame. S.M., Nokete Dan.I. (2010). The Effect of Service Quality on Customer Loyalty (Case Study of Four- and Five-Stars Hotels in Isfahan). *Journal of Business Management*, 2(5), 109-124. (In Persian)
- Anderson, J. C., & Narus, J. A. (1984). A model of the distributor's perspective of distributor-manufacturer working relationships. *Journal of marketing*, 48(4), 62-74.
- Anderson, J.C. and Narus, J.A. (1991). Partnering as a focused market strategy. *California Management Review*, 33(3), 95-113.
- Anderson, James C. and James A. Narus (1990). A Model of Distributor Firm and Manufacturer Firm Working Partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (1), 42-58.
- Ballantyne, D., (1994). Editorial: marketing at the crossroads. *Asia-Aust. Marketing Journal*. 2 (1), 1-7.
- Beck, J., Palmatier, R. W. In G. L. Lilien, & R. Grewal (Eds.) (2012). *Relationship marketing. Handbook of business-to-business marketing*, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Berry, L.L. and Parasuraman, A. (1991). *Marketing Services - Competing through Quality*. Free press
- Bitner, M.J. (1995). Building service relationships: it's all about promises. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), 246-51.
- Bloemer, J. and Odekerken-Schroder, G (2002). Store Satisfaction and Store Loyalty Explained by Customer- and Store- Related Factors. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 15(2), 70- 91.
- Bolton, R.N. and Drew, J.H. (1991). A multistage model of customer's assessments of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17, 375-84.
- Bove, L.L. and Johnson, L.W. in Chetty, S. and Collins, B. (Eds), (2001). Qualitative assessment of the customer-service worker relationship model", Bridging Marketing Theory and Practice. *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*, Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand, pp. 1-10.
- Buzzell, R. D., & Gale, B. T. (1987). *The PIMS Principles*. The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Caliskan, A., & Esmer, S. (2019). Does it really worth investing in relationship marketing for a port business?. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 7(2), 375-383.
- Calonius, H. (1988). A buying process model. In *Innovative Marketing—A European Perspective*, proceedings from the XVIIth Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy, University of Bradford (pp. 86-103).
- Chang, Y. T., Lee, S. Y., & Tongzon, J. L. (2008). Port selection factors by shipping lines: Different perspectives between trunk liners and feeder service providers. *Marine Policy*, 32(6), 877-885.
- Chung-Yu Wang, Li-Wei Wu (2011). Customer loyalty and the role of relationship length. *Managing Service Quality*, 22(1), 58-74.
- Churchill Jr, G. A., & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. *Journal of marketing research*, 19(4), 491-504.
- Cronin, J.J. Jr, Brady, M.K. and Hult, G.T.M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76, 193-218.
- Crosby, L.A., Evans, K.R. and Cowles, D. (1990). Relationship quality in services selling: an interpersonal influence perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(3), 68-81.
- Day, G. S. (1995). Advantageous alliances. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), 297.

- Dick, A.S. and Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Dwyer, F.R., Schurr, P.H. and Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(1), 11-27.
- Ennew Christine T, Binks R. martin (1998). Good and Bad customers: The benefits of Participating in the banking relationship. *International Journal of Banking Marketing*, 14(2), 5-13.
- Esmer, S., Nguyen, H.O., Bandara, Y.M., Yeni, K. (2016). Non-price competition in the port sector: a case study of ports in Turkey. *Asian Journal of Shipping Logistics*. 32 (1), 3-11.
- Gee, R., Coates, G. & Nicholson (2008). Understanding and profitably managing customer loyalty. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 26 (4), 359-374.
- Grönroos, C. (1994). From marketing mix to relationship marketing. *Management Decision*. 32 (2), 4-20.
- Gundlach, G.T., Achrol, R.S. and Mentzer, J.T. (1995). The structure of commitment in exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(1), 78-93.
- Hallowell, R. (1996). The relationship of customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and profitability: an empirical study. *The International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7(4), 27-42.
- Hansen Tarben (2001). Quality in the Marketplace: A Theoretical and empirical Investigation. *European Management Journal*, 19(2). 203-210
- Hellier, P.K., Geursen, G.M., Carr, R.A. & Rickard, J.A. (2003). Customer repurchase intention: a general structural equation model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37 (11), 1762-1800.
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser, E.W. and Schlesinger, L. (1994). Putting the service-profit chain to work, *Harvard Business Review*, 72, 164-74.
- Hosseini Mirza H.; Nemati B.; Sadeghi N. (2013). An investigation on Relationship between CRM and organizational learning through knowledge management: A case study of Tehran travel agency, *Management Science Letters*, 3, 999-1006.
- Kiesler, C.A. (1971). *The Psychology of Commitment*. Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Kincaid, J. (2003). *Customer Relationship Management: getting it right*. London: Prentice Hall Professional.
- Kotler, Philip, (2006). *Marketing Management; A framework*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
- Lai, F., Griffin, M. and Babin, B.J. (2009). How quality, value, image, and satisfaction create loyalty at a Chinese telecom. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 980-986.
- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G. and Deshpande', R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of market research: the dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29(3), 314-328.
- Morgan, R.M. and Hunt, S.D. (1994). The commitment trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20-38.
- Morris, M. H., Brunyee, J., & Page, M. (1998). Relationship marketing in practice: Myths and realities. *Industrial marketing management*, 27(4), 359-371.
- Mousa Khani, M.; Haghighi, M. Torkezadeh, S. (2012). Presentation of a model for customer loyalty using customer knowledge management in the banking industry of the country (private banks), *Journal of Business Management*. 4(12), 147-164.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. and Steers, R. (1982). Organizational linkages: the psychology of commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-47.
- Ndubisi, N. O. (2007). Relationship marketing and customer loyalty. *Marketing intelligence & planning*.
- Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4), 33-44.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of marketing research*, 17(4), 460-469.
- Paravatiyar, A. (1996). *Statement during the 12th International Conference on industrial marketing and purchasing*. Karlsruhe, September.
- Payne, A. (1994). Relationship marketing—making the customer count. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*.
- Payne, A., Christopher, M., Clark, M., Peck, H. (1995). *Relationship marketing for Competitive Advantage: Winning and Keeping Customers*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Pfeifer, P. (2005). The optimal ratio of acquisition and retention costs. *Journal of Targeting , Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 13 (2), 179-88.
- Rai, Alok K. and Srivastava, M (2014a). Customer Loyalty in the Indian Aviation Industry: An Empirical Examination. *Asia Pacific Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), 44-59.
- Reichheld, F.E. and Sasser, W.E. Jr (1990). Jr Zero defections: Quality come to service. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 105-11.
- Schellinck, T., & Brooks, M. R. (2016). Does superior service performance provided to shipping lines improve the perceived value of a port?. *International Journal of Shipping and Transport Logistics*, 8(2), 175-193.
- Schurr, P.H. and Ozanne, J.L. (1985). Influence on exchange processes: buyers' preconceptions of a seller's trust worthiness and bargaining toughness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(4), 939-53.
- Sheth, J. N., Parvatiyar, A., & Sinha, M. (2015). The conceptual foundations of relationship marketing: Review and synthesis. *Journal of Economic Sociology*, 16 (2), 119-149.
- Sin, L.Y.M, Tse, A.C.B, Yau, O.H.M., Chow, R.P.M, Lee, J.S.Y. and Lau, L.B.Y. (2005). Relationship marketing orientation: scale development and cross culture validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 185-194.
- Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J. and Sabol, B. (2012). Customer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66, 15-37.
- Slack, B. (1985). Containerization, inter-port competition, and port selection. *Maritime policy and management*, 12(4), 293-303.

- Srivastava, M and Rai, Alok K. (2013). An Investigation of Mediating and Moderating Variables in Service Quality – Customer Loyalty Relationship: A Research Agenda. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management*, 4(3), 20-43.
- Terawatanavong, C. and Whitwell, G. J. and, Widing, R. E. (2007). Buyer satisfaction with Relational exchange across the relationship lifecycle. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41, 915-938.
- Terblanche, N. & Boshoff, C. (2006). The relationship between a satisfactory in-store shopping experience and retailer loyalty. *South Africa Journal of Business Management*, 37 (2), 33-43.
- Thorelli, H.B. (1986). Networks: between markets and hierarchies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 37-51.
- Tseng, Y. M. (2007). The impacts of relationship marketing tactics on relationship quality in service industry. *The Business Review*, 7(2), 310-314.
- Venus. D.; Zohori. B. (2011). Investigating the Effect of Relationship Marketing Value Dimensions on Customer Loyalty to Cellular Phone Brand. *Journal of Business Management*, 3 (8), 149-172.
- Walsh, G., Groth, M. and Wiedmann, K.P. (2005). An examination of consumers' motives to switch energy suppliers. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21, 421-40.
- Wen-Bao Lin, (2007). An empirical of service quality model from the viewpoint of management. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 32 364-375.
- Wilson, D.T. (1995). An integrated model of buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), 335-45.
- Wong, A. and Sohal, A. (2002). An examination of the relationship between trust commitment and relationship quality. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 30 (1), 34-50.
- Woodruff, R. B. (1997). Customer value: the next source for competitive advantage. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 25(2), 139.
- Yang, Z. and Peterson, R.T. (2004). Customer perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty: the role of switching costs. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21, 799-822.

