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ABSTRACT

Cause-related marketing is an emerging area within the marketing discipline, originating in the United States in the 1980s. This thesis defines the term cause-related marketing as a marketing strategy whereby the firm makes a contribution, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation(s) contingent upon the customer engaging in a revenue providing exchange that satisfies business and individual objectives. This strategy may include additional elements such as sponsorship, sales promotion, co-branding and employee involvement.

In examining the literature relating to cause-related marketing, a need for further research was identified for a number of reasons. First, there is considerable investment and growth in this strategy both in Australia and overseas. Second, academic and practitioner research have indicated strong consumer support for the concept of cause-related marketing, yet there has been limited evidence to date regarding the effectiveness of this strategy, especially in comparison to other marketing strategies. Finally, in an increasingly challenging business environment, marketing practitioners are seeking to explore new strategies and the efficacy of traditional forms of marketing communications is subject to debate. As such, this thesis explored the following research questions:

What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of attitude to the strategy, attitude toward the brand and purchase intention?

Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?

To address these questions, an experimental research design incorporating self-administered questionnaires was used. The major finding of this research is that
consumers may have a more favourable attitude to cause-related marketing than
to either sponsorship or sales promotion, however the brand must be perceived to
have a natural association or fit with the cause. Further, cause-related marketing
has the ability to engender a more favourable change in attitude to the brand than
does sales promotion. This change in attitude is affected by the consumer’s
attitude to the strategy itself. This study did not, however, demonstrate that
exposure to cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion had a
significant effect on purchase intention. Finally, neither gender nor personal
values have been shown to influence the above outcomes. The findings of this
research have a number of practical implications for the effective use of cause-
related marketing.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the research

A growing number of firms are entering into commercial partnerships with nonprofit organisations to achieve specific business objectives (Cunningham 1997; Mescon and Tilson 1987; Ross, Stutts and Patterson 1991). Cause-related marketing is one example of such a partnership. The precise definition of this strategy is subject to debate, however, cause-related marketing generally involves a corporate donation to a nonprofit organisation contingent upon the consumer’s purchase of a nominated product (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). As is discussed in Chapter 2, the definition that was developed and adopted for the purposes of this research is as follows:

Cause-related marketing is a marketing strategy whereby the firm makes a contribution, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation(s) contingent upon the customer engaging in a revenue-providing exchange that satisfies business and individual objectives. This strategy may include additional elements such as sponsorship, sales promotion, cobranding and employee involvement.

It should be noted that the term ‘strategy’, as used throughout this thesis, is defined as ‘…any plan for achieving goals and objectives’ (Imber and Toffler 2000, p.525). A glossary of terms and definitions used throughout this thesis can be found in Appendix 1.

In an environment of increasing competition, product parity and demanding consumers, it has been suggested that cause-related marketing is a unique win-win-win strategy (Holmes and Kilbane 1993; Ptacek and Salazar 1997). That is to say, this marketing strategy benefits the community, generates goodwill and
revenue for the company and creates positive feelings for the consumer as a result of their purchase decision. Furthermore, cause-related marketing is an attractive proposition to nonprofit organisations facing decreased government funding and increased competition for contributions from individual donors (Andreason 1996; Bendapudi, Surendra and Bendapudi 1996; Meyer 1999). However, associated with this strategy are several potential risks for both partners. For the nonprofit organisation, corporate partnerships may be pursued at the expense of developing the individual donor base and the sustainability of this form of corporate support has been questioned (Andreason 1996; Caesar 1987; Smith and Higgins 2000). Further, an inappropriate choice of partner may result in damage to the integrity of the nonprofit organisation. Similarly for the corporate partner, there are several issues of concern associated with this strategy. For example, there is the risk of consumer perception of exploitation of the nonprofit organisation (Andreason 1996; Webb and Mohr 1998). Further criticism of cause-related marketing relates to the ability to quantify results, the effectiveness in attracting consumer attention (Meyer 1999) and the resource-intensive process of negotiating and administering the program (Varadarajan and Menon 1988).

Cause-related marketing has emerged relatively recently; its origins have been attributed to a promotion undertaken by American Express in the early 1980s (Cunningham 1997). As is discussed in Chapter 2, cause-related marketing falls within the domain of the marketing communications discipline. This discipline is undergoing significant change in terms of gravitating to a more integrated approach as well as adopting more targeted and accountable strategies (McArthur and Griffin 1997; Rust and Oliver 1994; Schultz and Kitchen 1997; Stewart
The key objectives of a marketing communications strategy include improving brand attitude and stimulating purchase intention (Belch and Belch 1998; Rossiter and Percy 1998). The success of a particular communication in achieving those objectives can be affected by the consumer’s attitude to the communication itself (Lafferty and Goldsmith 1999; Miniard, Bhatla and Rose 1990; Mitchell and Olson 1981). In that regard, cause-related marketing as a communications strategy is developing in an environment of increasing consumer interest in corporate social responsibility (Cunningham 1997; Ptacek and Salazar 1997; Sen and Morwitz 1996). There is evidence to suggest that consumers are willing to use their purchasing power to reward or punish companies based on their social responsibility (Creyer 1997; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001; Sen and Morwitz 1996). Given the preceding comments, it could be argued that cause-related marketing may be a particularly appropriate strategy for achieving the key communications effects.

Research to date has indicated that consumers have a positive view of both cause-related marketing and the companies that engage in this strategy (Cavill and Company 1997; Ross et al. 1991; Ross, Patterson and Stutts 1992; Smith and Alcorn 1991). However, as cause-related marketing is at a relatively early stage in its development, there has been limited research into its effectiveness and the factors that may contribute to its success (Berger, Cunningham, Kozinets 1999; Barone, Miyazaki and Taylor 2000; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998; Webb and Mohr 1998). Further, it is important to understand whether this strategy is likely to be more effective than traditional communications techniques for achieving the critical objectives of improved brand attitude and purchase intention. As is
discussed in Chapter 2, the literature makes numerous allusions to the similarities of cause-related marketing with both sponsorship and sales promotion. In fact, cause-related marketing has often been described as a form of either sponsorship or sales promotion (e.g., Duncan 2002; Shimp 2003; Smith and Alcorn 1991). However, Chapter 2 outlines the parameters of cause-related marketing and clearly differentiates it from sponsorship and sales promotion.

1.2 Research questions and hypotheses

The purpose of the current study is to contribute to a developing body of research in the emerging area of cause-related marketing. As discussed in the preceding section, there is a need to understand how cause-related marketing compares to other forms of marketing communications in terms of achieving key communications objectives. Further, this understanding should extend to how consumers view a cause-related marketing strategy compared to alternative strategies. Finally, the factors that may influence consumer response should also be examined. The current study seeks to make a contribution by addressing these issues. The specific research questions identified are:

*What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of attitude to the strategy, attitude toward the brand and purchase intention?*

*Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?*

In examining these research questions, a number of hypotheses are developed in Chapter 2. These hypotheses result from a review of the extant literature in cause-related marketing and other relevant areas such as marketing communications,
brand alliances, corporate philanthropy, consumer behaviour and helping behaviour. These hypotheses are as follows:

\[ H_1 \] Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2a} \] The change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2b} \] Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_3 \] Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

\[ H_4 \] Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.

\[ H_5 \] Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.

\[ H_6 \] Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

The primary constructs of interest are depicted at Figure 1.1. This conceptual model is developed and described in Chapter 2.
1.3 Justification for the research

Research into the area of cause-related marketing is justified on a number of grounds including the current level of investment and growth of the strategy, the sizeable level of consumer support for the concept, changes in marketing communications practices and the lack of existing research as identified by the literature. These factors are discussed in the following sections.

1.3.1 Investment and growth of cause-related marketing

Measuring the total investment by companies partnering with nonprofit organisations is difficult as often contributions of staff time, products or other resources are provided instead of financial assistance. Although there is a lack of current information, a number of figures have been reported which give an indication as to the potential financial magnitude and growth of this strategy, as discussed as follows.
In the United States, cause-related marketing has been in existence since the early 1980s and is used by a diverse range of companies and causes. It is estimated that the corporate expenditure on cause-related marketing programs increased from US$200 million in 1984 to US$1 billion in 1993 (Simon 1995). In addition, sponsorships involving nonprofit organisations were estimated at approximately US$2 billion for 1994 (Smith 1994). Other more conservative estimates indicate that spending on cause-related marketing was US$828 million in 2002, an increase from US$125 million in 1990 (Lewis 2003; Porter and Kramer 2002). It has also been suggested that cause-related marketing may be the fastest growing type of marketing (Smith 1994).

In the United Kingdom, almost £35 million in funds and equipment were generated in 2001 from cause-related marketing and other alliances between business and causes (Macalister 2002). A market analyst in the United Kingdom, Mintel, has predicted that cause-related marketing will become a core marketing strategy in Britain in the next five years (JohansenBerg 2002).

In Australia, a report published by the Centre for Corporate Public Affairs and the Business Council of Australia (2000) suggested that an annual figure for overall business support for nonprofit organisations was approximately $1.8 billion, with a further $467 million spent on sponsorships. As cause-related marketing is in its infancy in Australia, it is likely to account for only a small proportion of the above figures at this point in time. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that individual companies have made significant contributions. For example, a cause-related marketing strategy involving Kellogg Australia and Kid’s Help Line resulted in a
contribution of $500,000 in one year, not including additional funds allocated for promotion of the cause and the campaign, as well as time volunteered by management and staff (Pringle and Thompson 1999). For additional examples of cause-related marketing strategies in Australia and their financial contributions, please refer to Appendix 2.

The involvement in cause-related marketing in Australia is expected to increase. A 1999 survey of 197 marketing managers from the top 500 companies in Australia indicated that 42 percent of Australian corporations were involved in some form of cause-related marketing and an additional 21 percent planned to do so in the future (Cavill and Company 1999). Further, Bednall, Walker, Curl and LeRoy (2001) surveyed 183 companies regarding business support for nonprofits. Their findings suggest that marketing practitioners will increasingly consider more commercially oriented arrangements, such as cause-related marketing, as an element of their overall marketing strategy.

1.3.2 Consumer support for cause-related marketing

Competitive market conditions and strong consumer support have stimulated the growth of cause-related marketing as a business strategy. A study in the United Kingdom found that 86 percent of consumers have a more positive image of a company if that company is actively involved in improving the community (Business in the Community 1999). In the United States a benchmark survey on cause-related marketing found 84 percent of consumers expressing a similar sentiment, with 64 percent suggesting that cause-related marketing should be a standard component of a company’s activities (Cone Communications 1994).
study conducted by Barone et al. (2000) found that some consumers might even be willing to pay a higher price to support a company perceived as being socially responsible. In Australia, 83 percent of consumers agreed that companies should involve themselves with cause-related marketing (Cavill and Company 1997).

1.3.3 Changes in marketing communications practices

As is discussed in Chapter 2, marketing practitioners are increasingly questioning the effectiveness of traditional forms of marketing communications such as advertising (Rust and Oliver 1994; Stewart 1992). In Australia, this view is reflected in the decline in media spending on advertising, and the increase in spending on more targeted and accountable communications strategies (Plaskitt, 2003). This trend has been prompted by changes in the business environment, such as increased competition and the greater demands of consumers, which has forced business to consider new strategies and greater accountability for business expenditures (Kotler and Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Polonsky and Macdonald 2000). These trends are discussed in detail in section 2.8. As such, cause-related marketing as a business strategy should be of increasing interest to marketing practitioners.

1.3.4 Limited research contribution to date

Despite the evident corporate and consumer interest in cause-related marketing, it has been commented that academic research into consumer attitudes and responses to cause-related marketing is at an early stage (Barone et al. 2000; Varadarajan and Menon 1988; Webb and Mohr 1998). Further, minimal research has been undertaken to determine the factors that contribute to the effectiveness of
this strategy (Berger et al. 1999; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998). Although both commercial and academic research to date suggests general consumer support (e.g., Barone et al. 2000; Cavill and Company 1997; Ross et al. 1991,1992; Smith and Alcorn 1991), there is inadequate information to assist marketing managers with assessing the appropriateness of this strategy for their particular target market and brand (Polonsky and Speed 2001). A detailed discussion of the research to date is presented in Chapter 2. On the basis of this analysis, it is proposed that there is a need for more exploration into the circumstances in which cause-related marketing impacts on brand attitude and purchase intention. In addition, it has been suggested that the effectiveness of this strategy needs to be evaluated in relation to alternative marketing strategies (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). Only one such comparison between cause-related marketing and a discount sales promotion has been reported thus far in the academic literature (Strahilevitz and Myers 1998) and one comparison of cause-related marketing with an ambush appeal relating to a cause (Mizerski, Mizerski and Sadler 2001). These studies are discussed in Chapter 2. Finally, little published research has occurred outside the United States (Kropp, Holden and Lavack 1999).

1.3.5 Conclusion

Based on the preceding discussion, there are a number of indicators that suggest a substantial and growing interest in cause-related marketing by practitioners both in Australia and overseas. It has been suggested in the cause-related marketing literature that research into this strategy is still in its infancy (Berger, Cunningham, Kozinets 1999; Barone, Miyazaki and Taylor 2000; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998; Webb and Mohr 1998). Given that an overwhelming majority of
consumers are interested in, and supportive of, this particular marketing strategy, further research would be of benefit not only to business, but also to society as a whole.

1.4 Methodology

The research questions presented in this thesis have been investigated using a quantitative methodology. The research study used an experimental design as this design lends itself to establishing causal relationships (Hoyle, Harris and Judd 2002; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). A student sample was used and subjects were randomly assigned to three treatment groups and one control group, and data were collected using self-administered surveys. The treatment groups were exposed to a stimulus relating to cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion. The survey instrument was developed by adapting existing scales to measure the constructs of interest. The data were then analysed using univariate and multivariate techniques including analysis of variance (ANOVA), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). Chapter 3 describes the research methodology in detail.

1.5 Key findings and contribution of the research

In general, the results of this research indicate that consumer attitudes toward cause-related marketing are more favourable than consumer attitudes toward sponsorship or sales promotion when controlling for the consumer’s perception of fit between the brand and cause, sponsored organisation or promotion type. There was some support for the premise that cause-related marketing is more effective at
generating a positive change in brand attitude, when controlling for attitude to the marketing strategy. With regard to influencing purchase intention, this research did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the control, cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion groups. Finally, neither gender nor personal values were shown to impact consumer response in either change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

This research makes several contributions to a developing body of literature and research in the area of cause-related marketing. First, the research advances the definition of cause-related marketing. Further, this is the first research study to compare cause-related marketing to sponsorship and sales promotion and uses an experimental design. In addition, brand attitude change, as opposed to simply attitude, was measured as a result of exposure to each of the three marketing communications strategies. The research also provides empirical evidence for the importance of perceived fit between the cause and the brand. Finally, this study contributes additional evidence relating to the impact of gender and personal values on attitudes to cause-related marketing and its impact on brand attitude and purchase intention.

The theoretical implications of this research include the development of a conceptual model to demonstrate the process that leads to a favourable consumer response to cause-related marketing, as is illustrated and described in Chapter 5. Further, given that cause-related marketing is also regarded as a form of brand alliance, as discussed in section 2.10, the findings of this research provide additional evidence as to the importance of the perceived affinity between alliance
partners. Finally, the findings contribute to the overall discipline of marketing communications in terms of comparing the effectiveness of different approaches in achieving two key communications effects: changing brand attitude and influencing purchase intention.

The managerial implications of the research suggest that practitioners need to carefully consider the selection of a cause-related marketing partner. Research should be conducted among their customers to determine both the relevance of the cause as well as the perception of fit between the brand and cause. Further, marketers who engage in cause-related marketing should also consider actively communicating the connection between their brand and the cause to enhance the effectiveness of the strategy.

The findings, contribution and implications of the research are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

1.6 Delimitations

The delimitations of a research study indicate its parameters; that is, what the study will include and what it will not (Punch 1998). The scope of this study is limited to Australia, specifically Brisbane, due to budgetary constraints. In addition, the study examines the impact of cause-related marketing on a tangible product as opposed to a service. This product is a low involvement, fast-moving consumer good. Given the unique nature of this type of product it will not be feasible to extend the conclusions of the study to a service or a higher involvement product. Further, the focus of the research will be from the corporate
or brand perspective. That is, consumer attitudes toward the cause or nonprofit organisation will not be examined. The use of a student sample will also limit the generalisability of the findings to some extent. Finally, this study is cross-sectional as opposed to longitudinal.

1.7 Conclusion and outline of the thesis

This chapter provided an introduction to cause-related marketing and presented the justification as to the need for research in this emerging area. The research questions and hypotheses that are explored in this study were presented and a brief overview of the methodology was provided. Finally, the delimitations of the study were identified.

Chapter 2 outlines the theoretical foundations that underpin this research study. The first part of Chapter 2 explores the parent discipline of marketing communications and relevant concepts within the area of consumer behaviour. Current issues in marketing communications are identified and key constructs such as brand attitude and purchase intention are discussed. Finally, cause-related marketing is examined within the context of the marketing communications discipline. The second part of Chapter 2 reviews the extant literature and research relevant to the focal area of cause-related marketing. In addition, relevant literature from the areas of brand alliances, social responsibility, prosocial behaviour and philanthropy is also examined. A definition of cause-related marketing is developed and the parameters of this strategy are outlined. The factors contributing to corporate and nonprofit interest in this strategy are then discussed. A review of the literature in the area is presented, identifying
objectives, criticisms, management issues and critical success factors of the strategy, as well as consumer attitudes and responses to these programs. In undertaking this review, a number of hypotheses relating to the research questions are developed.

Chapter 3 justifies the choice of a primarily positivist research paradigm and describes the experimental design used to test the hypotheses. In addition, the rationale for sample selection and the treatment of variables is discussed. Chapter 4 then presents the results of the hypothesis testing. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the conclusions and implications of the findings as well as articulating the contributions of the research. Limitations of these findings are also identified and suggestions for future research are proposed.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 provided the background and justification for the current research study as well as outlining the research questions, hypotheses and delimitations. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical foundation that forms the basis of this research. The framework for the literature review is outlined at Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1 Framework for literature review

- **BACKGROUND THEORY:**
  - **MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS**
    - Consumer Behaviour
  - Philanthropy
  - Social Responsibility
  - Brand Alliances

- **FOCAL THEORY:**
  - **CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING**
    - **CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING AND CONSUMER RESPONSE**
      - Prosocial Behaviour

= Main areas pertaining to the focus of the research
= Related areas pertaining to the focus of the research

Source: developed for this research.
2.2 Marketing communications definition and overview

Promotion, or marketing communications as it is more commonly referred to, is one of the four ‘Ps’ of the marketing mix. The importance of this element of the marketing mix has prompted it to be described as ‘…a critical aspect of a company’s overall marketing mission and a major determinant of its success’ (Shimp 2003, p.3). It has even been argued that in the current environment, communication is so critical to the marketing effort that it is inseparable from marketing itself (Schultz, Tannenbaum, Lauterborn 1994). Marketing communications refers to the communications between a company and its customers that highlight the benefits and unique differences of a particular brand with the intention of ultimately stimulating a purchase. It has been comprehensively defined as representing:

…the collection of all elements in a brand’s marketing mix that facilitate exchanges by targeting the brand to a group of customers, positioning the brand as somehow distinct from competitive
brands, and sharing the brand’s meaning – its point of difference—
with the brand’s target audience (Shimp 2003, p.3).

The role of marketing communications is to create brand awareness, generate
favourable brand attitudes and stimulate purchase intention (Belch and Belch
1998; Rossiter and Percy 1998). These objectives are pursued using a range of
communications strategies including advertising, sales promotion, direct
marketing, public relations and personal selling. These strategies are defined in
the glossary of terms in Appendix 1 and are also discussed in comparison to
cause-related marketing in section 2.7.1.

Advertising has been an influential force in marketing history and has even been
credited with having ‘…pioneered marketing research and much of modern
marketing’ (Stewart 1992, p.2). The role of advertising can be to inform,
persuade, remind, add value and assist in other company efforts (Belch and Belch
1998; Shimp 2003). However, advertising’s persuasive ability is an indirect
influence designed to create a favourable predisposition toward a purchase
(Rossiter and Percy 1998).

Despite its historical prominence, the effectiveness of advertising is increasingly
being questioned, particularly with the maturity of markets, fragmentation of
media, development of new one-to-one media and increased pressure for
marketers to be more accountable (Rust and Oliver 1994; Stewart 1992). In
Australia, it is clear that spending on media for traditional advertising has
dropped, whereas media spend related to the more targeted and accountable direct
marketing has increased. In 2001, the Commercial Economic Advisory Service
of Australia (CEASA) reported a decrease in mass advertising of 6.2 percent and an increase in direct marketing spend of 2.4 percent (Precision Marketing 2002). In 2002, CEASA again reported an increase in direct marketing spend of 6 percent, the healthiest growth of all categories (Plaskitt 2003).

It has been argued that determining advertising effectiveness is a complex issue as advertising effects are mediated by variables such as the product’s lifecycle stage, advertising history, media context and other elements of the marketing mix (Schultz 1998; Stewart 1992). A detailed discussion of the literature on advertising effectiveness is beyond the scope of the current study, however, it is important to identify this issue as a contributing factor to the growing interest in alternative marketing communications strategies.

Sales promotion is another form of marketing communications. Price promotion, coupons, feature advertising and end-of-aisle displays have been identified as the most commonly used consumer promotions (Chandon, Wansink and Laurant 2000; Lemon and Nowlis 2002). Promotional tools in general are designed to stimulate short-term sales. Sales promotion, in comparison to advertising, has been referred to as a more aggressive and direct method of stimulating purchase generally by providing an additional incentive separate from the core product (Rossiter and Percy 1998). Therefore, the strength of sales promotion lies in the relative immediacy of its impact on buying behaviour. However, this behaviour is in response to a perceived change in value and therefore may only be temporary. Consumer promotions can be effective in generating product trial, rewarding existing customers, increasing usage, invigorating mature products or introducing
new ones (Shimp 2003). On the other hand, frequent promotions can alter the customer’s reference price and negatively impact on brand equity (Mela, Gupta and Lehmann 1997).

Public relations are a communications strategy designed to generate goodwill for the company (Shimp 2003). The target audience for this communication can include employees, suppliers, investors, government, the general public, unions, action groups and customers. It should be noted that the public relations function within an organisation might focus on broader organisational issues (i.e., corporate citizenship), as well as supporting marketing activities. A major role of public relations is to generate publicity in the media. In comparison to advertising, this activity has the advantage of higher credibility and lower cost. On the other hand, the organisation has significantly less control over the timing and content of its message.

Other activities that are often included under the mantle of public relations are sponsorship and cause-related marketing (Belch and Belch 1998; Clow and Baack 2002; Semenik 2002). Cause-related marketing will be discussed in section 2.4. It has been argued that sponsorship must consist of two critical activities relating to exchange and association if it is to be an effective investment:

1. an exchange between a sponsor and a sponsee whereby the latter receives a fee and the former obtains the right to associate itself with the activity sponsored and 
2. the marketing of the association by the sponsor (Cornwell and Maignan 1998, p.11).

Sponsorship’s importance as a form of marketing communications has increased in comparison to traditional advertising (Erdogan and Kitchen 1998; Harvey...
2001). Research conducted by Meenaghan (2001) indicates that consumers perceive sponsorship as a more subtle form of commercial persuasion while benefiting society. Advertising, on the other hand, is perceived as a self-serving activity on the part of the advertiser and even ‘forceful and coercive’ (Meenaghan 2001, p.101). Further, Meenaghan’s (2001) research indicated that ‘…advertising, when compared to sponsorship communications, seems to encounter consumer defense mechanisms in a heightened state of alertness’ (p.101). The popularity of sponsorship has also been attributed to its ability to avoid the clutter; one of the perceived limitations associated with advertising (Drumwright and Murphy 2001).

Sponsorship attempts to enhance consumers’ perceptions of the brand by creating a link between the brand and a sponsored event or organisation that is valued by the consumer (Erdogan and Kitchen 1998). The ultimate objective is to influence consumer preference and purchase. However, research into the effectiveness of sponsorship is still in its infancy (Cornwell and Maignan 1998) and marketers are not clear as to how to best measure its value (Harvey 2001).

Direct marketing and personal selling are the remaining two strategies generally included in the marketing communications mix. However, as they are not related to the current research, these activities will not be discussed.

Traditionally advertising, sales promotion, public relations, direct marketing and personal selling have been undertaken quite separately within the organisation. Increasingly however, both marketing practitioners and academics alike are
advocating an integrated approach to marketing communications (McArthur and Griffin 1997; Schultz and Kitchen 1997). That is, a communications process that places the primary focus on the customer or prospect; uses any combination of relevant means of contact; seeks to achieve consistency or synergy; seeks to build relationships between the brand and customer; and ultimately achieves a behavioural response from the target audience (Shimp 2003; Schultz et al. 1994).

Although the strategic concept of integrated marketing communications has existed formally since the early 1990s, there does not appear to be an agreed upon definition (Schultz and Kitchen 1997). In addition, the validity of the concept as more than a management fad as well as the mechanics of its practical application seem to be subject to extensive discussion and ongoing debate (e.g., Cornelissen and Lock 2000; Gould 2000; McArthur and Griffin 1997; Schultz and Kitchen 1997; 2000).

A detailed discussion of this debate is beyond the scope of the current research study, but its existence is worth noting. Despite the controversy, most major marketing and communications texts do recognise and promote the concept of integrated marketing communications (e.g., Belch and Belch 1998; Kotler et al. 2001; Rossiter and Percy 1998; Shimp 2003; Zikmund and D’Amico 2002).

In summary, this section has provided the background relating to the various forms of marketing communications of relevance to the research. This discussion has also summarised the current status and key issues relating to marketing communications in general and the various strategies embraced by the discipline. The changing philosophy surrounding marketing communications has resulted
from a number of changes in communications practices (Erodogan and Kitchen 1998; Schultz et al. 1994; Shimp 2003). Marketers’ dependence on mass media has been reduced as both communication effectiveness and cost-effectiveness have been questioned. There has been a trend toward using more targeted communication approaches and media with the assistance of marketing databases. Finally, marketers are under pressure to be financially accountable with regard to marketing decisions, including the return on investment from communications strategies. The emergence of some of these trends in marketing communications explains the development of new forms of communication and marketing strategies, such as cause-related marketing. It has been suggested that advertising as the dominant form of marketing communications is becoming obsolete and marketers will need to embrace more non-traditional forms of communications (Rust and Oliver 1994). The following section will outline the role of marketing communications within an organisation.

2.3 Objectives of marketing communications

Marketing communications objectives are derived from an organisation’s overall marketing objectives and are viewed in a number of ways, but tend to share similar characteristics. It has been proposed that objectives should be linked to a number of communications effects: category need, brand awareness, brand attitude, purchase intention and purchase facilitation. Communication effects relate to creating certain brand images in the mind of the consumer. These effects have been defined as:

…relatively enduring mental associations, connected to the brand, in the prospective buyer’s mind, that are necessary to create the brand’s position and predispose action (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.109).
Therefore, the role of marketing communications is to move the customer along a hierarchy of effects including awareness, knowledge, liking, preference, conviction and ultimately the purchase of an organisation’s product (Belch and Belch 1998). Marketing communications should also enhance brand equity as a way of leading customers toward a purchase and repurchase (Shimp 2003).

In general, there appears to be a consensus that marketing communications are designed to ultimately influence a purchase by the target audience. The following sections will examine two constructs that have a significant impact on consumer purchase behaviour: attitude toward the brand and intention to purchase. As discussed in section 2.2, the primary role of marketing communications is to change or improve brand attitudes and to stimulate purchase intention.

2.3.1 Brand attitude

Attitudes are not innate; they are learned and therefore can be created or changed through marketing communications strategies. Attitude plays a critical role in influencing behaviour. It has been suggested that:

Attitude is a key link in the causal chain between attribute perceptions on the one hand and intentions and behaviors on the other. Marketers who understand that causal sequence, and who use it in decision making, have a powerful ally in their battle for superiority in the marketplace (Lutz 1991, p.337).

Brand attitude can form the basis for consumer behaviour and is determined by the importance and relevance of the brand’s attributes and benefits (Keller 1993). Therefore, marketers need to engage in activities that will create favourable attitudes to the brand. Brand attitude has been defined as ‘...the buyer’s evaluation of the brand with respect to its perceived ability to meet a currently
relevant motivation’ (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.120). To generate a positive attitude toward the brand, the consumer must believe that the brand has the attributes and benefits that will satisfy his or her wants or needs (Keller 1993). These attributes or benefits can be product-related or non-product related, but must be important to the consumer to have an impact. Attitudes toward a brand can also be altered by ‘...pointing out their relationships to particular social groups, events or causes’ (Schiffman and Kanuck 1994, p.266). Marketing communications are designed to create these favourable attitudes, reinforce existing favourable attitudes and/or change negative attitudes (Belch and Belch 1998).

Two types of attitudes toward the brand have been proposed: ‘...personal attitude toward the brand, which is its long-term evaluative rating, and impersonal attitude, which is a short-term adjustment to this rating’ (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.130). Impersonal attitude adjusts the overall personal attitude to the brand, for example at point of purchase due to a sales promotion. The increased attitude can then stimulate brand purchase intention.

Attitude toward the advertisement also has been shown to have an influence on brand attitude (Miniard et al. 1990; Mitchell and Olson 1981). Aspects of advertisements that have been shown to influence attitude to the advertisement, as well as brand attitude, include product claims, pictures, source credibility and corporate credibility (Lafferty and Goldsmith 1999; Lafferty, Goldsmith and Newell 2002; Miniard et al. 1990). Research conducted by Smith, Feinberg and Burns (1998) found that a positive attitude to an advertisement would translate
into a positive attitude toward the brand in the case of unfamiliar brands. However, this finding did not extend to familiar brands where there is already an established attitude to the brand.

Although a favourable attitude toward a brand may not be enough to result in a purchase (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980), for most product categories a favourable attitude to the brand is generally required for a buyer to consider making a purchase (Rossiter and Percy 1998). The relationship between attitudes and behaviour is one of the most important issues in consumer behaviour (Beatty and Kahle 1988) and the concept of attitude has had a critical role in social psychology research (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980). The theory of reasoned action suggests that attitude toward buying the brand is a better indicator of the ultimate purchase decision than is simply the attitude to the brand (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). It is therefore useful to examine the construct of purchase intention and the factors that can influence the consumer’s intention to buy.

### 2.3.2 Purchase intention

Brand purchase intention is defined as:

…the buyer’s self-instruction to purchase the brand (or take other relevant purchase-related action). It is, in fact, an anticipated, conscious planning of the action step, the final buyer response step (target audience action) (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.126).

In terms of measuring the impact of marketing communications, it has been found that, ‘While the attitudes of customers are important, in this measurement scheme they are less relevant than what the consumer actually does in the marketplace’ (Schultz 1998, p.410). The ability to influence purchase intention is therefore a
critical objective for marketing communications. The theory of reasoned action essentially suggests that the best predictor of a consumer’s purchase behaviour of a particular brand is his or her intention to purchase that brand (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980). Furthermore, measuring aggregate intentions are likely to be more accurate and stable over time than predicting individual behaviour. Evidence has been found to suggest that behaviour is directly influenced by intentions, but there is a need for another model that incorporates the impact of variables such as habit and social normative influences on purchase behaviour (Bagozzi 1982). For low involvement products, it has been proposed that a favourable brand attitude is a stronger indicator of likely purchase behaviour than for higher involvement, higher risk purchases. In the case of the latter, an explicit purchase intention is necessary for the behaviour to occur (Rossiter and Percy 1998).

In addition to the existence of a favourable brand attitude, a number of other factors can contribute to a consumer’s purchase intention and ultimate purchase behaviour. For example, habit is an important element regarding purchase behaviour of frequently purchased products (Beatty and Kahle 1988). Corporate credibility can also have a critical effect on purchase intention (Lafferty et al. 2002). Endorsement of a product by an association can have a positive effect on purchase intention for those consumers who identify with that association and perceive it to be credible (Daneshvary and Schwer 2000). In relation to sport sponsorship, favourable purchase intentions are more likely to occur among consumers who have a strong identification with the team and when purchase intentions are perceived as a group norm (Madrigal 2000). Similarly, high
involvement with the sponsored activity will impact on a consumer’s preference for a sponsor’s product due to the level of goodwill generated (Meenaghan 2001). Finally, it has been suggested that there is a direct relationship between sponsorship awareness and purchase intention as well as corporate image and purchase intention (Pope and Voges 2000).

2.3.3 Summary

The preceding sections have outlined the objectives of marketing communications and specifically the impact on brand attitude and purchase intention. It has been demonstrated that changing or enhancing a consumer’s brand attitude and stimulating purchase intention are valid communications objectives. Further this section has illustrated the relationship and importance of brand attitude and purchase intention on purchase behaviour. Next, cause-related marketing and its relationship to marketing communications is discussed.

2.4 Cause-related marketing as a form of marketing communications

Cause-related marketing is fully described and defined in section 2.7. Historically, it was first referred to in the literature as a form of horizontal, cooperative, sales promotion (Varadarajan 1986). It was subsequently described as a unique marketing strategy, differing from sales promotion and sponsorship, as well as philanthropy (e.g., Andreaon 1996; Cunningham 1997; Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Polonsky and Speed 2001; Varadarajan and Menon 1988). In contrast to this perspective, it has also been referred to as involving ‘…an amalgam of public relations, sales promotion and corporate philanthropy’ (Shimp 2003, p.581) and ‘…sales promotion with a PR spin’ (Duncan 2002, p.644).
Finally, cause-related marketing has been referred to as ‘…company advertising with social dimensions’ (Drumwright 1996, p.71). Despite the varying views as to what defines cause-related marketing, an argument can be made for its inclusion within the marketing communications mix.

First, the objectives of cause-related marketing programs include many of the communications effects described in section 2.2. In particular, objectives for these programs tend to focus on generating positive brand image and ultimately influencing purchase behaviour and increasing sales (Bennett 1998; Cunningham 1997; File and Prince 1998; Wagner and Thompson 1994). Organisational motivation and objectives for engaging in this strategy are fully discussed in section 2.9.1. Further, the execution of a cause-related marketing strategy also adheres to the communication process. The organisation communicates the details of its support of a cause via a communication channel that may include direct or mainstream media and/or packaging. This communication is aimed at a target market that receives the message and decides whether or not to act upon the information. The company receives feedback in terms of the incremental sales resulting from the campaign. Furthermore, funds to develop the cause-related marketing program and the ultimate contribution to the charitable organisation often come from marketing communications budgets (Andreason 1996; Varadarajan and Menon 1988; Wagner and Thompson 1994).

Finally, cause-related marketing has been positioned within the scope of marketing communications from both an academic and managerial viewpoint. Academically, a cursory audit of marketing communications texts reveals that
reference to cause-related marketing is always included under the marketing communications umbrella and most often within the domain of public relations (e.g., Belch and Belch 1998; Clow and Baack 2002; Duncan 2002; Semenik 2002; Shimp 2003). It has even been suggested that cause-related marketing is the ‘… practice of advocating corporate social responsibility in marketing communication activities’ (Bronn and Vrioni 2001, p. 214). In practice, based on a review of published case studies, advertising or public relations firms generally are involved in developing and coordinating cause-related marketing strategies (e.g., Higgins 2002; Pringle and Thompson 1999).

2.5 Summary

The preceding sections have discussed the parent discipline of marketing communications, its various elements and its role in positively influencing brand attitude and stimulating purchase intention. The two constructs of brand attitude and purchase intention were defined and discussed. Further, current issues were identified such as the validity of the concept of integrated marketing communications and the questionable effectiveness of traditional forms of communications. This discussion also served to position cause-related marketing within the context of the marketing discipline, that is, as an element of the marketing communications mix. A number of issues impacting on the marketing communications discipline offer support for the premise that cause-related marketing will be of increasing interest to marketing practitioners. These issues include the pressure on marketers for increased accountability, the questionable effectiveness of traditional communications strategies as well as increasing
consumer sophistication regarding the self-serving nature of these communications.

The next part of this chapter will commence with a detailed description and definition of cause-related marketing and then proceed to an examination of the literature pertaining to this strategy. During this discussion, a number of hypotheses will be developed.

2.6 Introduction to focal theory

The first part of Chapter 2 situated the emerging area of cause-related marketing within the parent discipline of marketing communications. A discussion of two constructs of interest relating to the area of consumer behaviour, that is brand attitude and purchase intention, were defined and discussed. The second part of this chapter will commence with a discussion of the debate surrounding the definition of cause-related marketing. The general body of literature relating to cause-related marketing will be examined including its history, objectives, application and criticisms. Finally the focal area of cause-related marketing and its impact on consumer behaviour will be addressed. The findings of previous research are examined and hypotheses are generated throughout the discussion.

In exploring the literature on cause-related marketing, it has been noted that this area incorporates a number of other concepts from the fields of business, marketing and psychology. These concepts include philanthropy, corporate social responsibility, brand alliances and prosocial behaviour. As outlined at Figure 2.1 at the beginning of this chapter, these additional areas will also be explored in so
far as they relate to cause-related marketing and provide support for the hypotheses.

2.7 Cause-related marketing defined

The origin of the phrase ‘cause-related marketing’ has been attributed to American Express in relation to a marketing campaign undertaken in 1983 (Cunningham 1997). With the objectives of increasing new cardholders as well as usage of the card, American Express developed a marketing strategy that linked those objectives with a commitment to contribute funds for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty. The company promised to donate one cent for each use of its card, and a dollar for each new card issued, during the fourth quarter of 1983. American Express achieved a 28 percent increase in card usage compared with the same period the previous year, as well as obtaining a substantial increase in new cardholders. The campaign resulted in US$1.7 million contributed by American Express to the Statue of Liberty–Ellis Island Foundation.

Varadarajan and Menon (1988) launched the academic literature relating to cause-related marketing. Varadarajan and Menon (1988) explored the emergence of the concept as well as the strategic implications and proposed the following definition:

"Cause-related marketing is the process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives (p.60)."

In effect, cause-related marketing is a strategy designed to achieve business objectives through support of a cause or charity. Cause-related marketing has also
been referred to as ‘strategic philanthropy’ (Smith 1994, p.111) and a way for business to ‘…do well while doing good’ (Varadarajan and Menon 1988, p.58).

This approach presents an attractive proposition to businesses that have come under increasing pressure to generate a return for every investment (Cunningham 1997). It is also suggested that the strategic use of philanthropy is an important component in building long-term competitiveness (Simon 1995).

While the marketing orientation of this concept is not in dispute, a precise understanding of what cause-related marketing is, and what it is not, appears to be subject to debate. The following discussion explores the various perspectives on this issue to identify the defining characteristics of cause-related marketing and to differentiate it from other activities that it has been compared with, such as philanthropy, sponsorship and sales promotion.

2.7.1 Cause-related marketing as a unique marketing strategy

Several authors have emphatically stated that cause-related marketing is not synonymous with philanthropy (e.g., Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Varadarajan and Menon 1988; Welsh 1999). Philanthropy is described as providing support, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation with little expectation of return (Collins 1994). As such, there is no anticipated impact on consumer attitudes and behaviour. On the other hand, it is contended that these altruistic endeavours, particularly when publicised, do in fact aspire to long-term objectives such as generating community goodwill and enhancing corporate reputation (Collins 1994).
Drumwright and Murphy (2001) suggest that cause-related marketing and traditional philanthropy are different forms of corporate societal marketing which also includes strategic philanthropy, sponsorships, advertising with a social dimension, licensing agreements, social alliances, traditional volunteerism, strategic volunteerism and social enterprises. Drumwright and Murphy (2001) describe corporate societal marketing as encompassing ‘…marketing initiatives that have a least one noneconomic objective related to social welfare and use the resources of the company and/or one of its partners’ (p.164). Strategic philanthropy extends beyond a financial donation and may include the contribution of organisational expertise and the involvement of employees or business partners. Essentially strategic philanthropy seeks to use the competencies of the organisation to achieve both corporate and social objectives (McAlister and Ferrell 2002). Therefore, this activity has a broader organisational focus than cause-related marketing.

The distinction between philanthropy and cause-related marketing is further supported by the fact that funding for the latter generally comes from a company’s advertising or marketing budget as opposed to a philanthropic fund (Andreason 1996; Drumwright and Murphy 2001; Smith and Higgins 2000; Wagner and Thompson 1994). Additional evidence of the business focus of cause-related marketing is observed where the investment in promoting these programs to the target market often tends to exceed the ultimate contribution to the nonprofit organisation (Varadarajan and Menon 1988).
It has been suggested that traditional philanthropic activity is on the decline and business is engaging in more commercially oriented partnerships with nonprofits to generate tangible returns (Bednall et al. 2001; Cunningham 1997; Mescon and Tilson 1987; Porter and Kramer 2002). In Australia, an industry report on fundraising sources indicates that while donations by individuals have been increasing, philanthropic giving by corporations has been steadily declining (O’Keefe and Partners 2000). The report also contends that corporate philanthropy is being cannibalised by businesses’ preference for sponsorship and cause-related marketing. However, it is believed that the increase in the latter activities will outweigh the decrease in the former. A subsequent report from the same source suggests that traditional corporate philanthropy (i.e., giving without an expectation of return) is ‘virtually extinct’ (O’Keefe and Partners 2001, p.6).

This trend toward a more strategic, business-oriented approach to corporate/nonprofit partnerships is also supported by a study conducted by the Business Council of Australia (1999). This study explored the views of 115 large companies on their attitudes and commitment to community involvement. Among these businesses there was a general consensus that a more formal and strategic approach is being adopted in the management of community involvement, aligned with long-term commercial interests. Again, this evidence reflects a transition from traditional philanthropic activity to activities that are more synergistic with business objectives.

In further characterising the concept of cause-related marketing, it has been suggested that this strategy should be considered distinct from sponsorship, sales
promotion, endorsement and public relations. However, these activities may, in some cases, form part of a cause-related marketing strategy (Cunningham 1997; Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Mendleson and Polonsky 1995; Varadarajan and Menon 1988).

Sponsorship has been described as ‘…the underwriting of a special event to support corporate objectives by enhancing corporate image, increasing awareness of brands, or directly stimulating sales of products and services’ (Javalgi et al. 1994, p.48). It has been proposed that the test of whether a marketing strategy can be considered to be cause-related marketing is determined by the fact that a contribution to a cause results from a specified customer-firm revenue producing exchange (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). In the case of sponsorship, the contribution to the nonprofit organisation precedes the generation of sales revenue and is made in anticipation of an outcome. In contrast, with a cause-related marketing strategy, the contribution is a direct consequence of revenue generation. Therefore, cause-related marketing and sponsorship are perceived as different strategies (Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Polonsky and Speed 2001).

However, not all authors make this distinction. For example, Smith and Alcorn (1991) state that a cause-related marketing strategy is ‘…implemented through one of three forms of corporate sponsorship,’ outlined as follows:

- media support, such as the promotion and purchase of media for a telethon;
- media support combined with conditional donations based on consumer purchases; and
- media support combined with dual incentive donations, that is, cents-off coupons are offered to the consumer as an incentive to purchase and each redeemed coupon results in a donation to a cause (p.22).
The first form appears to reflect the traditional definition of sponsorship, whereas the last two descriptions conform to Varadarajan and Menon’s (1988) definition of cause-related marketing. In addition, the last form combines cause-related marketing with an element of sales promotion.

Sales promotion, however, should also be considered distinct from cause-related marketing. Sales promotion has been defined as ‘…short term incentives to encourage purchase or sales of a product or service’ (Kotler et al. 2001, p.535). Both academics and practitioners agree, an effective cause-related marketing strategy needs to be conceived with a long term horizon, both to overcome consumer scepticism as well as to maximise the resulting benefits (Adkins 1999; Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997). Incentives used in sales promotions generally relate to discounts, cash-back offers, additional product for the same cost or free gifts; that is, a tangible utilitarian benefit for the consumer. Cause-related marketing, conversely, does not necessarily offer a personal benefit to the consumer, but instead provides a benefit to a third party via the cause or charity. Sales promotion however can be used in conjunction with cause-related marketing, as described by Smith and Alcorn (1991) and outlined previously.

It should be noted that some authors contend that consumers do in fact receive a benefit from cause-related marketing, albeit intangible. For example, Ross et al. (1992) describe the benefit as follows:

…a symbolic social exchange could occur between all three parties that adds to the perceived value of the exchange. A firm offers to donate to a cause if the consumer engages in the exchange process, thus increasing the perceived value of the exchange at no additional perceived cost to the consumer (p.93).
Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) also concede a consumer benefit when they state:

In contrast to other types of incentives, such as discounts and rebates, which offer the utility of saving money, or free gifts and lotteries, which offer the utility of receiving something extra, charity incentives offer a more selfless utility that comes from giving to others (p.434).

The confusion between whether or not cause-related marketing is distinct from sales promotion is understandable since the academic literature first referred to this activity as a horizontal, cooperative, sales promotion technique (Varadarajan 1986). However this same author later acknowledged that cause-related marketing was a strategy in its own right (Varadarajan and Menon 1988).

Although there is clear agreement that cause-related marketing strategies are designed to achieve business objectives, as this strategy evolves there is some ambiguity as to what specifically constitutes a cause-related marketing strategy. For example, in contrast to the explicit definition formulated by Varadarajan and Menon (1988), Cunningham (1997) proposes that cause-related marketing is an umbrella term that, in addition to stimulating a purchase-linked donation, may also include co-branding activities and programs that are less promotion-oriented and may even resemble strategic alliances. It has also been suggested that ‘cause programs’ can take several forms including donations of funds, employee volunteers, donation of materials or public service announcements (Meyer 1999).

Andreason (1996) adds to the debate when he identifies three types of cause-related marketing alliances:

- transaction-based promotions, whereby a firm donates funds, product or materials in proportion to revenues generated;
• joint issue promotions, where a firm in conjunction with a nonprofit agree to create awareness for a social issue through distributing promotional materials and advertising; and,
• licensing of the name or logo of a nonprofit to a firm in return for a fee or percentage of revenues (p.49).

Practitioners are also advancing their views on cause-related marketing based on their application of the strategy. Business in the Community is a nonprofit organisation in the United Kingdom that was established to inspire businesses to increase the quality and extent of social responsibility. This organisation proposes a broader definition of cause-related marketing as ‘…a commercial activity by which businesses and charities or causes form a partnership with each other to market an image, product or service for mutual benefit’ (Business in the Community, 2003). This definition allows for activities between companies and nonprofit organisations that may not be strictly revenue or donation driven and is compatible with Andreason’s (1996) three types of alliances.

Based on their experience at Saatchi and Saatchi, the international advertising agency, Pringle and Thompson (1999) suggest that cause-related marketing is also distinct from the more simplistic ‘charity promotions’ (p.101), which result in a donation based on purchases of a product. The distinction proposed is that a true cause-related marketing strategy is actively communicated to the target audience as an integrated part of the brand communication. Secondly, whereas charity promotions may be short-term in nature, cause-related marketing has a longer term focus, particularly where the objectives are related to brand image. Pringle and Thompson (1999) use the analogy of the business and nonprofit committing to ‘…a marriage as opposed to a one-night stand’ (p.103), thereby demonstrating the firm’s commitment and overcoming potential consumer cynicism.
In summary, cause-related marketing is a relatively new strategy and its usage and development continue to evolve. There is evidence to suggest that there is not a universally accepted definition as to what constitutes cause-related marketing and some practitioners and academics consider the strategy to encompass a broader range of activities than initially proposed by Varadarajan and Menon (1988). However, in order to contribute to the development of this concept through research, it is necessary to establish some parameters for the strategy. Furthermore, the definition of cause-related marketing needs to be specific enough to allow for differentiation from other business/nonprofit partnerships such as those outlined by Smith and Alcorn (1991) and Andreason (1996), as well as other forms of societal marketing as outlined by Drumwright and Murphy (2001). This differentiation will allow for future researchers to test and compare different approaches to these partnerships.

It is suggested that the original definition proposed by Varadarajan and Menon (1988) needs to be expanded. As such, based on both academic and practitioner views, the following definition is proposed for the purpose of the current research:

> Cause-related marketing is a marketing strategy whereby the firm makes a contribution, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation(s) contingent upon the customer engaging in a revenue-providing exchange that satisfies business and individual objectives. This strategy may include additional elements such as sponsorship, sales promotion, co-branding and employee involvement.

It is important to reiterate that a cause-related marketing strategy involves a three-way relationship between company or brand, cause and customer as illustrated at Figure 2.2. The customer directly affects the level of support the cause receives
from the company and the combination of the cause and brand is likely to
influence the customer’s response. The outcome of the cause-related marketing
strategy is contingent upon the interaction of the three parties. For the purposes of
the current research, a cause is generally associated with a nonprofit organisation
that exists to provide a social service as opposed to a profit-making venture. The
organisation is governed by an independent group of people and any surpluses are
reinvested in the activities associated with the cause (Abdy and Barclay 2001).

**Figure 2.2**  Cause-related marketing interaction

![Cause-related marketing interaction diagram](image)

Source: developed for this research

To further illustrate the concept of cause-related marketing and in particular, how
it differs from philanthropy, sponsorship and sales promotion, several examples
are outlined at Table 2.1. These examples highlight a variety of partnerships
between nonprofit organisations and companies such as Uncle Ben’s, Kellogg
Australia, SPC Limited, AMP and Kimberley Clark. These relationships
demonstrate cause-related marketing, cause-related marketing combined with
sponsorship activity, cause-related marketing combined with a sales promotion
and finally, activity which is primarily philanthropic.
## Table 2.1 – Business/nonprofit partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Program</th>
<th>Cause Related Marketing</th>
<th>Sales Promotion</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Philanthropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncle Ben’s/Pal Dog Food</strong></td>
<td>Yes, the contribution was linked to the consumer engaging in a revenue producing transaction.</td>
<td>No, a personal incentive was not offered directly to the consumer.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of, and related to the sales generated.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of an expectation that specific business objectives would be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company agreed to contribute 50 cents to the Royal Guide Dogs Associations for every specially marked label of Pal Dog Food mailed in, up to a value of $120,000. The campaign was promoted on television as well as on the pack.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kellogg Australia</strong></td>
<td>Yes, part of the contribution was linked to the consumer engaging in a revenue producing transaction.</td>
<td>No, a personal incentive was not offered directly to the consumer.</td>
<td>Yes, as part of the campaign provided funds to sponsor the special events, for the purpose of brand building and sales objectives, however, this contribution was not contingent on revenue generation.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of an expectation that specific business objectives would be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with Kids Help Line included a donation of 5 cents per pack to the charity. Advertisements were also placed on the pack, in magazines and on television to promote the help line as well as Kellogg’s involvement. A number of special events associated with publicising and raising funds for the Help Line were also supported by Kellogg Australia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPC Limited</strong></td>
<td>No, contribution was not linked to the consumer engaging in a revenue producing transaction.</td>
<td>No, a personal incentive was not offered directly to the consumer.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of, and related to, the sales generated.</td>
<td>Yes, although depending on the extent to which the activity is publicised, there may be some expectation of enhanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1 – Business/nonprofit partnerships  (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Program</th>
<th>Cause Related Marketing</th>
<th>Sales Promotion</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Philanthropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP Foundation</td>
<td>No, the contribution is not linked to the consumer engaging in a revenue producing transaction.</td>
<td>No, a personal incentive was not offered directly to the consumer.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of, and related to, the sales generated.</td>
<td>Yes, AMP wants to give something back to the community in which it operates, although it does want to be perceived as a responsible corporate citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley-Clark</td>
<td>Yes, the contribution was linked to the consumer engaging in a revenue producing transaction.</td>
<td>Yes, a personal incentive was offered directly to the consumer.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of, and related to, the sales generated.</td>
<td>No, the contribution was made as a result of an expectation that specific business objectives would be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section discusses the trends in the business environment that have encouraged firms to include cause-related marketing as part of their overall marketing strategy.

2.8 Factors contributing to the use of cause-related marketing

The developing interest in cause-related marketing has been stimulated by a number of factors pertaining to business, nonprofit organisations and government. These factors include changes in the macroenvironment, competitive challenges, increased demands of consumers and decreased government support for nonprofit organisations. The following discussion examines these issues.

Changes in the competitive, social and political environments have provided the impetus for business to consider the marketing opportunities presented by some form of partnership with nonprofit organisations. Many companies face a saturated marketplace and an increasingly difficult task in differentiating their product or service. Intense competition, both locally and internationally, has forced business to adopt new strategies to develop a sustainable competitive advantage, while becoming more accountable for business expenditures (Kotler and Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Polonsky and Macdonald 2000). As discussed in section 2.1, traditional marketing communications strategies, particularly advertising, are being re-evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in the changed business environment (Rust and Oliver 1994; Stewart 1992).

In addition, customers are becoming increasingly demanding, both in terms of price and quality, as well as the firm’s social responsibility (Cunningham 1997;
Corporate social responsibility is described as:

…achieving outcomes from organizational decisions concerning specific issues or problems which (by some normative standard) have beneficial rather than adverse effects upon pertinent corporate stakeholders (Epstein 1987, p.104).

It is suggested that social responsibility encompasses four areas: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary responsibility (Maignon, Ferrell and Hult 1999). Discretionary responsibilities include those activities ‘…which reflect society’s desire to see businesses get actively involved in the betterment of society’ (Maignon et al. 1999, p.456). A firm’s contribution to the community, whether motivated by altruism or business objectives, can therefore be considered part of its overall social responsibility as perceived by its customers. Cause-related marketing has been described as a subset of corporate social responsibility (Mohr, Webb and Harris 2001). Commercial surveys indicate that consumers may be prepared to support companies that in turn actively support the community, and would even be prepared to switch brands provided that price/quality was equal (Cavill and Company 1997; Cone Communications 1994). Consumer response to cause-related marketing will be discussed in detail in section 2.11.

At the same time that business is facing challenges posed by competitors and consumers, non-profit organisations are also under pressure to look for new avenues of funding as government support declines (Andreason 1996; Bendapudi et al. 1996; Meyer, 1999). In Australia, the Prime Minister has indicated that business should take a greater role in supporting community organisations. As a result, in 1999 the Prime Minister’s Community Business Partnership was established as a forum to promote partnerships between business, government and
the community, as well as to encourage philanthropic activities. A report commissioned by the government to highlight the benefits of these partnerships states that:

Corporate community involvement is an important aspect of good citizenship and concerns the active role of companies in contributing money, time, products, services, leadership and other resources to the communities in which they operate. The resources address a variety of social and economic issues and strengthen the link between business objectives and the needs of the community (Centre for Corporate Public Affairs/Business Council of Australia 2000, p.38).

Firms need to consider these social, political and competitive forces when developing strategies to achieve business objectives such as differentiating their product, building brands, retaining customers, motivating employees and enhancing corporate reputation (Smith 1994). One such strategy involves the formation of commercial partnerships with nonprofit organisations. A form of this partnership is of course cause-related marketing which benefits a cause, generates revenue and goodwill for the company and positive feelings for the consumer (Holmes and Kilbane 1993). Therefore, cause-related marketing can be perceived as a way to address many of the challenges that are currently faced by both business and nonprofit organisations (Ptacek and Salazar 1997).

Benefits of cause-related marketing accrue to both business and nonprofit organisations. The benefits to business include providing differentiation in a competitive marketplace, a more accountable form of marketing and communications, fulfillment of the corporate social responsibility expectations of consumers, improved employee morale, enhanced brand image and increased sales (Andreason 1996; Bronn and Vrioni 2001; Kotler and Andreason 1996;
Ptacek and Salazar 1997). The primary benefit to nonprofit organisations is the obvious financial support. However, additional advantages include increased awareness of its services that may in turn result in increased donations from the public (Polonsky and Wood 2001; Ptacek and Salazar 1997). Despite the lucrative benefits for both parties involved in cause-related marketing, there are also a number of potential risks. These risks will be discussed in section 2.9.2.

In summary, a number of factors have conspired to encourage business to consider cause-related marketing as an element of their marketing strategy: increasing product parity, intensity of competition, increasing consumer demands relating to both the firm’s product and its social responsibility, and governmental pressures. Nonprofit organisations are also challenged with developing new sources of funding to replace declining government support.

As discussed in section 2.7.1, philanthropic contributions to nonprofit organisations by business are in decline and firms are beginning to gravitate toward more commercial opportunities that will provide them with tangible returns for their investment. Cause-related marketing provides an attractive proposition as a merging of social responsibility with marketing. As Adkins (1999) suggests:

The strength of CRM over more traditional forms of marketing is that it can provide the emotional as well as the rational engagement of the consumer. It engages the consumer’s heart as well as their mind, and thereby has the potential to build a much stronger and enduring relationship (p.20).
The following section explores the specific issues confronting firms that choose to engage in cause-related marketing.

2.9 The application of cause-related marketing

The literature has identified a number of issues concerned with the implementation and management of a cause-related marketing strategy. Issues relate to the objectives of this strategy, its effective management and potential criticisms. These issues will be discussed in the following sections before examining the research into consumer response to this strategy.

2.9.1 Objectives of cause-related marketing

Firms engage in cause-related marketing to fulfil a number of objectives related to corporate strategy, marketing strategy or individual product strategies. These objectives are varied but tend to relate to three primary areas: revenue generation, corporate image and brand equity, as indicated at Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2</th>
<th>Corporate cause-related marketing objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Generation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Corporate Image</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate incremental revenue</td>
<td>Enhance corporate image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract new customers</td>
<td>Improve social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain existing customers</td>
<td>Counter negative publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase market share</td>
<td>Pacify customer groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive edge</td>
<td>Attract and retain employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve customer loyalty</td>
<td>Favourably influence external stakeholders (i.e. government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: developed for this research based on findings from Bennett 1998, 2002; Bronn and Vrioni 2001; Cunningham 1997; Ross et al. 1991; Smith and Alcorn 1991; Varadarajan and Menon 1988
Although the primary objectives may be driven by business strategy, the presence of additional altruistic motives is not precluded. Firms may have additional social objectives such as generating awareness of the cause or nonprofit organisation and its activities as well as promoting direct contributions to the organisation (Varadarajan and Menon 1988).

Little empirical research exists to indicate the prevalence or priority of the range of objectives among firms. A study conducted by File and Prince (1998) among 478 medium-size private companies found that approximately half of the companies participating in cause-related marketing were seeking to enhance their company image or promote products. Similarly, Wagner and Thompson (1994) found that the primary objective identified by firms was to increase income. However, these firms also recognised the opportunity to fulfil their social responsibility and build goodwill amongst both consumers and the general community.

Research in the United Kingdom found that 75 percent of chief executives, marketing directors and community affairs directors interviewed felt that cause-related marketing would enhance corporate or brand reputation (Business in the Community 1999). Australian commercial studies indicate that the key objectives of major Australian corporations involved in the strategy are to help the cause and enhance corporate reputation (Cavill and Company 1999).

The motivation for undertaking a cause-related marketing strategy may be varied and multifaceted. However, both academic and practitioner research indicates
that businesses engage in this strategy primarily to generate a positive response from customers or potential customers. There is an expectation that this response will ultimately manifest itself in an increase in revenue. Despite the potential benefits of cause-related marketing, this strategy is not without risk. These risks will be discussed in the following section.

### 2.9.2 Criticisms of cause-related marketing

There is no clear consensus on whether cause-related marketing is a sound strategy (Caesar 1987) and both academics and practitioners have raised a number of issues of concern. The potential benefits of increased sales and community goodwill may be tempered by the risks of negative publicity and perceived exploitation of the nonprofit organisation (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). A number of ethical concerns have been identified including the potential for this strategy to undermine traditional corporate philanthropy, to reduce public donations directly to nonprofit organisations, and for businesses to support nonprofits based on marketing potential as opposed to the value of the work undertaken by the nonprofit (Cunningham 1997). The latter issue may lead to only popular or risk-free causes being supported, a phenomena known as ‘cherry picking’ (Drumwright and Murphy 2001).

On the other hand, Cunningham’s (1997) research suggests that business is aware of the ethical pitfalls and has made efforts to avoid them. Organisations that engage in corporate societal marketing initiatives, and essentially position themselves as socially responsible, can become vulnerable to criticism and may
suffer from unrealistic expectations of consumers (Drumwright and Murphy 2001).

Although attitudes toward firms participating in cause-related marketing are generally positive (Cavill and Company 1997; Ross et al. 1991, 1992; Smith and Alcorn 1991), there exists some degree of concern amongst consumers that firms may exploit the cause. Research conducted by Ross et al. (1992) found that this sentiment was most likely to be expressed by males. However, this study also indicated that most consumers were willing to continue their traditional support of a cause, despite supporting a cause-related marketing effort, thus putting one of the most common criticisms into dispute. Research among nonprofit professionals undertaken by Wagner and Thompson (1994) also suggested that cause-related marketing did not affect other types of giving. Webb and Mohr (1998) found that negative views held by a segment of consumers toward cause-related marketing generally related to the structure of a cause-related marketing strategy, for example inadequate donation size, and the perceived motive of the firm, or both. Andreason (1996) acknowledges the importance of perceived motive when he states that:

Many good programs can be sabotaged if the public believes that a company is using a nonprofit’s positive image to disguise an inferior product, that the nonprofit is being manipulated by the corporation, or that the nonprofit will not actually receive funds from the program (p.59).

The structure of the program may also be an issue of concern (Polonsky and Wood 2001). For example, two-stage giving programs that require consumers to undertake a behaviour in addition to making a purchase, such as mailing in a
barcode, may mean that corporate contributions are exaggerated if this secondary behaviour is not clearly communicated and subsequently undertaken. Given the extensive number of concerns outlined, it has been suggested that firms need to anticipate the potential problems associated with a cause-related marketing strategy and address these issues early in the planning stages (Cunningham 1997).

Commercially-related concerns have also been expressed regarding the effectiveness of these programs. For example, the ability to quantify results, the ability to attract consumer attention (Meyer 1999) and the resource-intensive process of negotiating and administering the program (Varadarajan and Menon 1988) have all been questioned. The results of supporting a ‘pro-social stance’ cannot be guaranteed therefore making it difficult for firms to justify the expense (Osterhus 1997). Further, company advertising with a social dimension does not necessarily result in short-term sales increases or product differentiation (Drumwright 1996). Finally, the success of cause-related marketing strategies to date may be due to their uniqueness, and as more companies adopt such a strategy, their effectiveness may be reduced (Ross et al. 1991).

Nonprofit organisations that participate in cause-related marketing are also exposed to risk. These risks have been identified as follows: the potential for inefficient use of limited management resources on a venture which may not succeed; potential for individual donations to decrease, due to donors either not supporting the commercial involvement or a perception that they are no longer needed due to the corporate support; and the inappropriate choice of a partner with a questionable reputation, thus affecting the image and credibility of the nonprofit
(Andreason 1996; Caesar 1987; Drumwright and Murphy 2001; Kotler and Andreason 1996; Wagner and Thompson 1994). The sustainability of these funds for nonprofit organisations, once the benefits of cause-related marketing have been exhausted by business, are also of concern (Smith and Higgins 2000).

The potentially perilous nature of these partnerships is illustrated by the alliance between the Arthritis Foundation and a Johnson and Johnson subsidiary, McNeil Consumer Products Company, in the United States. The company produced Arthritis Foundation branded pain relievers and advertised them as new, despite the fact that the active ingredients had been available previously. Further, the advertising claimed that the Arthritis Foundation helped to develop the product, which was not the case. Finally, the company stated that a portion of each sale would be donated to the Arthritis Foundation; however, a fixed donation had been agreed upon regardless of sales. Once these facts were revealed, the company was perceived as taking advantage of the nonprofit organisation and committing fraud. McNeil ultimately settled out of court for US$2 million (Marketing 1998).

Given the potential problems associated with cause-related marketing, the effective management of each aspect of the strategy is imperative. The following section discusses the management of the critical success factors for cause-related marketing.
2.10 Management of a cause-related marketing strategy

Based on the academic literature, as well as the experience of practitioners, it is evident that the critical success factors for a cause-related marketing strategy relate to three main areas:

- strategic fit between the company, the nonprofit organisation and the target market;
- the effective management of the program; and
- presence of evaluation mechanisms.

Each area is discussed in the following sections.

2.10.1 Strategic fit

One of the critical success factors proposed by practitioners for the success of a cause-related marketing strategy is the strategic fit between the cause and the brand (e.g., Adkins 1999; DeNitto 1989; Higgins 2002; Lewis 2003). That is, the consumer should perceive an affinity between the selected cause and the product. Cause-related marketing has often been referred to as a form of marketing or brand alliance (Andreason 1996; Polonsky and Macdonald 2000; Till and Nowak 2000). Research on commercial brand alliances has also indicated that the fit between the two parties has a significant effect on attitudes toward the alliance (Simonin and Ruth 1998). The marketing alliance literature suggests that alliances succeed when partners are carefully selected and projects are well planned, with the anticipation of strong benefits in relation to costs (Bucklin and Sengupta 1993). Collaborative arrangements are based on the expectation of both partners creating greater value for each other than they would be able to achieve on their own (Abdy and Barclay 2001).
Since the ultimate success of any cause-related marketing strategy relies on the positive response of the consumer (Barone et al. 2000), it is critical that the appropriate nonprofit partner is selected and the company’s motives are perceived favourably. As discussed previously, the consumer’s response to cause-related marketing can be negatively affected by their cynicism of the firm’s motive for participating in the program and their perception of exploitation of the nonprofit organisation (Andreason 1996; Barone et al. 2000; Ross et al. 1992; Webb and Mohr 1998). Similarly, sponsorship research conducted by Speed and Thompson (2000) also concluded that the perceived fit between the sponsor and event is a key factor in generating a favourable response. A logical association between the business and nonprofit brands can reduce the chance of the alliance being regarded with scepticism (Webb and Mohr 1998).

In addition, a corporate culture that embraces the philosophy of cause-related marketing may be fundamental to the strategy’s success (Varadarjan and Menon 1988). The overall ethical behaviour of an organisation may also influence the successful outcome of a cause-related marketing strategy (Cunningham 1997). The cause must fit with the company’s culture and values, and prior to embarking on the strategy, a firm should review and/or update its internal code of ethics to pre-empt any allegations of impropriety (Simon 1995). Finally, nurturing consumer trust is important in realising the benefits of pro-social campaigns (Osterhus 1997).

When selecting a nonprofit partner, firms are advised to consider a cause that has some synergy with the firm’s products or one that will be viewed with empathy by
That is, a cause-related marketing strategy is likely to be perceived more favourably by consumers where there is an obvious connection between the two partners. The issue of perceived fit from a consumer point of view will be addressed more fully in section 2.11.1.

### 2.10.2 Effective management

Many authors have advocated the importance of a strategic approach to cause-related marketing; that is, viewing the program as a vital part of, and complementary to, the firm’s overall marketing strategy (Andreason 1996), and setting specific objectives which are regularly reviewed (Mescon and Tilson 1987). Also critical are the commitment of senior management and the allocation of adequate resources, both financial and human (Andreason 1996). As part of the management of the overall strategy, the partnership between the corporate and nonprofit organisation must also be managed. As with any relationship, several key tenets for success have been identified, such as mutual trust and transparency of actions (Cunningham 1997), open communication (Wagner and Thompson 1994), and an explicit understanding of each partner’s goals (Andreason 1996).

It has been argued that any marketing decision should consider both the long-term effect and the overall impact on the brand (Keller 1993). Increasingly, both academics and practitioners are advocating a long-term approach to cause-related marketing to enhance the potential benefits (Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Murphy 1997; Simon 1995). Welsh (1999) highlights the importance of longevity when he states:
A company that faithfully supports one cause over time can truly benefit - and can bring increasing returns to the cause - by virtue of sustained brand-building and advertising. To support its broad commitment, a company can launch periodic local promotions, special events, and employee-participation programs (p.21).

Under a long-term timeframe, the importance of selecting an appropriate partner and effectively managing that partnership is accentuated.

Finally, as alluded to previously, potential ethical concerns relating to both the appropriateness of the selected partner, the implementation of the program and the perceived benefits to the nonprofit organisation, also need to be managed. Polonsky and Wood (2001) suggest that the conditions relating to the company’s contribution need to be made clear, particularly if any secondary consumer behaviour is required. They even suggest keeping consumers informed throughout the program or at least at its conclusion to prevent the perception of exaggerated claims. Robin and Reidenbach (1987) also highlight the importance of the ethical management of programs:

Without the integration of concerns about ethics and social responsibility at the very beginning of the marketing planning process, as well as throughout the process, the organizational culture may not provide the checks and balances needed to develop ethical and socially responsible marketing programs (p.52).

2.10.3 Evaluation

In order for cause-related marketing to be a sustainable aspect of the overall business strategy, it needs to be subject to evaluation and review in terms of meeting the stated objectives (Mescon and Tilson 1987). The fundamental issue for a company considering a campaign related to social issues should be the effectiveness of such a campaign (Simon 1995). Further, the costs and benefits
associated with cause-related marketing need to be evaluated in relation to alternative strategies (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). Varadarajan and Menon (1988) suggest that evaluation mechanisms should include: financial measures, such as sales volume, market share, purchase quantity and frequency and average purchase size; consumer measures, such as brand switching and repeat purchase; and, image measures, such as corporate image, brand image and media coverage. Bennett’s (2002) study of 94 companies in the United Kingdom engaged in cause-related marketing found that commercial evaluation techniques were used to measure cause-related marketing. These techniques included monitoring media coverage, tracking sales impact and measuring impact on corporate image and market share. Consumer behaviour such as brand awareness, brand switching and frequency of purchase were also measured. Andreason (1996) indicates that firms have also been found to measure increases in customer loyalty and employee satisfaction.

2.11 Cause-related marketing and consumer behaviour

Sections 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10 outlined the background of cause-related marketing and the research and literature relating to the corporate objectives and management of this strategy. This section will examine the impact of cause-related marketing on consumer behaviour, specifically the impact on consumer attitudes toward the brand and intention to purchase, which is the focus of the current research study. As discussed in section 2.2, a critical role of any marketing communications strategy is to change or enhance brand attitude and/or stimulate purchase. The importance of brand attitude and purchase intention as indicators of likely purchase behaviour was also explored in that section.
In an environment of increasing pressure to generate bottom line results, cause-related marketing is viewed as an avenue to increase sales, particularly when contributions to a cause are directly linked to consumer purchases (Polonsky and Speed 2001). In general, academic research has revealed majority support by consumers for the concept of cause-related marketing and the firms who employ this strategy (e.g., Ross et al. 1991, 1992; Smith and Alcorn 1991). Given that cause-related marketing is driven by commercial objectives and designed to ultimately generate a response from the customer, it is critical to gain an understanding as to the circumstances that will facilitate that response. If a brand’s association with a cause is to have an effect on consumer behaviour, the success of this strategy relies on the existence of a socially conscious consumer. That is, it relies on a consumer whose purchase behaviour will be influenced by an opportunity to help others. This consumer has been characterised as follows:

The socially conscious consumer can be defined as a consumer who takes into account the public consequences of his or her private consumption or who attempts to use his or her purchasing power to bring about social change (Webster 1975, p.188).

Therefore, in addition to examining the literature and research in the focal area of cause-related marketing, relevant literature from the areas of consumer behaviour, pro-social behaviour and helping behaviour will also be discussed.

Consumer behaviour refers to ‘…the behavior that consumers display in searching for, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products and services that they expect will satisfy their needs’ (Schiffman and Kanuk 1994, p.7). As previously discussed in section 2.9.1, the motivation for a firm employing a cause-related marketing strategy is the expectation that it will favourably
influence their customers’ behaviour, specifically purchase behaviour. Prosocial
behaviour is described as ‘…behaviour that is valued by the individual’s society’
(Burnett and Wood 1988, p.3) and may include a variety of actions such as
helping others and donating to charity. A subset of prosocial behaviour is helping
behaviour (Dovidio 1984). Helping behaviour has been defined as:

…voluntary acts performed with the intent to provide some benefit
to another person. These behaviors may or may not require
personal contact with the recipient, and they may or may not
involve anticipation of external rewards (Dovidio 1984, p.364).

It is proposed that the consumer exchange involved with a purchase linked to a
nonprofit organisation encompasses both traditional consumer decision-making as
well as prosocial or helping behaviour. Therefore, it is beneficial to draw on the
literature from both areas to gain a better understanding as to the impact of cause-
related marketing on consumer behaviour.

Furthermore, as discussed in section 2.10, the literature on strategic alliances or
brand alliances is also useful in gaining an understanding as to the impact of a
marketing association between two brands on consumer behaviour. Brand
alliances are a strategy in which ‘…two (or more) brands are presented
simultaneously to consumers’ (Simonin and Ruth 1998, p.30). It is obvious that a
cause-related marketing strategy aligns a for-profit brand with a non-profit brand,
therefore literature in the area of brand alliances is relevant to this discussion.

2.11.1 Brand image and brand attitude

As discussed in section 2.9.1, one of the key objectives of firms that pursue a
cause-related marketing strategy relates to enhancing corporate or brand image
Before exploring the impact of cause-related marketing on brand image, it is necessary to define what is meant by the term brand and brand image. First, a brand is defined as ‘…a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or combination of them which is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors’ (Kotler et al. 2001, p.352).

Keller (1993, p.3) defines brand image as ‘…perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory.’ He further explains that brand associations consist of attributes (product-related and non-product-related), benefits (functional, experiential, symbolic) and attitudes. Keller (1993) suggests a link between consumers’ evaluations of a brand and their subsequent behaviour. He states:

Fundamentally, high levels of brand awareness and a positive brand image should increase the probability of brand choice, as well as produce greater consumer (and retailer) loyalty and decrease vulnerability to competitive marketing actions. (p.8)

As a result, Keller (1993) proposes that marketing strategies should seek to expose consumers to the brand to increase familiarity and awareness, and advocates:

Frequent and prominent mentions in advertising and promotion vehicles can intrusively increase consumer exposure to the brand, as can event or sports sponsorship, publicity, and other activities (p.10).

It is suggested that cause-related marketing could be included in those ‘other’ activities. In fact, Hoeffler and Keller (2002) suggest that corporate societal marketing, which includes cause-related marketing, can be effective in developing positive associations for the brand and building brand equity. In addition,
Hoeffler and Keller (2002) suggest that cause-related marketing activities are useful for actively involving the customer with the brand. Furthermore, advertising campaigns with a social dimension have been found to receive greater media coverage and consumer reaction than do standard advertising campaigns (Drumwright 1996), therefore cause-related marketing should be particularly effective at increasing brand awareness and ultimately contributing to enhanced brand equity.

Dacin and Brown (1997) conducted a number of studies that revealed that consumers’ perceptions of a company influence their attitudes and behavior toward a product. Therefore, they suggest that a crucial strategic task is to manage the associations that a consumer has about a company, including its social responsibility. Fombrun and Shanley’s (1990) research on corporate reputation also found that a firm’s commitment to social concerns had an impact on how stakeholders judged that firm. Fombrun and Shanley (1990) recommend that managers consider ‘...boundary spanning activities with consumers, investors and society at large’ (p.253).

It is evident from the preceding comments that cause-related marketing has a role to play in contributing to the attitudes that consumers form towards the brand or company. Furthermore, it has been found that consumers will use their purchasing power to reward or punish firms based on their approach to social responsibility (Creyer 1997; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001; Sen and Morwitz 1996). Research into the effective use of cause-related marketing conducted by Ross et al. (1991) found that approximately half of the respondents indicated that they had
purchased a product or service primarily because of their desire to support the cause. Similarly, commercial surveys conducted in the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia indicated that the majority of respondents had a positive attitude toward both the concept of cause-related marketing and the companies that engage in that strategy (Business in the Community 1999; Cavill and Company 1997; Cone Communications 1994).

Although the literature suggests that cause-related marketing can have a positive influence on consumer response, the efficacy of this strategy needs to be considered in relation to other marketing strategies that a firm may employ to achieve that same objective (Varadarajan and Menon 1988). For example, sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 outlined research findings that suggested advertising (as well as attitude toward the advertisement), sponsorship and certainly sales promotions can also impact on brand attitude and/or purchase intention.

Minimal research has been undertaken to date that compares the effectiveness of cause-related marketing to other marketing strategies. For example, Mizerski et al. (2001) compared the effectiveness of a cause-related marketing advertisement and an ambush advertisement that simply expressed verbal support for a cause without a financial contribution. The study used a convenience sample of 700 students and randomly assigned them to either the control group or one of four treatment groups. The treatment groups were mailed a copy of an advertisement three times and were then asked to complete a survey in class three days after receiving the last postcard. The advertisements were relevant to the students and related two different causes: a cause not naturally associated with the business,
‘campus night safety’, or a cause more directly associated, ‘responsible alcohol use’. The business supporting the causes was a liquor store chain. The results indicated that an ambush advertisement could be as effective as a cause-related marketing advertisement in impacting on consumers’ perceptions of the retailer, and there was no difference in the consumers’ purchase intention. However, these results should be interpreted with caution as the survey used single measures for constructs and this may therefore impact on reliability and validity. Further, given the student sample, it is difficult to generalise these findings to the overall population.

In addition, Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) examined the effectiveness of donations to charity as a purchase incentive in comparison to a cash rebate. Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) found that the effectiveness of each strategy was in fact dependent on the type of product. Their findings suggest that a charity donation strategy is more effective for ‘frivolous’ products, such as chocolate or a restaurant meal, as opposed to more ‘practical’ products such as textbooks or toothpaste. It was suggested that the feelings of potential guilt arising from a frivolous purchase may in some way be negated by the more selfless benefit to others generated by the donation. Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) specifically suggest:

…the altruistic utility offered by charity incentives may be more complementary with the feelings generated from frivolous products than with the more functional motivations associated with practical products (p.444).

The research involved a series of studies using undergraduate students. The first study, using a sample of 150 students, sought to determine participants’
preference for an altruistic incentive, that is, a donation to charity, versus a monetary incentive of equivalent value, when bundled with a frivolous or practical product. The second study, using a sample of 264 students, tested this preference using fictitious brand names with accompanying descriptors of attributes. Unlike the first study, participants were asked which brand they would be likely to purchase.

The third study, using a sample of 1200 students, involved the distribution of coupons for one of four experimental conditions. Based on a minimum purchase of $1.00, the four coupons were either for a chocolate shop or stationery store and offered either 50 cents off or a 50 cent donation to the ‘March of Dimes’. The purpose of the study was to determine the ability of each incentive to stimulate a purchase for each product type. In total, 11 percent of the coupons were redeemed.

On the basis of these three studies, Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) concluded that charity incentives were more effective in promoting frivolous, or hedonic, products as opposed to practical, or utilitarian, products. However, it is recognised that the findings may have been influenced by a number of factors, including student sensitivity to price due to limited budgets, as well as the size of rebate/donation and the appeal of the selected charity.

Berger et al. (1999) explored the impact of the persuasiveness of print advertisements with cause-related marketing claims, on brand attitude and purchase intent in comparison to print ads with no cause-related claims. In
general, the findings from the study demonstrated that information related to the
cause-related marketing strategy enhanced the consumer’s involvement with the
advertisement. Specifically, if the cause was evaluated positively, there was a
higher level of involvement with the advertisement and subsequently more
positive brand attitudes and purchase intentions. Although the results indicated
that respondents exposed to the advertisements featuring cause-related marketing
claims expressed higher brand attitudes and purchase intentions than those of the
control group exposed to only service arguments, the differences were not
statistically significant. The study consisted of two experiments with a sample of
approximately 200 students in each. The students were randomly assigned to
eight treatment groups in the first experiment and in the second, different students
were randomly assigned to eight treatment groups and one control group.

To summarise, the literature suggests cause-related marketing can create positive
associations for the brand leading to stronger brand equity. As discussed in
section 2.7.1, cause-related marketing, although a unique strategy, shares
characteristics with, and is often compared to, sponsorship and sales promotion.
It therefore would be of value to compare the effectiveness of the three strategies.

One of the reasons that cause-related marketing may have more positive
implications for brand equity is that the strategy actively engages the customer.
That is, the consumer’s purchase decision triggers the contribution to the
nonprofit. This engagement is an advantage over other marketing activities such
as sponsorship. With regard to sales promotions, as discussed in section 2.2, these
activities are generally short-term in nature and can be useful for encouraging
product trial, rewarding existing customers or increasing usage. However, sales promotions also have the potential to negatively impact on brand equity, especially if overused (Mela et al. 1997). Sales promotion as a brand building activity is also more overtly self-serving than the other two strategies. Based on the preceding discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H_1 \quad \text{Consumers will have a more positive attitude toward a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.} \]

Similarly, the active involvement elicited by a cause-related marketing strategy should be reflected in an increased ability to positively influence brand attitude compared with sponsorship. Given the increased interest in corporate social responsibility and general support for companies who support the community, cause-related marketing should also have an advantage over sales promotion in influencing brand attitude. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H_{2a} \quad \text{The change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.} \]

Finally, there has been evidence to suggest that consumers will use their buying power to reward companies whose behaviour they approve of, again relating to social responsibility or a company’s support of the community through cause-related marketing. Given that the consumer’s purchase stimulates this community support, cause-related marketing should be more effective in influencing purchase intentions than either sponsorship or sales promotion. As such, the following hypothesis is proposed:
$H_{2b}$ Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

### 2.11.2 The effect of the consumer, the cause and the brand on cause-related marketing effectiveness

As discussed, both commercial and academic research indicates that the majority of consumers have a positive attitude toward the concept of cause-related marketing and the companies who employ that strategy. However, consumer response, in terms of attitude toward the brand and intention to purchase, needs to be understood in more detail in order to provide marketing managers with guidelines to help maximise the effectiveness of cause-related marketing strategies (Chaney and Dolli 2001; Polonsky and Speed 2001). Since cause-related marketing involves a three-way interaction between the consumer, the brand and the cause, each element needs to be examined to determine its impact on the consumer’s formation or change of brand attitudes and intention to purchase.

**Consumer characteristics.** Research has been undertaken to determine whether specific types of consumers are likely to have a more positive response to cause-related marketing. A study in Australia by Kropp et al. (1999) used the List of Values to explore the impact of personal values and susceptibility to interpersonal influence on attitudes toward cause-related marketing. In addition, demographic factors such as age, marital status, education level and income were also considered, as was the individual’s donation behavior. Questionnaires were distributed to 78 Australian university business students, including both undergraduates and postgraduates.
This study revealed that individuals who placed more importance on values such as warm relationships, self-fulfillment and security, as well as fun and enjoyment in life, tended to exhibit more positive attitudes toward cause-related marketing. These findings to some extent echo the sociopsychological profile of the socially conscious consumer developed by Anderson and Cunningham (1972) who describe this consumer as ‘…more cosmopolitan, less conservative, less status conscious, less alienated, and less personally competent than his less socially conscious counterpart’ (p.30).

Kropp et al. (1999) also found that those individuals who were generous in their personal contributions to charity, that is, donated more than one percent of their incomes, were also found to have more favourable attitudes to cause-related marketing. It was concluded that individual factors are more likely to determine attitudes toward cause-related marketing than social influences, probably due to the low visibility of the resultant purchase behavior. This research provides valuable insight into the characteristics of consumers likely to respond positively to a cause-related marketing strategy. However, there are limitations to these findings due to the small sample size and use of a student sample, which means the results are difficult to generalise to the overall population.

Studies focusing on helping behaviour have suggested a relationship between empathy and the propensity to help (Burnett and Wood 1988). In addition, Dovidio’s (1984) model of helping behaviour suggests that both arousal and empathy are the primary motivators of this behaviour. He proposes that empathy is likely to be experienced under certain conditions. These conditions relate to
persons with high empathetic ability, prior experience with the need or emotional attachment to the cause.

With regard to the influence of individual characteristics on purchase behaviour, Beatty, Kahle, Homer and Misra (1985) suggest that, ‘…values underlie the consumption behavior and are thus more inherently useful than demographics in understanding attitudes and behaviors’ (p.184). A value has been defined as ‘…an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence’ (Rokeach 1973, p.5). Given the potential impact of values on consumer behaviour, the following hypothesis will be tested to determine whether consumer values influence the response to cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion.

\[ H_3 \quad \text{Consumers' personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.} \]

The effect of gender on consumer response to cause-related marketing has also been researched. The study by Kropp et al. (1999) suggested that women are likely to have a slightly more positive attitude toward cause-related marketing than men, but this finding was not statistically significant. Previous research conducted by Ross et al. (1991, 1992), however, revealed that women had a more favourable attitude toward cause-related marketing as well as toward the firm and the cause involved. In fact, it was found that men tended to express some concern that the firm might be exploiting the cause, more so than women. This gender bias was further evident in purchase behaviour, with more women than men
stating that they had purchased a product due to their desire to support a cause. Further, a greater number of women than men indicated that they would be tempted to switch brands as a result of a cause-related marketing program.

The first study conducted by Ross et al. (1991) was designed to examine consumer responses to a number of aspects of cause-related marketing, including their attitude to the concept as a way to raise funds for charity. The research was conducted in a major American city via personal interviews with a convenience sample of 225 respondents. Students were not included in the sample. Ross et al. (1991), however, suggest that the convenience sampling technique may limit conclusions regarding gender bias to the sample studied.

The 1992 study explored the impact of the geographic coverage of a cause, as well as gender effects on attitudes toward cause-related marketing. Personal interviews were used with 238 respondents selected via mall intercept. Respondents were shown magazine ads for Proctor and Gamble, which promised to donate funds either to a local or national Special Olympics fund. Ross et al. (1991) noted that the nature of the cause may have influenced respondents’ likelihood of expressing negative attitudes.

A study conducted in New Zealand by Chaney and Dolli (2001) examined consumer attitudes and behaviour towards cause-related marketing and in general did not find significant attitude differences based on gender or income. However, there was evidence to suggest that females were more sceptical than males as to the company’s motive for participating in cause-related marketing, thus
contradicting the findings of Ross et al. (1991, 1992). The survey sample of 250 was representative of residents in a major city and respondents were questioned on awareness of cause-related marketing strategies and actual purchase behaviour. It is of interest to note that 57 percent of respondents stated they had purchased a product associated with a cause-related marketing campaign, but the majority could not recall the company involved yet they did remember the cause. Of these respondents, 15 percent purchased the product although it was not their usual brand and 10 percent claimed to have increased the quantity purchased as a result of the cause-related marketing campaign.

Berger et al.’s (1999) research exploring the impact of cause-related marketing claims in print advertisements found that women had more positive attitudes toward both these claims and the products associated with them. Based on the results from the preceding research studies, the findings regarding the impact of gender on response to cause-related marketing are not conclusive.

Other demographic factors have also been examined to determine their impact on consumer response to cause-related marketing. Kropp et al. (1999) examined income, marital status and education. However, these factors were not found to differentiate the respondent’s attitudes to cause-related marketing. Again, the limitations of using a student sample may have had some impact on these results. On the other hand, Ross et al. (1991) also did not discover any other demographic variables that impacted on attitudes to this strategy.
The issue of gender has also been explored in the literature on prosocial or helping behaviour. Burnett and Wood’s (1988) review of the literature in this area highlights the inconclusive nature of these findings. On the other hand, Eagly and Crowley’s (1986) review of the social psychology literature concluded that males have in fact been shown to help more than females. Eagly and Crowley (1986), however, qualify this finding by suggesting a bias toward this result due to the type of helping behaviour that has been researched and assert that the social psychological research has focused on ‘…chivalrous and heroic acts’ (p.301). Eagly and Crowley (1986) state that social-role theory suggests that females are in fact more likely to engage in helping behavior that is more nurturing or caring. Conversely, males are more likely to become involved in more individualistic or heroic helping behaviour.

Given the inconclusive nature of the role of gender in influencing behaviour, including response to cause-related marketing, this research study will also investigate this issue. In terms of the different types of helping behaviour, cause-related marketing is more likely to be perceived as nurturing or caring as compared with a more heroic form of helping such as rescuing someone from a burning building. Therefore, in light of Eagly and Crowley’s (1986) comments, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H_4 \quad \text{Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.} \]

**Characteristics of the cause.** Alliances with a nonprofit organisation and advertisements with a social dimension can result in free publicity and public relations opportunities (Andreason 1996; Drumwright 1996). Therefore, the
image of the nonprofit organisation with which a company chooses to align is important with regard to the potential impact on the company’s image:

From a corporate marketer’s point of view, a nonprofit organization’s most valuable asset is its image. Many companies seeking cause-related marketing alliances hope that a nonprofit’s image will define, enhance or even repair their own (Andreason 1996, p56).

Literature in the area of helping behaviour also supports the importance of a nonprofit organisation’s image on an individual’s attitude and willingness to respond to donor appeals. It suggests that whether a charity is familiar and credible is a critical factor in determining whether a potential donor perceives a need and is motivated to respond to that need (Bendapudi et al. 1996). Research into commercial brand alliances also indicates that these alliances have the potential to affect attitudes toward the brands of each of the parties involved (Simonin and Ruth 1998). It is suggested that these insights can assist in understanding the role of the specific cause associated with the cause-related marketing strategy in influencing the likelihood of the consumer having a positive response. Given the importance of selecting an appropriate nonprofit partner, there is a notable lack of research into the specific cause’s impact on consumer response to a cause-related marketing strategy.

One of the few aspects of the cause that has been researched to date is its locality. Ross et al. (1992) found that consumer attitudes toward cause-related marketing were only slightly more positive (deemed not to be statistically significant) when the cause was local as compared with national. This finding conflicts with earlier research by Ross et al. (1991), which indicated that there was greater consumer
support for local causes and less support for national. Further investigation is required before any conclusions can be made on the relevance of this issue to consumer attitudes toward cause-related marketing strategies.

Ellen, Webb and Mohr (2000) explored the issue of type of cause in relation to a cause marketing venture they refer to as a ‘joint issue promotion.’ In this promotion, the company facilitates consumer contribution to a cause and may even provide an additional contribution. Ellen et al. (2000) found that consumers responded more favourably to an appeal to help in a disaster relief situation rather than an appeal for an ongoing cause. The literature addressing helping behaviour can provide some insight into types of causes that are likely to motivate consumers to respond. For example, it has been suggested by Griffin, Babin, Attaway and Darden (1993) that perception of need and subsequent helping behaviour tend to be greater when the beneficiary’s need is caused by factors beyond his control, as opposed to resulting from his own actions. Therefore, disaster relief is likely to elicit greater support as a cause than is alcohol addiction.

In summary, the literature suggests that the nonprofit partner selected by the firm is a critical determinant of the consumer’s propensity to respond. The consumer’s perception of a logical association between the two organisations is also believed to be a key factor in generating a favourable response. As discussed in section 2.9.2, consumer response to cause-related marketing can be negatively affected if it is perceived that the nonprofit organisation is being exploited (Andreason 1996; Barone et al. 2000; Ross et al. 1992; Webb and Mohr 1998). Osterhus’ (1997) research into prosocial consumer influence strategies suggests that the prosocial
positioning must fit with consumer perceptions as well as being relevant or of interest to the consumer. The issue of perceived fit between the company and an event has also been found to impact on consumer response to sponsorship (Speed and Thompson 2000). Furthermore, perceived fit is also a critical issue in the brand extension literature (Aaker and Keller 1990; Bridges, Keller and Sood 2000) and it is suggested that consumer evaluations of these extensions are dependent upon this fit (Park, Milberg and Lawson 1991). Although there is no agreed definition of this concept in the literature, it has been proposed that consumers’ perception of fit is a function of similarity of product features and consistency with the concept of the original brand (Park et al. 1991). This concept of perceived brand consistency may have relevance for consumers’ perception of fit between a brand and nonprofit organisation in the case of cause-related marketing. Another view suggests that the basis for perceived fit can relate to any association between the parent brand and extension including product category, brand concept or brand associations (Bridges et al. 2000). Perceived fit is also examined in the brand alliance literature. In this case, perceived fit tends to refer to the relatedness of the two products involved in the alliance (Simonin and Ruth 1998).

However, the role of perceived fit in generating a favourable response to cause-related marketing is subject to some debate. It has been suggested that a strong perceived link between the company and the cause may in fact accentuate the benefit to the firm and result in a consumer backlash (Ellen et al. 2000). Research conducted by Drumwright (1996) found that advertising managers believed that consumer scepticism may occur in relation to advertising campaigns with a social
dimension if the association between the company and cause was too close. Further, Mizerski et al. (2001) found that the most effective cause used in a cause-related marketing campaign was one that was not normally associated with the organisation.

Attribution theory may provide some insight into impact of the consumer’s perception of fit between a brand and nonprofit organisation on their response to cause-related marketing. Kelley (1973) describes attribution theory as ‘…a theory about how people make causal explanations, about how they answer questions beginning with “why”?’ (p.107). Kelley and Michela (1980) also state that ‘…people interpret behavior in terms of its causes and that these interpretations play an important role in determining reactions to the behavior’ (p.458). Folkes (1988) suggests that attribution theory has much to contribute to the field of consumer behaviour. As such, this theory can be used to explain the implications of the consumer’s perception of fit. That is, consumers will naturally question why the firm is participating in a cause-related marketing strategy. If they perceive the firm’s motivations positively, that attribution will then favourably impact on their attitude to the brand and their intention to purchase. A logical association between the brand and cause may assist in forming positive attributions as to the firm’s involvement in cause-related marketing. Exploratory research conducted by Webb and Mohr (1998) did in fact identify a group of consumers amongst the qualitative sample that considered the firm’s motives prior to determining their response to cause-related marketing campaigns. This research study will be discussed in the next section.
Based on the preceding discussion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H_3 \quad \text{Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly co-vary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.} \]

**Characteristics of the company or brand.** As discussed in the previous section, consumer perceptions of the cause and the partnership itself are likely to impact on their response to a cause-related marketing initiative. In addition, consumer perceptions of the company or brand have been found to impact on their response to cause-related marketing. For example, Barone et al. (2000) investigated the impact of cause-related marketing on consumer choice, and in particular the perceived motivation of the firm as well as potential price/performance trade-offs involved in supporting a brand involved with cause-related marketing. Four studies were conducted using groups of approximately 160 undergraduate business students in each study. Based on the findings from these studies, one of the conclusions drawn is that marketers need to be concerned with consumer perception as to the company’s motives for participating in the program, as this did affect consumer choice. Several limitations to the study were identified including lack of identification of a specific cause, providing information regarding company motivations prior to product information and the inclusion of only two products: televisions and personal computers.

The findings regarding the impact of perceived company motivations are however supported to some extent by earlier research undertaken by Webb and Mohr (1998) that found that it was important for consumers to trust that the campaigns were honest and non-exploitative. Webb and Mohr (1998) undertook a qualitative
study using indepth personal interviews to gain an understanding of consumer responses to cause-related marketing. In total, results were drawn from 44 interviews from a varied sample. It was found that four distinct groups or segments appeared to exist with regard to the responses. The first group, referred to as the ‘skeptics’, had primarily negative views of cause-related marketing. The ‘balancers’ represented the largest group and generally held positive views, but tried to balance support of the cause with traditional purchase criteria. The third type, ‘attribution-oriented’ were more discerning and involved in considering company motives before responding to a cause-related strategy. The last group, the ‘socially concerned’ primarily had a positive response motivated by the desire to help. Although the study provides a unique perspective on the ways in which consumers regard cause-related marketing, unfortunately, the ability to generalise these results to a larger population is limited by the small and diverse sample. However, Osterhus’ (1997) research into pro-social consumer influence strategies, such as environmental and cause-related campaigns, also emphasises the pivotal role of consumer trust in the effectiveness of these strategies.

The preceding research suggests that a consumer’s existing relationship with the brand is likely to influence whether a cause-related marketing strategy is viewed positively. Javalgi et al. (1994) examined a similar issue in relation to sponsorship. Javalgi et al. (1994) found that corporate sponsorship could have an effect on image, and that effect may be mitigated by the company’s image prior to the sponsorship. Therefore, a sponsorship may in fact exacerbate a previously held negative image.
It is conceivable that consumer response to a cause-related marketing strategy may also be mitigated by the prior attitude to the brand held by the consumer. A consumer’s preference or loyalty to the brand may affect their response in terms of a change in brand attitude and purchase intention. The concept of brand loyalty has generally been described in terms of behaviour, as opposed to recognising attitudinal elements (Chaudhuri and Holbrook 2001). However, Oliver (1999) has acknowledged both behavioural and attitudinal components with the following description of loyalty:

…a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour (p.34).

Given that the preceding definition suggests that the presence of brand loyalty can impact on the effectiveness of marketing efforts and influence purchasing behaviour, it can therefore act as a potential confound to the impact of cause-related marketing on consumer response. Therefore, the following hypothesis will be tested:

\[ H_6 \quad \text{Consumers’ loyalty to the brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or in purchase intention.} \]

In addition to the existing relationship with the brand, there has also been some limited research into the role of the type of product in determining the effectiveness of a cause-related marketing strategy. As discussed previously, Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) found that the effectiveness of donations to charity as a purchase incentive is dependent on the type of product. Specifically, this strategy was shown to be more effective for ‘frivolous’ products, such as
chocolate or a restaurant meal, as opposed to more ‘practical’ products such as textbooks or toothpaste.

It has also been suggested that when brands are of similar price and quality, consumer purchase intention will favour the brand associated with a cause (Business in the Community 1999; Cavill and Company 1997; Cone Communications 1999). Consumers in the United States indicated majority support for buying a product associated with a cause (Cone Communications 1994). In fact, 54 percent stated that they would be willing to pay more for a product supporting a cause which they care about, 30 percent were willing to pay 5 percent more and 24 percent would pay 10 percent more.

On the other hand, there is also evidence to suggest that cause-related marketing may not affect buying behaviour, particularly when traditional purchase criteria are important (Webb and Mohr 1998). Barone et al. (1999) also found that support for products associated with a cause may be tempered by the perceived trade-offs. The influence of cause-related marketing on purchase choice was strongest when there was little differentiation between brands in terms of price or quality. Although this influence decreased when there was differentiation, some consumers were still willing to accept a higher price or lower performance to support the firm associated with a cause.

Research in the area of helping behaviour may be useful in providing an explanation for the above consumer behaviour. For instance, helping behaviour may be dependent on a cost-benefit analysis undertaken by the potential donor
(Bendapudi et al. 1996). Benefits may include either reward, avoiding punishment or enhancing the welfare of others. Costs may be financial, physical, social or psychological. Therefore a consumer’s likelihood of purchasing a brand associated with a cause-related marketing strategy may depend on the perceived benefits outweighing the costs.

Researchers have also investigated the impact of donation size as a factor influencing consumer response. However, Ross et al. (1991) found evidence to suggest that the amount of the contribution to the nonprofit organisation does not necessarily affect the consumer’s purchase decision. On the other hand, in a pilot study undertaken by Dahl and Lavack (1995) it was found that small donation size could result in the perception by consumers that the cause was being exploited. This perception could produce a negative consumer response to both the product and corporation, and it is reasonable to assume that this could extend to a negative impact on purchase behaviour.

Dahl and Lavack (1995) conducted an experiment to determine the impact of the size of corporate donation and the size of promotion on consumer perception of exploitation. A sample of 100 individuals was selected via mall-intercept and asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding the introduction of a new product. The participants were given one of four scenarios relating to donation size, small or large, and promotion size, small or large. Promotion size related to the amount of space on the label allocated to the cause. The scenarios also discussed other attributes of the new product such as flavour, price, size and availability. Participants then responded to a series of questions for which each item was rated.
As mentioned, the findings suggested that a small donation size could result in perceived exploitation. However, there was no evidence to suggest that the promotion size had any impact on the perception of exploitation, regardless of whether the associated donation size was large or small. This study had several limitations including the recruitment of participants in a university mall and the limited way in which the size of a promotion could be communicated, compared with a real world experience of media exposure. Finally, Dahl and Lavack (1995) suggested that the survey instrument could be changed to improve reliability and validity.

Holmes and Kilbane (1993) also conducted a study looking at consumer attitudes and purchase intentions to different donation amounts and different price levels. The sample consisted of 300 university students who were asked to complete a questionnaire in response to a promotional message prepared by a fictitious retail music store. Three different price levels and three different charitable contributions (including none) provided nine different questionnaires. Holmes and Kilbane (1993) concluded that the cause-related marketing promotion did not generate negative reactions to the message, the store or intention to respond, compared with messages that did not contain a cause-related marketing element.

2.12 Conclusion

In summary, cause-related marketing is an emerging area and the literature supports the need for further research regarding this strategy. It has been established that cause-related marketing is a unique element of the marketing communications mix. Given that a critical role of marketing communications is
to favourably influence brand attitudes and purchase intention, it is important to examine the ability of cause-related marketing to achieve those objectives. There is evidence to suggest that consumers view this strategy positively and in some circumstances cause-related marketing can influence purchase behaviour. However, the impact of cause-related marketing also needs to be examined in relation to other marketing strategies. Limited research has been undertaken in this area. A summary of the academic research specifically investigating consumer response to cause-related marketing is provided in Appendix 3.

This chapter presented the theoretical foundation that forms the basis of the current study. In exploring the literature on cause-related marketing, a number of other relevant areas were incorporated including philanthropy, corporate social responsibility, brand alliances and prosocial and helping behaviour. Throughout the examination of the literature and research in the area of cause-related marketing, a number of hypotheses were developed. These hypotheses are summarised in section 2.12.1. Chapter 3 will outline the research methodology and method used in testing these hypotheses.

2.12.1 Summary of hypotheses

This research study examines the a number of hypotheses to address the following research questions:

*What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of attitude to the strategy, attitude toward the brand and purchase intention?*

*Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?*
The hypotheses are as follows:

\[
H_1 \quad \text{Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.}
\]

\[
H_{2a} \quad \text{The change in attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.}
\]

\[
H_{2b} \quad \text{Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.}
\]

\[
H_3 \quad \text{Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.}
\]

\[
H_4 \quad \text{Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.}
\]

\[
H_5 \quad \text{Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.}
\]

\[
H_6 \quad \text{Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.}
\]

The conceptual model for this research, based on the outcome of the literature review, is summarised at Figure 2.3. The conceptual model depicts the key variables and the presumed relationships, which will be explored in the research (Miles and Huberman 1994; Punch 1998). A conceptual framework is particularly used in quantitative research and usually is represented in diagrammatic form (Punch 1998).
Figure 2.3 Conceptual framework for the impact of cause-related marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-Related Marketing</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Attitude to the Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Attitude to Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: developed for this research.
3.0 METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

3.1 Introduction

This research investigates the relationship between cause-related marketing, attitude to the strategy, brand attitude and purchase intention. It also explores consumer response to cause-related marketing as compared to sponsorship and sales promotion. The findings build on existing research and provide knowledge that will assist marketing managers in the development of more effective cause-related marketing strategies.

The previous chapter reviewed the current literature and research in the area of cause-related marketing as well as the relevant literature in the related areas of philanthropy, social responsibility, brand alliances and prosocial behaviour. This chapter outlines the method for testing the model and hypotheses that were developed in Chapter 2. It also discusses the research paradigm, the research design, treatment of variables, details of the sample, data collection and data analysis methods. The chapter concludes with a rationale for the chosen research design and method of data analysis. The process undertaken in developing and conducting this research is represented diagrammatically at Figure 3.1. The majority of these steps are discussed in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated.
3.2 Justification for the research paradigm and method

Prior to discussing the method applied to this research, it is necessary to consider the fundamental purpose of the research as well as the research approach or paradigm appropriate to the study. The primary goal of social research falls in one of three categories: exploration, description or explanation (Babbie 2001; Neuman 2003). Exploratory research is generally conducted when little is known about a particular phenomenon. The goal of the research is not to seek answers but to generate a greater understanding of a particular issue to allow more precise research questions to be formulated. Exploratory research does not follow a
structured path but allows flexibility and exploration of all available information. This form of research tends to use - although not exclusively - qualitative techniques in data collection.

Descriptive research generally begins with a more focused issue than exploratory research. The research attempts to develop a detailed description to yield an understanding of a particular phenomenon, allowing for classification or categorisation. The ‘how’ and ‘who’ of the investigation tends to be more important than the ‘why’. Descriptive researchers may use a range of techniques in gathering data, including both qualitative and quantitative, although experimental designs are rare.

The first stage of this research study exhibits characteristics of both exploratory and descriptive research. An initial review of existing literature was undertaken to develop an understanding of cause-related marketing and related areas, the key issues pertaining to that strategy and the research conducted to date. The findings from this preliminary research have been outlined in Chapter 2 and form the basis of both the research questions and development of the hypotheses.

Explanatory research, on the other hand, tends to build on both exploratory and descriptive research and searches for the explanation (the ‘why’). Explanatory research looks for the cause or the reason a phenomenon occurs and thus goes further than description (Neuman 2003; Punch 1998). The major focus of this study is explanatory, that is, to understand whether cause-related marketing affects a consumer’s attitude to a brand as well as his or her purchase intention.
Further, the research investigates whether or not this response is affected by an individual’s gender, personal values, existing brand loyalty and perceived fit between the brand and cause. Finally, the study examines whether or not cause-related marketing has a more positive impact on a consumer’s response than does sponsorship or sales promotion.

Having established the underlying purpose of the study, selection of an appropriate research paradigm must be considered. A paradigm has been described as ‘…an accepted model or pattern’ (Kuhn 1979, p.23) or ‘…a basic orientation to theory and research’ (Neuman 2003, p.70). As suggested by Kuhn (1979):

No natural history can be interpreted in the absence of at least some implicit body of intertwined theoretical and methodological belief that permits selection, evaluation, and criticism (p.16).

A paradigm thus enables the researcher to determine what problems should be explored and what methods are appropriate (Bryman 1988; Deshpande 1983). The two broad research approaches relevant to the social sciences are positivism and interpretivism (Carson, Gilmore, Perry and Gronhaug 2001; May 1997; Neuman 2003). In attempting to define or describe positivism, it should be noted that there are many different views on its meaning (Bryman 1988; Punch 1998). There are also many varieties of positivism such as logical empiricism, the accepted or conventional view, post-positivism, naturalism, the covering law model and behaviourism (Neuman 2003). However, the fundamental nature of the positivist view of social science combines deductive logic and empirical data regarding human behaviour in an effort to explain and predict that behaviour (Carson et al. 2001; Neuman 2003). The positivist perspective relies on objective
fact and the detachment of the researcher. Favoured methodologies are quantitative, including surveys, experiments and statistics. The main focus of the research is to test a theory that has been developed based on reviewing existing theory or research; that is, using a deductive approach to research. The theory is then subjected to empirical measurement and evaluation. It should be noted that positivism seeks to verify hypotheses, whereas the more recently evolved perspective of post-positivism seeks to falsify hypotheses (Guba and Lincoln 1998).

Post-positivism emerged in the last few decades as a way of responding to the most serious criticism of positivism, while still upholding the basic tenets of the paradigm. That is, post-positivism recognises that reality can never be fully captured and understood, but only imperfectly approximated (Guba and Lincoln 1998). The main drawback to these positivistic approaches is that they may prevent the development of genuinely new theory as they exclude the element of discovery (Guba and Lincoln 1998). However, it is recognised that ‘…theory verification is an important part of the overall growth of a body of knowledge…’ (Deshpande 1983, p.106).

Conversely, the interpretive approach focuses on understanding human behaviour by observation. This approach takes into account ‘multiple realities’ (Carson et al. 2001, p.5) including the perspectives of the different participants, the involvement of the researcher and the context in which the behaviour of interest occurs. There are many varieties of interpretivism including hermeneutics, constructionism, ethnomethodology, cognitive, idealist, phenomenological
subjectivist and qualitative sociology (Neuman 2003). Interpretivist researchers generally prefer qualitative methods such as observation and field research. The main focus of this type of research is to build a theory by seeking out and understanding a phenomenon, that is, using an inductive approach to the research (Blaikie 1993). As such, the shortcoming of this approach is that the researcher may not benefit from existing theory.

It has been suggested that these two paradigms, positivism and interpretivism, in reality represent two ends of a continuum of a range of philosophies including critical theory, realism, constructivism, hermeneutics, humanism, natural inquiry and phenomenology (Carson et al. 2001). The differences between the two main approaches have been summarised at Table 3.1. It has been emphasised that one perspective is not necessarily better than another, but rather are different ways of ‘…telling a story about society or the social world…’ (Denzin and Lincoln 1998, p.10).

The current research study tends toward the positivist approach. The aim is to test a number of hypotheses that have been deduced from existing theory and research. Since this research investigates the impact of cause-related marketing in comparison with other marketing methods, an objective measurement of the difference is required. Given the desire for measurement and comparison of results, quantitative methods are therefore indicated.

Quantitative and qualitative research techniques are associated with different data collection methods and research strategies. Before discussing and comparing the
two types of research, it is worthwhile to note that there are two different points of view as to the extent of the differences between the two research traditions (Bryman 1988). The first perspective suggests that the two methods represent different paradigms or epistemological positions, that is, two different views of social reality, very much in line with the positivist and interpretivist paradigms discussed previously. The alternative view suggests that quantitative and qualitative research differ only on technique and therefore appropriateness to particular research problems (Bryman 1988). As such, quantitative and qualitative methods can be used with any research paradigm (Guba and Lincoln 1998).

### Table 3.1 Comparison between positivism and interpretivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for research:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description and explanation.</td>
<td>To understand and describe meaningful social action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To discover natural laws so people can predict and control events.</td>
<td>Concerned with understanding human behaviour from the individual’s frame of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks the facts of social phenomena without subjective interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of social reality:**

- Stable preexisting patterns or order that can be discovered.
- World is external and objective.

- Fluid definitions of a situation created by human interaction.
- Multiple realities.

**Methodology:**

- Quantitative methods preferred.
- Likely to use experiments, surveys and statistics.
- Favours objective research.
- Focus on measurement and testing hypotheses.
- Deductive – theory testing.
- Researcher detached.

- Qualitative methods preferred.
- Use participant observation or field research.
- Consider both verbal and nonverbal communication.
- Inductive – theory building.
- Researcher involved.

In simple terms, quantitative research collects numerical data. Conversely, qualitative research collects non-numerical data, including words or pictures (Neuman 2003; Punch 1998). Quantitative research revolves around testing and confirming hypotheses formed on the basis of existing theory. This type of research is often focused on establishing causality between variables. Therefore, quantitative researchers generally adhere to positivist principles and reality is perceived in terms of variables and the relationships between them (Bryman 1988; Denzin and Lincoln 1998; Punch 1998). Consequently, methods are less varied than qualitative research and one of the strengths of quantitative research is that it can be more easily replicated (Bryman 1988; Punch 1998). Quantitative data may be collected using a range of techniques including experiments, surveys, content analysis and existing statistics.

Experimental research is the technique most closely aligned with the principles of scientific research. Experiments generally divide people into two or more groups, with one group subjected to a treatment, that being the particular condition in which the researcher is interested. Responses of each group are measured and any differences attributed to the treatment, as the researcher controls all other elements. Experiments can be particularly effective for explanatory research and focus on a well-defined research question. Strengths of experimental research include: the ability to isolate the experimental variable, thus allowing causality to be inferred; designs which can control for internal and external validity; and scientific rigour (Babbie 2001; Christensen 1994; Hoyle et al. 2002; Patzer 1996). The main criticism of experiments – particularly for laboratory experiments – is their artificial nature, thus raising doubts as to the ability of the results to reflect
Surveys may be used in either descriptive or explanatory research. The researcher extracts information using either a written set of questions or an interview. The answers are then summarised in a quantifiable form and generalisations are made to the larger population. The advantages of survey research include economy and ease of collecting large amounts of data and the standardisation of the collected data. The limitations of surveys relate to an element of artificiality similar to experiments. Further, there is the potential for surveys to be superficial and inflexible given the need to standardise responses, and a resultant inability to deal with context (Babbie 2001).

Content analysis requires a researcher to develop a system for describing elements of a body of material. This system monitors and quantifies particular aspects of the material such as themes or certain words. This technique is used most often for descriptive research, but can also be applied to both exploratory and explanatory research. The strength of content analysis primarily lies in its unobtrusiveness and its economy (in both time and money) as well as the opportunity for longitudinal study. The main weakness is the potential difficulty in the accessibility and availability of the data required (Babbie 2001). Finally, research using existing statistics seeks to analyse available information with the objective of reorganising the information in a new way. Limitations of this method are similar to those relating to content analysis. Again, this technique is most often used for descriptive research.
Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, tend to adhere to interpretivist principles. They follow a less structured strategy and seek interpretations for social behaviour that accommodate context. Qualitative data collection techniques include field research and historical-comparative research. Field research focuses on a small group of people and may include observation and informal interviews based initially on a loosely formed topic. This type of research is used most often for exploratory and descriptive studies. The strength of field research is its effectiveness in studying the nuances of human behaviour and social processes. This research technique also allows flexibility in modifying the approach used. On the other hand, field research does not allow for quantification and thus descriptions of a larger population. Historical-comparative research focuses on social aspects of past history or different cultures. The researcher has a loosely formed topic and examines existing documents with observation and interviews. This type of research is used most often for descriptive studies.

It should be noted that there is considerable support in the research methods literature for the efficacy of combining both qualitative and quantitative research (Bryman 1988; Carson et al. 2001; Deshpande 1983; Miles and Huberman 1994; Punch 1998). In particular, Bryman (1988) advocates that qualitative research can facilitate quantitative research in serving as a source of hypotheses, in the construction of scales or in the analysis of data. In addition, Deshpande (1983) suggests that qualitative fieldwork can assist quantitative surveys in the area of survey design, data collection and analysis. The concept of using more than ‘…one method of investigation, and therefore more than one type of data…’ is
referred to as triangulation (Bryman 1988, p.131). This approach is encouraged in that it provides a more thorough investigation of the research question. As Neuman (2003) states, ‘…the two methods or styles have complementary strengths…a study using both is fuller or more comprehensive’ (p.139).

As previously indicated, this research study tests hypotheses to investigate the possibility of a causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables. That is, this study seeks to test the extent that cause-related marketing has an impact on a consumer’s attitude toward the brand and purchase intention. In addition, it is hypothesised that this impact will be more positive for cause-related marketing than for sponsorship or sales promotion. As stated, the objectives and parameters for this research study suggest quantitative methods are appropriate. In particular, an experimental design offers the ability to test and compare consumer responses to the different treatments of cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion. However, qualitative methods are integrated into the research in the form of a pilot test of the questionnaire to assist with elements of the research design. The research design is discussed in detail in the following section.

3.3 Research design

Prior to undertaking this research, a review of the literature was conducted to identify and develop the initial research questions and subsequent hypotheses. Neuman (2003) has identified the goals of a literature review as follows:

1. To demonstrate a familiarity with a body of knowledge and establish credibility.
2. To show the path of prior research and how a current project is linked to it.
3. To integrate and summarize what is known in an area.
4. To learn from others and stimulate new ideas (p.96).

Research is not an isolated activity, but rather seeks to build on previous work as well as providing new avenues for exploration. This research study was designed to achieve the above goals. The relevant literature in the area of cause-related marketing, and related areas of marketing communications, consumer behaviour, brand alliances, social responsibility, philanthropy and helping behaviour, was examined in Chapter 2.

As discussed in section 3.2, the primary focus of this research is a quantitative study. Quantitative research uses structured questions with predetermined responses and a large number of respondents to quantify the response to a particular research problem (Burns and Bush 2000). This research quantifies consumer response to cause-related marketing as indicated by attitude toward the strategy, attitude change toward the brand and purchase intention. Further, it compares this response to consumer response to sponsorship and sales promotion. The data collection methods that can be used for quantitative research were described in section 3.2 and include experiments, surveys, content analysis and existing statistics. Given the nature of the research question which requires both measurement of consumer response as well as comparison, content analysis is not appropriate nor is there existing data relating to the research question. A combination of the remaining two methods, survey and experiment, was proposed. As was also discussed in section 3.2, surveys lend themselves to collecting data from a large group of people and then summarising the results in a quantifiable form. Experiments allow the researcher to control elements not being tested for in
the study and to compare responses among groups. These two methods, experiments and surveys, are discussed in detail in the following sections.

3.3.1 Experimental method

The experimental method originated in the natural sciences and was first used in the social sciences for psychology research in the early 1900s (Neuman 2003; Punch 1998). The attraction of the experiment is that it is an ‘…objective, unbiased, scientific way to study human mental and social life…’ (Neuman 2003, p.239). Experiments are used by social researchers for these reasons as well as for their ‘…logical rigor and simplicity, consistency with positivist assumptions, and relatively low cost’ (Neuman 2003, p.240). An experimental design was chosen for this research for a number of these reasons.

This study seeks to establish a causal relationship between the type of marketing strategy and attitude to the strategy, change in attitude to the brand and purchase intention. It has been commented that this objective of establishing a causal relationship is difficult to achieve without the use of an experimental design (Hoyle et al. 2002; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). Experimental designs allow the three conditions or criteria for causality to be met; that is, appropriate timing, association and no alternative explanations (Malhotra 2004; Neuman 2003; Patzer 1996). Appropriate timing, or temporal order, refers to the requirement that the cause must come before the effect. The researcher in an experimental design can successfully manipulate this timing. Association refers to the fact that there is a relationship between the two variables in that they ‘…occur together in a patterned way…’ (Neuman 2003, p.56). Finally, the elimination of alternative
explanations may be controlled by experimental design and through subsequent techniques used to analyse the data.

The research question under examination demonstrates a fit with the strengths and limitations of experimental research. The researcher can manipulate the independent variables, the issues explored are relatively focused, and there are a small number of variables (Babbie 2001; Neuman 2003). Experiments are particularly suited for hypothesis testing, determining causation, and thus explanatory research (Babbie 2001). In a review of existing research in the area of cause-related marketing, it has been commented that survey data are prone to a social desirability response bias but that it is less likely to occur in an experimental design (Mohr et al. 2001). A social desirability response bias has been defined as ‘…the general tendency to overreport one’s desirable behaviors and other characteristics and to underreport one’s less admirable qualities…’ (Hoyle et al. 2002, p.82). Social desirability will be discussed further in the next section.

In social research, an experiment sets up comparison groups that receive a different treatment, or are exposed to a different independent variable. The groups are then compared with respect to the dependent variable(s) with the purpose of attributing the differences to the independent variable (Punch 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). This research sought to compare the response to a cause-related marketing strategy with that of a sponsorship and a sales promotion.
There are three broad categories of experimental designs: classical experimental design, pre-experimental design and quasi-experimental (Neuman 2003). The classical experimental design is comprised of random assignment of subjects, a pre-test and post-test, an experimental group and a control group. The pre-experimental design lacks one or more of the elements of the classical design, such as the pre-test, the control group or both. As a result, the ability to demonstrate a causal relationship may be affected. The quasi-experimental design is a variation of the classical design and is used where some elements of that design may be difficult to incorporate or are not relevant. In particular, the researcher may not have complete control over the independent variable as the treatment groups are naturally occurring. As is discussed in section 3.4.1, the classical experimental design was chosen for this research.

3.3.2 Survey method

As discussed in section 3.2, the advantages of using a survey method include the standardisation of data, the ease with which surveys can be administered as well as the ease in tabulating and analysing the data. Further, surveys can reveal otherwise unnoticed patterns and information, and are sensitive to small group differences (Burns and Bush 2000; Churchill 2001).

The collection of survey data may be via face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, the internet or self-administration. Face-to-face interviews offer several advantages such as the flexibility to use visual aids, the ability of the interviewer to correct misunderstandings or probe for additional information, and the ability to control the order in which questions are answered. Most importantly
however, is the tendency for this technique to generate the highest response rate of all survey methods as well as generating the highest quality and depth of information. However, face-to-face interviews are the most costly data collection method, and as a result, the least used (Hoyle et al. 2002). In addition, this form of data collection presents a threat to internal validity in the form of interviewer effect. For example, the interviewer may influence the responses due to personal characteristics or the rapport established with the interviewee. The latter situation may contribute to a social desirability bias given the respondent’s desire to please the interviewer (Hoyle et al. 2002). This issue would be of particular concern in the case of this research study.

Telephone interviews have similar strengths to face-to-face interviews with the exception of the ability to use visual aids. In terms of response rate, telephone interviews are only slightly lower than personal interviews (Hoyle et al. 2002). In comparison to face-to-face interviews, there is greater control over interviewers as they often work from one room, interviews can be completed more quickly and the cost is lower. The disadvantages of this type of interview relate to the inability to observe visual cues and difficulties that may be experienced in addressing complex questions.

Data collection via the internet allows for diverse populations to be reached at a relatively low cost. Respondents also have the flexibility to complete the survey at their convenience and with a degree of anonymity. Disadvantages of this method relate to poor response rates and the difficulty experienced in actually
determining the response rate and the representativeness of the sample (Babbie 2001; Hoyle et al. 2002).

Finally, survey data can be collected via self-administered questionnaires, distributed either by mail or to groups of respondents in a designated area. The benefits of self-administered questionnaires are that they are less costly than either interviewer or computer administered surveys, allow respondents to complete at their own pace and are not influenced by an interviewer (Burns and Bush 2000). This method is also suggested as a means of reducing potential social desirability response bias (Nancarrow, Brace and Wright 2001) as subjects need not be concerned with how an interviewer would regard their responses. Zerbe and Paulhus (1987) suggest that it is this tendency of respondents toward ‘impression management’ that can significantly compromise the validity of the research findings. Although the issue of the degree of contamination presented by social desirability bias in marketing research is subject to debate, it is suggested that researchers need to at least be aware of the potential (King and Bruner 2000).

On the other hand, there are disadvantages with self-administered surveys such as lower response rates. However, distributing the survey to groups of respondents in a controlled area, as opposed to via the mail, overcomes this key disadvantage. In addition, the risk of response error due to misunderstanding either the instructions or the questions is reduced by the opportunity to ask for clarification from the person administering the survey. Other disadvantages associated with self-administered surveys include the lack of control over the order in which the questions are answered as well as the completeness of answers.
For the purposes of this research study, face-to-face and telephone interviews were discounted for a number of reasons. First of all, given the nature of the questions, the need for probing or clarification was not anticipated to be an issue. Visual aids were not required nor were visual cues likely to be relevant. Most significantly, the costs of these methods were prohibitive, and equally important, there was a desire to minimise any potential social desirability bias. Data collection via the internet was not practical given the stringent sampling requirements for an experimental design as well as response rate considerations. Therefore, self-administered surveys appeared to be the most feasible method. Distributing the surveys to groups in a designated area was preferable to mailing the surveys in terms of maximising the response, controlling the environment in which the surveys were completed and providing the opportunity for respondents to seek clarification if required. The following section will discuss the issues considered in the survey design.

3.3.3 Survey and instrument design

The purpose of a survey instrument is to collect the information required to address the overall research question and hypotheses. In designing the survey, a set of questions must be developed to capture this information as well as to encourage respondent involvement and minimise response error (Malhotra 2004). The phrasing of questions needs to consider the characteristics of the respondent group particularly in terms of their education level. Lack of understanding of the question’s intent is directly associated with inaccurate or nonresponse (Malhotra 2004). Further, survey designers should be cognisant of other sources of response error; that is, the fallibility of the respondents’ memory, their motivation to
respond as well as their level of knowledge (Sudman and Bradburn 1982). Unfortunately there is not a scientific approach to survey design that will guarantee the optimal outcome, however, several guidelines exist (Churchill 2001; Malhotra 2004; Sudman and Bradburn 1982). These guidelines relate to question design and format, response design, question order, presentation of instructions, survey format and pretesting. These areas will be discussed as follows.

First, it is suggested that questions should be clear in terms of using simple and appropriate language, setting manageable tasks and supplying the required information (Converse and Presser 1986). Specific questions are preferable to general ones and both double-barrelled and leading questions should be avoided as they contribute to response error (Fink 2003). Questions should also be relevant and related to each other in a meaningful way. Negative phrasing should be avoided as respondents may inadvertently miss the negative qualifier if reading quickly (Babbie 1990; Punch 1998). Finally, it is suggested that where possible questions should be adapted from questions that have been successfully used in other surveys providing the context is appropriate (Fink 2003; Fowler 1993; Sudman and Bradburn 1982). This is consistent with the argument that the wording of a question is critical to maximising survey validity (Sudman and Bradburn 1982, Malhotra 2004).

With regard to question format, researchers must also decide between open-ended and close-ended questions. Open-ended questions allow for a greater variety of response that might otherwise be missed, but conversely they also allow for responses that may not match the intent of the question. Open-ended questions
are also more labourious with regard to data entry. Close-ended questions are easier to process but need to be constructed to provide all possible responses; this may require the inclusion of a category such as ‘other’. Further, the stated responses should ideally be mutually exclusive (Babbie 1990).

Another issue to be considered is whether a middle alternative should be provided in response to bipolar questions; that is questions in which respondents are asked to choose between two opposite positions. The reason for eliminating this option of indifference is that it forces respondents to take a stand in a particular direction. An opposing view suggests that respondents should not be forced to take a position, and that the middle-of-the-road position provides valuable information as to the intensity of the respondent’s view (Converse and Presser 1986). In terms of listing responses, it is suggested that the least socially desirable response be listed first to increase the likelihood that the respondent will read all possible answers.

Question order must also be considered to reduce any potential biasing effect; unfortunately there is no clear guidance as to when an order effect will occur (Sudman and Bradburn 1982). Researchers need to be aware that answers to some questions may have implications for subsequent questions in terms of providing a context, either intended or unintended, in which they will be answered. Researchers should be aware that survey validity may suffer from fatigue effects when respondents are required to address long lists of items or questions. In general, surveys should commence with the easiest questions and progress to those that may require more thought (Bourque and Fielder 2003).
Similarly, questions should also be presented in a logical order with general questions preceding specific ones. With regard to questions seeking demographic information, there is some dispute as to whether they are best placed at the beginning or the end of the survey (Bourque and Fielder 2003). The reasons for placing these questions at the end are because they may be perceived by the respondent as either boring or perhaps personal. In either instance, the upfront placement of these questions may impact on the likelihood of completion. On the other hand, an argument can be made for commencing the survey with these questions. That is, the questions are easy for the respondent to answer and the likelihood that they will be answered is maximised.

Due to the lack of interviewer presence, specific strategies have been recommended for developing self-administered questionnaires that focus on maximising user-friendliness and minimising error (Bourque and Fielder 2003; Fowler 1993). In general, it is essential that questions are unambiguous and detailed instructions are given (Malhotra 2004). Close-ended questions are particularly recommended and researchers should strive to format questions so they can be answered in the same way. Further, questions should be as short as possible and the instances where a respondent may be required to skip a question should be minimised.

In general, the instructions that accompany a survey are another important influence on the accuracy of the information gathered and are critical in the case of self-administered surveys. Instructions contained within a self-administered survey can be divided into three categories: general instructions, transitional
instructions and question-answering instructions (Bourque and Fielder 2003). General instructions include an introduction to the survey, a statement relating to the researcher’s interest in the respondent’s attitudes, experiences and opinions as well as instructions as to what the respondent should do with the completed survey. Transitional instructions advise the respondent that the question topic is changing or provide a context within which a question should be answered. Finally, question-answering instructions provide respondents information as to how to answer the questions, for example by circling the appropriate response.

The format of the survey also impacts on both the accuracy of response and completion rate. The format should assist the respondent in moving through the document. In general, it is suggested that questionnaires should be between four and twelve pages with adequate spacing between questions using 12 point type in an easy to read font (Bourque and Fielder 2003). To maximise legibility, italics should be avoided and it is preferable to use bold or capitals if emphasis is required. Questions should never be split between pages and response codes should clearly correspond to the relevant alternative. The survey should end with instructions as to what to do with the completed questionnaire and the respondent should be thanked for their time and effort.

Prior to administering the survey, it should be reviewed by experts as well as by potential respondents to allow the instrument to be fine-tuned (Fink 2003; Fowler 1993). It is particularly important to pre-test self-administered surveys as there is no interviewer to clarify what is required of the respondent. It is suggested that the best way to pre-test in this circumstance is by having a group of respondents
fill out the survey and then conducting a discussion with the respondents regarding clarity of instructions and questions as well as comprehension. Finally, a pre-test will also indicate the time required to complete the questionnaire. Researchers must strike a balance between collecting all of the information they require and ensuring that the accuracy and completeness of responses do not suffer as a result of respondent fatigue.

The specific design considerations for the surveys used in this research study will be described in section 3.4.4. The surveys are provided in Appendix 5.

3.4 Method

The following section will outline the details of how the research study was conducted including the research design, operationalisation of variables, sample, pilot study and administration of the survey instrument. A justification for the method is also provided.

3.4.1 Experimental design

The design for this study followed the classical experimental design as depicted diagrammatically at Figure 3.2. This experimental design is one of the most frequently used designs to measure attitude change (Petty and Cacioppo 1981).
Figure 3.2  Pre-test/post-test four group design

X = exposure to the independent variable  
O = measurement of dependent variable  
R = participants randomly assigned to each group

Source: Adapted from Hoyle et al. 2002.

Subjects were randomly assigned to each of the following four groups: cause-related marketing, sponsorship, sales promotion or control. This random process is essential to the effectiveness of the experimental design in terms of the ability to later draw causal inferences about the independent variable (Babbie 2001; Hoyle et al. 2002). Randomisation is generally favoured with a large pool of subjects and furthermore, most statistics that will be used in the analysis will assume randomisation (Babbie 2001). Random assignment, however, is only one method to achieve comparable groups, matching is another alternative but was rejected for the purposes of this study. This process involves matching subjects based on a number of relevant characteristics and then assigning one subject to the control group and the other to the experimental group. However, matching is often impractical due to the difficulty in identifying in advance the relevant characteristics to be used in the matching process. Also, it can become unwieldy to match on more than a couple of characteristics (Punch 1998).

As this study followed the classical experimental design, a pre-test was undertaken. The pre-test was in the form of a self-administered survey that was
identical for all experimental groups as well as the control group. The three experimental groups were then exposed to the relevant stimuli and all four groups completed a post-test self-administered survey. The benefit of using a pre-test is that it allows for a more precise measure of the effect of the treatment (Christensen 1994; Hoyle et al. 2002). Unfortunately, a pre-test can also sensitise participants and introduce a bias into the post-test responses, thereby affecting the validity of the experiment (Christensen 2002). For this study, it was perceived that the benefit, in terms of achieving a benchmark of the pre-existing attitude to the brand, outweighed the risk. Measures were taken to minimise the risk, for example, allowing class time to elapse between the pre-test and post-test. Also, the order of the questions was manipulated to ensure maximum distance between scales that were repeated in the post-test. The survey administration is discussed in detail in section 3.4.7.

3.4.2 Treatment of variables

Response to marketing stimuli is measured by the dependent variables of attitude to the strategy, attitude to the brand, or more specifically the change in brand attitude, as well as purchase intention. The operationalisation of these variables will be discussed in section 3.4.2.2. Based on the literature examined in Chapter 2, it is hypothesised that consumer response is moderated by the values of the consumer, their loyalty to the brand and the perceived fit between the brand and cause. The operationalisation of these covariates will be discussed in section 3.4.2.3. In all cases, existing scales were used, although most scales required modification for this study. The scales in their original form can be referred to in Appendix 4 and the survey instruments can be referred to in Appendix 5.
Chapter Three: Methodology and Method

Adapting existing questions reduced potential error due to the survey instrument (Fink 2003; Fowler 1993). Punch (1998) advocates using an existing instrument, particularly to measure a variable that is central to the research study. The scales were selected on the basis of their appropriateness for this study, their reliability and ease of use by both the researcher and respondent. It has been suggested that for measures that have been used previously and undergone refinements, reliability levels should be expected to be in excess of .70 (Burns and Bush 2000). The reliability of the measuring instrument refers to the extent to which it is free from random error (Hoyle et al. 2002). The internal consistency of an instrument is a good indicator of reliability and the preferred measure of this characteristic is Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (Hoyle et al. 2002). The reliability of each scale was measured using a reliability coefficient alpha, as advocated by Nunnally (1978). The purpose of this measure is to ascertain the extent to which the results can be repeated.

The following sections will describe the treatment of the variables, commencing with the independent variables, that is, the stimuli relating to the experimental groups.

3.4.2.1 Independent variables and stimuli

As discussed, the independent variables for this study relate to three stimuli:

- Stimulus A: Exposure to cause-related marketing
- Stimulus B: Exposure to sponsorship
- Stimulus C: Exposure to sales promotion

In addition, gender was treated as an independent variable and was self-reported in the survey. The three stimuli indicated above were directed at three treatment
groups and a control group was also included. As such, a $4 \times 2$ factorial design was used.

The development of the stimuli for each group required decisions relating to a number of elements including a product/brand, cause, sponsored organisation, type of sales promotion, financial aspects relating to each strategy and format of stimuli. Each will be discussed as follows.

**The product.** Given that the proposed model hypothesised that existing brand loyalty might impact on consumers’ response to cause-related marketing, it was necessary to use a real brand in the study. Prior to selecting a specific brand to be used in the stimuli, the product category needed to be determined. Several factors were considered as follows.

First, to maximise the amount of data collected, the product category had to be one that was both familiar to, and likely to be used by, the sample. Second, given that it was intended that the findings from this research study would be of practical significance and relevance to marketing managers, a review of cause-related marketing campaigns was undertaken to determine the product or service categories that are most likely to use this strategy (see Appendix 2). Fast-moving consumer goods are most prevalent in cause-related marketing. This category was one of the first to explore and benefit from cause-related marketing strategies (DeNitto 1989). As the study sought to compare consumer responses to cause-related marketing with sponsorship and sales promotion, this category had to fit well with usage of the latter two marketing strategies. Prior research also suggests
that cause-related marketing is an effective strategy in a parity market where price and value are equal (Barone et al. 2000). Finally, the product category needed to be one that would most likely be personally purchased by the majority of the sample. Given the age of many of the respondents, it would be likely that many purchase decisions for fast moving consumer goods products for the household would be made by parents.

The product category that was ultimately selected was soft drinks. The next task was to select a particular brand based on a number of considerations. First, to determine whether consumers’ response to a cause-related marketing strategy covaried with brand loyalty, the selected brand would need to have varying degrees of loyalty among the sample so this could be tested. Secondly, the brand needed to be reasonably well known so that attitude to the brand could be measured in the pre-test. Given these criteria and limitations, it was decided to use Schweppes Lemonade (regular or diet) as the brand referred to in the stimuli. Both the product category and brand had no history of involvement with cause-related marketing.

The cause. In developing the stimulus for the cause-related marketing treatment group, a specific cause had to be selected. A number of issues were considered. First, based on the literature, it is hypothesised that a consumer’s perception of fit between the brand and the cause would covary with that consumer’s response toward a brand participating in a cause-related marketing campaign. As such, the selected cause would ideally be perceived by the sample as having varying degrees of fit. For example, the alliance between Pal Dog Food and the Royal
Guide Dogs would be likely to have a consistently high degree of perceived fit and therefore would not be suitable for this study.

The type of cause, that is, a social, environmental or arts-related cause, was selected again based on reviewing the types of causes sponsored in past cause-related marketing campaigns (see Appendix 2). As discussed in the literature, cause-related marketing generally refers to alliances with community or social causes as opposed to the arts or sport. The literature also suggests that consumers’ response to cause-related marketing is affected by their perceived relevance of the cause.

The selected cause was homeless youth shelters. It was deemed that the sample would be able to empathise with contemporaries of a similar age, but less fortunate than themselves. At the same time, a decision was made not to select a cause that could possibly arouse a high degree of empathy and thus engender a bias in the response, for example children’s charities. Given the target market for Schweppes Lemonade, varying perceptions of fit between the brand and the cause were anticipated.

Finally, the structure of cause-related marketing campaigns is such that they may raise funds (and awareness) for a specific organisation, for example the Royal Guide Dogs, or for a cause in general, for example breast cancer research. It was decided not to use a specific organisation to remove any bias in the response that may be generated by the attitude to that nonprofit organisation, as this was not being tested.
The organisation sponsored. In developing the stimulus for the sponsorship treatment group, a sponsored organisation needed to be chosen. A number of factors contributed to the selection of the organisation. First, the decision was made to choose a sport as opposed to an arts organisation. In Australia, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1999), the value of sports sponsorship in 1996-97 was $281.9 million, significantly greater than any other area of sponsorship including the $29.2 million spent on arts sponsorship. In addition, it was decided that both the cause and organisation sponsored should be local. Studies conducted by Ross et al. (1991, 1992) suggest that consumer response to cause-related marketing may be affected by whether the cause is local or national. Therefore, it was deemed important that the cause and the sponsored organisation were either both local or both national to remove a potential confound. Finally, the sport had to be relevant to the sample without being overly popular, as in the case of rugby league. As such, the local Australian Rules football club, the Brisbane Lions, was chosen. To minimise response error, it was deemed to be too confusing to refer to ‘the local football team’ instead of a particular organisation. The attention of the respondents could be diverted to wondering which team, Brisbane’s Aussie Rules team, the Rugby team or a suburban club. The assumption of the respondent could then affect his or her response in a way that might differ to another respondent.

Sales promotion. The sales promotion featured in the stimulus for the last treatment group was a discount, as this is a common consumer sales promotion used by soft drink brands. Also, a promotion in the form of tangible savings to the consumer was anticipated to be more relevant to the sample than a
competition, extra value or a free gift, given the budget limitations that students often face.

Chandon et al. (2000) propose that consumers derive a number of hedonic and utilitarian benefits from sales promotion. Hedonic benefits include value expression as a result of the consumer perceiving themselves to be an astute shopper and reaffirms personal values; entertainment due to the fun or interest created; and exploration benefits by providing stimulation and fulfilling consumers’ need for information. Utilitarian benefits include the obvious monetary saving in addition to a quality benefit by allowing consumers to upgrade to previously unaffordable brands and a convenience benefit by reducing consumer search time due to the obvious promotion signals and visibility of the brand. Chandon et al. (2000) suggest that different types of sales promotions offer consumers different benefits and that there is some value in appropriately matching the sales promotions and the product, particularly for those with high brand equity. Nonmonetary promotions offer more hedonic benefits and are relatively more effective for hedonic products. On the other hand, monetary promotions are more effective for utilitarian products. Given the nature of the product category featured in the stimulus, a monetary promotion was deemed to be most appropriate.

**Details of the strategy.** To reduce the impact of extraneous variables interfering with the response to the stimuli, with the exception of the type of strategy, the details of the campaigns were kept as similar as possible. In addition, it was hypothesised that a consumer’s attitude toward the strategy will covary with that
consumer’s response toward a brand participating in cause-related marketing. As such, in the case of sponsorship and cause-related marketing, the total financial contribution was the same at $200,000. In the case of cause-related marketing contribution and the sales promotion discount, the financial contribution was also the same at 20 cents per 1.25 litre bottle. These amounts were decided upon after reviewing financial contributions by fast moving consumer goods companies participating in cause-related marketing, for both total contribution and contribution per unit purchased (see Appendix 2), as well as feasible consumer discounts offered by soft drink manufacturers.

**Presentation of independent variable.** The final decision relating to the formulation of the independent variable was how the stimuli should be presented to the experimental groups. It was decided to present a brief description of the marketing campaign at the beginning of the post-test survey. The clarity of this information was confirmed in a pilot test, as outlined in section 3.4.6.

The manipulation of instructions is one of the basic techniques used to create variation in the independent variable (Christensen 1996). The risks of using this method include the potential for inattention on the part of the respondent or that the interpretation of the instructions by respondent may vary. Either outcome will alter the independent variable. For this reason, the instructions to each of the treatment groups were kept to one short paragraph prominently displayed above the first question, as opposed to appearing on a separate piece of paper.
3.4.2.2 Dependent variables

A summary of the reliability achieved with the scales used to measure the dependent variables is shown at Table 3.2. The reliabilities were acceptable as all scales achieved a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of greater than .85. In terms of standards of reliability, Nunnally (1978) recommends that .70 is sufficient, but where important decisions hinge on the results, then .90 should be the desired minimum.

Table 3.2 Item reliabilities for dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA</th>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE TO THE STRATEGY*</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE TO THE BRAND</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASE INTENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current study; n = 135
* n= 96

Attitude toward the strategy was measured using a modification of a 5-item, 9-point semantic differential rating scale (Burton and Lichtenstein 1988; Lichtenstein and Bearden 1989). The scale uses the following anchors in response to the statement ‘My attitude toward this deal is’: favourable/unfavourable, bad/good, harmful/beneficial, attractive/unattractive, poor/excellent. The final item has the anchors of strongly disagree/strongly agree in response to the statement ‘I like this deal’. For the purpose of this study, the first two statements were changed to: ‘My attitude toward this marketing campaign is…’ and ‘I like this marketing campaign.’ In addition, the anchors attractive/unattractive were reversed to be consistent with the other items. Finally, a 7-point scale was used to be consistent with the majority of the items in the survey. In terms of reliability,
Burton and Lichtenstein (1988) and Lichtenstein and Bearden (1989) report alphas of .92 and .95 respectively. The current study achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .96.

The construct of attitude toward the brand was operationalised using a 7-point semantic differential scale (Batra and Ahtola 1988). This scale measures the pleasure-related aspects of a consumer’s attitude toward a product anchored by the descriptors: bad/good, unfavourable/favourable, disagreeable/agreeable, unpleasant/pleasant, negative/positive and dislike/like. The reliability of a four and six item version of this scale were reported as having alphas of .85 and .96 respectively. In the current study, the scale achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 in the pre-treatment survey and .93 post-treatment. Change in brand attitude was measured by taking the difference between the pre-treatment and post-treatment measure for each of the four groups (refer Figure 3.2).

The construct of purchase intention was measured using a 3-item, 7-point Likert-type scale (Baker and Churchill 1977). Respondents are asked whether they would like to try the product, would they buy the product if they saw it in a store and would they actively seek out the product to purchase it. With regard to reliability, several researchers have reported alphas ranging from .73 to .91 (Kilbourne 1986; Kilbourne, Painton and Ridley 1985; Perrien, Dussart and Paul 1985; Okechuku and Wang 1988). In the current study, the scale achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .87.
3.4.2.3 Covariates

The covariates of consumer values, brand loyalty and perceived fit, between brand and cause, sport or promotion, were identified as potential confounds to the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. It is essential to control for these variables to remove their effects (Punch 1998). Table 3.3 summarises the item reliability for each of the constructs measured.

Table 3.3 Item reliabilities for covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA PRE-TEST</th>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF VALUES</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED FIT*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND LOYALTY</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current study; n = 135.
*n = 96

The reliabilities for the scales were acceptable, with the exception of brand loyalty. The other two scales had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of greater than .90. As discussed in the previous section, Nunnally (1978) recommends that .70 is sufficient, but .90 should be the desired minimum for critical decisions. Given the alpha of .62 for brand loyalty, this construct was discarded as a covariate. It is surmised that the low involvement nature of the product may have impacted on the reliability of the scale.

The construct of consumer values was operationalised using the *List of Values (LOV)* (Kahle 1983). The development of the LOV was subject to a number of influences including Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and the Rokeach Value Survey
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(RVS). The LOV is much easier to administer than the RVS, takes less of respondents’ time and is more relevant to consumer behaviour (Beatty et al. 1985). The LOV consists of nine values: sense of belonging, excitement, warm relationship with others, self-fulfillment, being well-respected, fun and enjoyment of life, security, self-respect and a sense of accomplishment. These values can be rated on a 9-point scale (very unimportant to very important) or can be ranked in order (most to least important). The validity of this scale has been confirmed by other researchers and has been used in previous research in the area of cause-related marketing (see Kropp et al. 1999). For the purposes of this research study, respondents were simply asked to rate the importance of each of the nine values. In addition, a 7-point scale was used to be consistent with the majority of the other scales used in the surveys. In the current study, the scale achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .94.

Perceived fit was measured by adapting a scale developed to measure the fit of a proposed brand extension (Keller and Aaker 1992). The scale is a 3-item, 7-point semantic differential with reliabilities reported by the authors to be in excess of .70. For the purpose of this research study, the original wording in the first of the three items, which referred to fit between company and product, was replaced with wording referring to product and cause, product and sport or product and promotion. For example, the anchors for the first item were ‘Bad fit between product and cause’ and ‘Good fit between product and cause’. The anchors for the second item changed the word ‘company’ for ‘product’: ‘Not at all logical for product’ and ‘Very logical for product’. The anchors for the third item were
changed in the same way, ‘Not at all appropriate for product’ and ‘Very appropriate for product.’ The current study achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of .91.

The construct of brand loyalty was operationalised by adapting a scale developed to measure store loyalty (Sirgy, Johar, Samli and Claiborne 1991). This scale is a 3-item, 5-point rating scale with reliability reported as an alpha of .85. This scale was modified to reflect the Schweppes Lemonade brands as opposed to a store. For example, the first question: ‘How often do you buy here?’ was changed to: ‘How often do you buy Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade?’ The second question: ‘How would you characterise your loyalty to this store?’ was changed to ‘How would you characterise your loyalty to Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade?’ The third question: ‘How would you rate this store compared to your ideal store?’ was changed to: ‘How would you rate Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade compared to your ideal lemonade?’ In the current study, the scale achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of only .62 and as a result the construct of brand loyalty was discarded as a covariate.

3.4.3 Sample

A convenience sample of university students was used for this study due to the ease in satisfying the requirements of an experimental design for a homogeneous sample that can be divided into subgroups (Babbie 2001; Punch 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001) as well as due to budgetary considerations. Given the similarities between the groups, it is easier to assign causality to the treatment as opposed to differences between groups. A homogeneous sample is preferred when the research goal is theoretical explanation (Sternthal, Tybout and Calder
1994). The more similar the respondents, the more likely the experimental treatment will affect all participants the same way. One of the drawbacks of using a student sample, however, is the difficulty in generalising the results of the research to the rest of the population. Babbie (2001) suggests that this weakness is less significant in explanatory research. He states, ‘Social processes and patterns of causal relationships appear to be more generalizable and more stable than specific characteristics such as an individual’s level of prejudice’ (p.221).

The convenience sample was drawn from undergraduate and postgraduate students at an Australian East Coast University. It was believed that this sample would provide a gender balance as well as a range in age reflecting a mix of both school-leavers and mature age part-time students. Data were collected from the control and treatment groups via self-administered survey as previously discussed.

The sample size was determined based on the guidelines outlined by Roscoe (1975) and advocated by Sekaran (2000). Specifically, for tightly controlled experimental research, sample sizes of 10 to 20 may be appropriate. However, for multivariate analysis, the sample size should be 10 times or more as large as the number of variables. In the case of the current study, those guidelines would indicate a sample of 30. Roscoe (1975) also indicates that a sample size of 30 or larger will usually ensure the benefits of the central limit theorem. However, the author also concedes that choice of sample size is often a function of budgetary constraints, and a carefully selected small sample is preferable to a poorly selected large sample. Hair et al. (1998) also suggests that the sample sizes required for
MANOVA should be larger than the number of dependent variables and a suggested minimum is 20 observations for each group.

The total sample size for this research was 200, with 50 students randomly allocated to each of the four groups. The total number of usable questionnaires was 170. Three of the groups were approximately equal in size, with a smaller group of 28 participants for the sales promotion treatment group. The primary analysis method chosen, that is multivariate analysis of covariance, allows for differences in group size (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black 1998). Further details on the profile of the sample are provided in Chapter 4.

3.4.4 Survey instrument

The survey instrument used in this research study was designed using the established principles of questionnaire design as discussed in section 3.3.3 in an effort to maximise both the reliability and validity of the instrument and therefore the quantity and quality of response. To minimize response error, several factors were taken into consideration. First, questions related to respondents’ personal details and attitudes, therefore they possessed the data or knowledge to answer the questions. The questions followed a logical flow and some additional questions were added to assist this. For example, prior to determining respondents’ brand loyalty, usage of the category and the brand were determined. Finally, to minimise the potential for fatigue, survey questions were kept to a minimum and were either directly related to the variables identified in the model or served to assist with the flow as described.
The question format was close-ended, as recommended for self-administered questionnaires (Bourque and Fielder 2003; Fowler 1993). Questions were well-spaced with clear instruction as required. Respondents were consistently asked to circle their responses and a middle alternative was provided. Given the low involvement product referred to in the study, it was anticipated that an attitude of indifference may in fact be valid. As the survey was relatively short, two and a half pages for the pre-test and two pages for the post-test, the demographic questions were positioned at the start of the pre-treatment survey as a way of easing the respondents into the questions.

Five surveys were developed for this research; one uniform survey was administered to all four groups in the pre-test and four different surveys, one for each group, were used in the post-test. Each survey included a cover page explaining the focus of the survey, the number of questions, instructions as to what to do with the completed survey and a brief note thanking the participant.

The pre-treatment or pre-test survey commenced with the List of Values and demographic questions before moving on to the specific questions relating to soft drink consumption and brand attitude. The post-test surveys commenced with the presentation of the independent variable, that is, a description of the relevant marketing strategy as stated in section 3.4.2.1. Respondents were then asked attitudinal questions relating to the following: the marketing campaign; the perceived fit between the brand and the cause, sport or promotion; attitude toward the brand; and purchase intention. Scales were either 5-point or 7-point, thus including a middle point, or point of indifference. As described in the previous
section, existing scales were adapted where possible. Question-answering instructions consistently requested that respondents circle one answer. The pilot test and administration of the survey are discussed in sections 3.4.6 and 3.4.7 respectively.

3.4.5 Ethical considerations

The proposal for this research was reviewed by the Secretary of the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee. It was determined that the nature of the study did not require the approval of the Committee. The guidelines of the Committee, however, were followed in undertaking this research. That is, participation in the research was voluntary, all responses were anonymous and respondents were debriefed following the post-test survey.

3.4.6 Pilot test

Prior to undertaking the study, the questionnaire was reviewed by experienced researchers as well as subjected to a pilot. A pilot test is generally recommended prior to finalising the questionnaire (Fink 2003; Fowler 1993). Pilot testing is used to test both individual questions and the questionnaire as a whole. The purpose is to improve the reliability of the measuring instrument (Creswell 1994; Neuman 2003). Individual items can be examined for a number of reasons such as to ensure variation in answers, understanding by respondents, potential for nonresponse, scalability, potential to respond in agreement and development of appropriate response categories. In addition, the entire questionnaire should be evaluated for flow of questions, question skips, timing and respondent attention (Babbie 1990; Burns and Bush 2000; deVaus 1995). It is also recommended that
participants in the pilot study be interviewed regarding the various aspects of the entire experimental procedure including their understanding of what is required and their ‘…belief in the cover story’ (Hoyle et al. 2002, p.297). It is suggested that a pilot of five to ten respondents is sufficient to identify problems with a questionnaire (Burns and Bush 2000).

Consistent with the above guidelines, the pilot study asked six people to complete the questionnaire using the procedure that would be used with the sample, with the exception that no intervening time elapsed between the pre- and post-treatment surveys. Upon completion, respondents were interviewed regarding the following issues:

- ease of understanding the instructions contained on cover page and instructions as to how to respond to each question;
- ease of understanding the stimulus material; and
- ease of understanding what each question was asking.

The time for completion for both surveys was noted and deemed to be acceptable, as it was less than 10 minutes. It was assumed that the short completion time would minimise the chance of respondent fatigue; that is, respondents becoming bored or impatient and thus skipping questions or answering without fully contemplating the question. Competed surveys were examined for non-response, variation in responses and appropriateness of response in terms of correct application of the scale. No changes were made to the survey instrument as a result of the pilot study. The survey was then undertaken with the sample, as discussed in the following section.
3.4.7 Survey administration

The survey instrument was self-administered and the data were collected during class time, however, students were made aware that participation was voluntary. Distributing and completing the questionnaire in class overcame one of the key disadvantages with self-administered surveys; that is, the risk that the survey will not be returned. In addition, the possibility of answering questions incorrectly was reduced by the respondents having an opportunity to ask for clarification from the person distributing the questionnaire.

The surveys were distributed in four classes, to 126 undergraduate and 74 postgraduate students, for a total of 200 students. The first survey, or pre-treatment survey, was identical for all groups and distributed at the beginning of class. Once the survey was completed students were asked to place it in an envelope and retain.

At the end of class, students were asked to complete a second survey. There were four different versions of this survey that were randomly distributed. Each version was distributed to 50 students, for a total distribution of 200 surveys. The post-treatment survey included information describing a specific marketing campaign relating to the brand, either a cause-related marketing initiative, a sponsorship arrangement or a sales promotion. The control group merely received a description of packaging size, which was also included in the scenarios received by the treatment groups. The survey then asked students in the experimental groups about their attitude to the strategy and perceived fit between the cause, sport or promotion, and the brand. All groups were asked about their attitude to
the brand and purchase intention. Students then placed the second completed survey in the envelope containing the first survey.

Finally, students were debriefed in terms of being made aware that the marketing strategies described were for the purposes of research, and did not reflect any activity, existing or planned, by Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade. The full set of surveys can be referred to in Appendix 5.

3.4.8 Validity of the experiment

With regard to an experimental design, internal validity means that the relationships between the variables of interest to the study have been correctly interpreted. It relates to the question as to whether the independent variable brought about the changes to the dependent variable as opposed to other extraneous variables (Babbie 2001; Hoyle et al. 2002; Punch 1998). At a minimum, it is imperative that an experiment is internally valid for the results to be of any value (Campbell and Stanley 1972). A number of threats to internal validity are commonly referred to in the research literature (Babbie 2001; Campbell and Stanley 1972; Patzer 1996; Punch 1998). These threats include the impact of history, subject maturation, the testing process, inconsistency of instrumentation, statistical issues, selection bias, experimental mortality, causal time order, contamination of control group, compensatory behaviour, rivalry between groups and demoralization. In general, the classical experimental design is well-equipped to deal with most of these threats, however, the following discussion will address each issue.
Given the design of this research study, many of these threats were not relevant. For example, as the pre-test and post-test in the experiment were conducted within two hours of each other, the threat of intervening historical events was not relevant nor was experimental mortality as no subjects withdrew from the experiment. Further, the maturation of subjects is not likely to have had a significant influence. Contamination of the control group, causal time order, compensatory behaviour, rivalry between groups and potential demoralisation were also not a concern given the design of the experiment. The post-test immediately followed exposure to the treatment and subjects were unaware which group they were in or what the ‘stimulus’ was. As no group was deprived of anything, there was no inadvertent compensation, nor was anyone in the position to do so.

As such, the main threats to internal validity for this research study related to the testing process itself, selection bias, inconsistency of instrumentation and statistical regression. As the process of testing and retesting can impact on subjects’ behaviour, this possibility was controlled for by allowing class time to elapse between the pre-test and post-test. In addition, the presence of a control group can assist with measuring this impact. Selection bias was dealt with by randomly assigning students to each of the groups as described previously. With regard to inconsistency of instrumentation, for a measure that was compared pre- and post-test, the same scale was used as advocated by Sudman and Bradburn (1982). Finally, statistical issues can occur due to extreme values relating to the dependent variable either due to a lack of homogeneity across the groups or because subjects tend to score very high or very low on that variable. In the case
of this research study, this threat was minimised due to the homogeneity of the sample as well as the careful selection of the product that was the focus of the study. The latter was discussed in section 3.4.2.1.

With experimental design, external validity is generally a greater concern than internal validity. External validity relates to the ability to generalise the experiment findings to the real world (Babbie 2001; Campbell and Stanley 1972; Punch 1998). Experiments conducted within a contrived setting are particularly prone to being externally invalid. These criticisms relate to the unrealistic nature of non-field experiments as well as the fact that participants may be subject to reactivity. For example, they may behave differently in an experiment because they know it is a study or because of a desire to please the researcher. The nature of laboratory, or non-field, experiments is such that there is less control over external validity. Therefore, the ability to generalise the findings from this research study to the general population will be subject to a number of limitations. These limitations will be discussed fully in Chapter 5. However, it should be noted that the design of this research study sought to compare the dependent variable between groups as opposed to focusing on the results of any one group.

### 3.5 Data analysis

This section will discuss the initial screening of the data, the examination of the data for missing values and outliers, and the selection of analysis methods. The section will commence with the justification for the selection of the analysis techniques.
3.5.1 Justification of analysis techniques

A number of factors including the type of research question, the number of independent and dependent variables and the existence of covariates determined the choice of statistical technique for analysing the data generated by this study. Based on these criteria, a decision tree of analytical options outlined by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) indicated that the recommended statistical technique would be factorial multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). The goal of this analysis is to ‘…create a linear combination of DVs to maximize mean group differences’ (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001, p.27).

In general, the research questions for this study sought to determine whether the dependent variables, that is attitude to the strategy, attitude to the brand and purchase intention, would differ by group, that is, cause-related marketing, sponsorship, sales promotion and control. In addition, several covariates were identified such as brand loyalty, consumer values and perceived fit between the brand and the cause, sport or promotion. Based on criteria outlined by Hair et al. (1998), the number of variables, and the non-metric nature of the independent variables and metric nature of the dependent variables also indicated that multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) should be used in conjunction with MANCOVA. As stated by Hair et al. (1998, p.14), MANOVA ‘…is a statistical technique that can be used to simultaneously explore the relationship between several categorical independent variables (usually referred to as treatments) and two or more metric variables.’ In addition, Hair et al. (1998, p.14) suggest that MANCOVA ‘…can be used in conjunction with MANOVA to remove (after the experiment) the effect of any uncontrolled independent variables on the dependent
variables.’ Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) also suggest that for experiments, MANCOVA ‘…serves as a noise-reducing device’ (p.324). Variance attributed to the covariates is removed from the error variance. Finally, Hair et al. (1998) advise that, ‘Both ANOVA and MANOVA are particularly useful when used in conjunction with experimental designs…’ (p.327).

Wherever possible in the data analysis, MANOVA or MANCOVA is used in preference to analysis of variance (ANOVA) or analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). MANOVA has several advantages in comparison with ANOVA. For example, measuring more than one dependent variable increases the likelihood of discovering the impact of different treatments. In addition, using MANOVA as opposed to separate ANOVAs reduces TYPE I error. On the other hand, MANOVA is more complicated than ANOVA and it can sometimes be difficult achieve a clear interpretation of the effect of independent variables on a single dependent variable.

3.5.2 Data screening

Upon collecting and entering the data, the analysis process commenced with data screening. Prior to analysing the data, a critical first step is to examine the basic characteristics of the data in order to assist with the application of a multivariate analysis model as well as an interpretation of the results (Hair et al. 1998). As discussed in section 3.4.6, 200 surveys were distributed to undergraduate and postgraduate business students, resulting in 170 completed surveys, a response rate of 85 percent. Although there is no clear agreement on an acceptable response rate, it has been suggested that a response rate of at least 75 percent
means that the results will not be significantly affected by a nonresponse bias, if it in fact exists (Babbie 2001; Hoyle et al. 2002; Neuman 2003). The data from these surveys were first screened to identify out-of-range values by examining the minimum and maximum values for each question, as well as ensuring the means and standard deviations were credible (Tabachnick and Fidell 2002). There were no out-of-range values. The next step was to examine the data for missing values and outliers. The investigation of these two areas will be discussed in the following sections.

3.5.3 Missing values

It was discovered that 35 cases, or 20 percent of the sample, contained missing data. The majority of data missing was evident in questions related directly to the measurement of the dependent variables. Using the Missing Value Analysis function in SPSS, it was determined that the 35 cases had missing data ranging from 1 to 27 items, as shown in Appendix 6. It was also discovered that three cases were missing more than 40 percent of the data. Given this extremely high level of missing data, these three cases were eliminated prior to further analysis. The level of missing data for each variable was also examined, as shown in Appendix 7. It was found that 28 of the 42 variables contained missing data, ranging from 1 case to 14 cases, or 8.4 percent, when viewing all four groups in total. Upon examining the groups individually, it was discovered that the sponsorship group had the greatest amount of missing data for any variable, with eight cases or 18.2 percent on six items.
Analysis of the cases with missing values revealed no obvious pattern in the type of data missing. The data were then examined to determine whether the missing data were random in their distribution across cases and variables. Again, using SPSS Missing Values Analysis, groups were formed based on cases with missing values for each variable and compared to cases with valid data for that variable. The means for each group were compared using t-tests. This analysis was performed separately for each of the experimental groups. Using a significance level of \(p < .05\), the 2-tail analysis showed a difference between the means on a small number of variables. However, for these variables in question, given the small number of cases with missing values, it was not deemed to be of concern.

It was subsequently decided that all cases with missing values would be deleted given the critical nature of the missing data to the analysis and the random pattern in the missing data. Missing values can be handled in a number of ways. The most common approach is to either delete cases with missing data or estimate the value by using the mean for the group or by using a regression equation generated by cases with complete data (Hair et al. 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). Choosing the appropriate method is dependent on both the extent and pattern of missing data.

Mean substitution is primarily recommended when the pattern in the missing data is nonrandom, or when the amount of missing data is very small (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). However, the missing data for the current study were random and were discovered for critical variables. The cases with missing values were therefore deleted. One of the drawbacks to deleting missing values is the
reduction of sample size (Hair et al. 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). It has been recommended that the sample sizes required for MANOVA, which are greater than required for ANOVA, should be larger than the number of dependent variables and a suggested minimum is 20 observations for each group (Hair et al. 1998). As such, even with the reduction of the sample size due to deletion of cases with missing values, each group exceeds the recommended minimum.

After deleting cases with missing values, 135 cases remained or 80 percent of the original 170 surveys. The details of the sample size and demographics for each of the control and treatment groups are presented in Chapter 4.

### 3.5.4 Outliers

The next step in the data screening was to identify outliers in the data. It has been suggested that MANOVA and ANOVA are very sensitive to outliers and therefore before proceeding with analysis, outliers should be identified and potentially eliminated to prevent them from having a disproportionate influence over the results (Hair et al. 1998).

Univariate outliers are essentially cases with extreme values whereas multivariate outliers represent cases with an unusual combination of values that occur in the data. Outliers may occur for a number of reasons (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). First, the data may not have been entered or coded correctly and thus should be checked. Second, a missing value indicator may be interpreted as an actual value. Third, the outlier represents a member of a population that was not intended to be
included in the sample. Finally, the membership of that outlier is valid but its values are more extreme than a normal distribution.

The data were first checked for univariate outliers by examining z-scores. It was discovered that eight cases were outliers on the majority of the nine items in the List of Values scale. An investigation of the data suggests that these respondents most likely reverse-scored their answers. As a precaution, analysis was run both with and without those cases. The data were then examined for multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis distance. The analysis revealed only one outlier. It was decided to maintain the outliers in the sample. Researchers have been cautioned not to eliminate outliers too easily (Hair et al. 1998).

Upon completion of the data screening, testing of the hypotheses was undertaken using analysis of variance (ANOVA), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). The results of these tests are presented in Chapter 4.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter outlined the method used in testing the conceptual model developed in Chapter 2. A rationale for selecting a primarily positivist paradigm and using quantitative methods was presented. In addition, a description and justification of the research design, that is, a classical experimental design using self-administered questionnaires, was outlined. Details of sample selection, questionnaire design and administration were also provided. Finally, the data
screening and rationale for the selected data analysis method were discussed. The following chapter presents the findings of the research study.
4.0 FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 outlined the method used in the collection of the data for this research as well as the initial screening of the data. This chapter will present the descriptive statistics of the sample and the results of the hypothesis testing.

This study sought to address the following research questions:

*What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of (1) attitude to the strategy, (2) attitude toward the brand and (3) purchase intention?*

*Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?*

In examining these research questions a number of hypotheses were explored, as described below:

\[ H_1 \] Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2a} \] The change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2b} \] Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_3 \] Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

\[ H_4 \] Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.

\[ H_5 \] Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the
promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.

\[ H_6 \quad \text{Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.} \]

The findings of this research are discussed in the context of the literature in Chapter 5.

### 4.2 Sample description

As discussed in Chapter 3, after deleting the cases with missing values, 135 cases remained or 80 percent of the original 170 surveys. No cases were deleted as a result of outliers. Table 4.1 indicates the original sample size for each group and the sample size as a result of deleting cases with missing values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Original Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample Size with Missing Values Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause-related marketing (CRM)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship (SPONS)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion (SP)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicates the demographics for each of the control and treatment groups. The groups have a gender distribution of approximately 60 percent female, with the exception of the sales promotion group, which was 75 percent female. The mean age is early 20s, with the exception of the sponsorship group, which had a
mean age of 26 years. The group sample sizes were not equal. However, multivariate analysis of covariance allows for differences in group size (Hair et al. 1998).

Table 4.2 Demographics of final sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min/Max</td>
<td>18/37</td>
<td>18/52</td>
<td>19/48</td>
<td>18/53</td>
<td>18/53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Assumptions of ANOVA and MANOVA

Prior to commencing the analysis to test the hypotheses using ANCOVA and MANOVA, the data must be further examined to ensure that they conform to the assumptions upon which the test procedures are based. The following sections discuss each of the assumptions as outlined by Hair et al. (1998).

4.3.1 Independence

A fundamental assumption of both ANOVA and MANOVA is that there is independence in the data from each respondent. This assumption can be violated in an experimental situation due to noise or confusing instructions as well as other extraneous effects. There are no tests to identify potential dependence. In the
case of this research study, the design of the experiment was such that the potential for this assumption to be violated was minimal.

4.3.2 Equality of variance-covariance matrices

This assumption pertains to the equivalence of variance-covariance matrices of the dependent variables across the groups. If the sample sizes are equal, a violation of this assumption has minimal impact. However, if the sample sizes are unequal, then the Box test or Box’s M is generally used as a test for equality of covariance matrices. The Levene test is used to assess the equality of variance for a single variable across groups. For this analysis, one or both tests were applied depending on the type of analysis, ANCOVA or MANOVA. In all but one instance, this assumption was upheld. The results of the tests are stated in the presentation of the hypothesis tests.

4.3.3 Normality

This assumption relates to the normal distribution of the dependent variables. In the case of MANOVA, it assumes multivariate normality; that is, the normal distribution of the dependent variables and any combinations thereof. However, there is no direct test for multivariate normality, therefore univariate normality is generally used (Hair et al. 1998). Violations of this assumption can be tolerated for larger sample sizes, or moderate sample sizes if the differences are due to skewness, as opposed to outliers. Further, it has been suggested that even in the case of unequal sample sizes, a sample size of about 20 in the smallest cell should ensure robustness (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). Data were subjected to standard tests of normality of variance, Box’s M and Levene.
4.4 Results of hypothesis testing

This section will present the results of the tests for each of the hypotheses.

4.4.1 Hypothesis one

H1: Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.

The first hypothesis stated that consumers would have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they would to a sponsorship or sales promotion. Table 4.3 presents the mean scores of the attitude to the strategy for each of the three treatment groups. The control group is not included, as it was not subjected to a treatment, that is, a marketing campaign. Recall that the scale consisted of 6 items measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale, with 1 representing a less favourable or negative attitude and 7 representing a more favourable attitude. The means shown are the results of the summated scale.

Table 4.3 Means of the attitude to the strategy for the three treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-related marketing</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 4.3 indicate that those respondents who were exposed to a cause-related marketing strategy had a slightly more favourable attitude to the
strategy than those who were exposed to either the sponsorship or sales promotion.

In order to test whether the means were significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was not significant (F=.60, $df=2.93$, $p>.05$), indicating that the data do not violate the assumptions of variance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this analysis indicate that there is not a significant difference between consumers’ attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy and a sponsorship or sales promotion at a 95% confidence level (F=2.93, $df=2$, $p>.05$). As such, hypothesis one is not supported.

### 4.4.2 Hypothesis two

- $H_{2a}$ The change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

- $H_{2b}$ Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.
Hypothesis two stated that the change in brand attitude experienced by a consumer would be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion. In addition, it was hypothesised that the consumer’s purchase intention would also be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than to exposure to a sponsorship or sales promotion. Gender was also included as an independent variable in the analysis.

Brand attitude was measured on a 6-item, 7-point semantic differential scale where 1 indicated a negative or unfavourable attitude and 7 indicated a positive or favourable attitude. Brand attitude was measured both pre- and post-treatment. The scale was summated and the value given in the pre-treatment survey was subtracted from the post-treatment result to provide a measure of the change in brand attitude. Purchase intention was measured in the post-treatment survey using a 3-item, 7-point scale where 1 represented an unlikelihood of purchasing and 7 represented a likely purchase. The means reflect the summated scale. Table 4.5 shows the mean scores for the analysis.
Table 4.5 Mean scores for the independent variables of treatment group and gender for dependent variables of change in brand attitude and purchase intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Change</td>
<td>Control male</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause-related marketing male</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsorship male</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales promotion male</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Purchase Intention       | Control male | 4.15   | 1.00  | 16  |
|                          | female     | 3.77   | 1.56  | 23  |
|                          | total      | 3.92   | 1.36  | 39  |
|                          | Cause-related marketing male | 3.88   | 1.80  | 16  |
|                          | female     | 4.25   | 1.29  | 23  |
|                          | total      | 4.09   | 1.51  | 39  |
|                          | Sponsorship male | 4.58   | 1.62  | 12  |
|                          | female     | 4.70   | 1.46  | 21  |
|                          | total      | 4.66   | 1.50  | 33  |
|                          | Sales promotion male | 3.72   | 1.67  | 6   |
|                          | female     | 4.59   | 1.14  | 18  |
|                          | total      | 4.38   | 1.31  | 24  |
|                          | Total      |        |       |     |
|                          | male       | 4.11   | 1.51  | 50  |
|                          | female     | 4.30   | 1.41  | 85  |
|                          | total      | 4.23   | 1.44  | 135 |

n=135

The results illustrated in Table 4.5 indicate that only the treatment group exposed to cause-related marketing experienced a positive change in attitude overall. In
addition, the results indicate that for all four groups, males experienced a more positive, or less negative, change in attitude. However, in terms of purchase intention, the group exposed to sponsorship indicated the most positive response. In fact, the purchase intention indicated by the cause-related marketing group was also lower than the group exposed to the sales promotion stimulus, but higher than the control group. With the exception of the control group, females appeared to have a more positive intention to purchase than di males.

A multivariate analysis of variance was then undertaken to determine the significance of the differences indicated by these results. The data did not violate assumptions of homogeneity of variance (Box’s $M=31.82$, $p>.01$). Levene’s test indicated that the assumption of equal variance was not violated ($F=1.50$, $df=7,127$, $p>.05$) for purchase intention. However, this assumption was violated in the case of attitude change ($F=2.20$, $df=7,127$, $p<.05$). The results of the multivariate analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6 Results of multivariate analysis of variance: relationship between group and gender on attitude change and purchase intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP * GENDER</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=135

Table 4.6 shows that group had a significant main effect on attitude change (F=10.79, df=3, p<.05). However, gender did not have a significant main effect, nor was there a significant interaction effect between group and gender. To determine the strength of association between group and attitude change, $r^2$ was examined. The $r^2$ is one of the most frequently used indices to assess strength of association (Huck 2000). It was shown that group accounts for approximately 23 percent of the difference in attitude change ($r^2= .228$). Further examination using pairwise comparisons, as well as the more conservative Scheffe’s test, revealed that there was a significant difference between the control group and each of the three treatment groups, in terms of attitude change. However, there were no significant differences between the three treatment groups, that is, the cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion groups. With regard to purchase intention, there was no significant difference between the four groups.

Given the violation of Levene’s test in the above analysis of change in attitude to the brand, the data were examined for a potential cause. The examination of the
data indicated that a skewed distribution of males and females within two groups may have interfered with attitude change. The analysis was conducted a second time with group as the only independent variable. By removing gender as an independent variable, the data did not violate assumptions of homogeneity of variance (Box’s M=12.43, p>.01) nor Levene’s test, for either attitude change (F=1.30, df=3,131, p>.05) or purchase intention (F=.39, df=3,131, p>.05). The results of the multivariate analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Results of multivariate analysis of variance: to re-examine hypothesis two, with group as the sole independent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=135

Table 4.7 shows that group had a significant main effect on attitude change (F=11.36, df=3, p<.05). The $r^2$ was examined and it was shown that group accounts for approximately 21% of the difference in attitude change ($r^2=.206$). Further examination using pairwise comparisons, as well as Scheffe’s test, again showed that there was a significant difference between the control group and each of the three treatment groups, in terms of attitude change. In addition, the pairwise comparisons indicated a significant difference between the cause-related marketing and sales promotion groups. However, this was not borne out by the more conservative Scheffe’s test. As such the analysis was rerun selecting a slightly less conservative posthoc test, Tukey LSD. This test did support the
difference between the cause-related marketing and sales promotion groups, however these results should be interpreted with caution due to the less powerful nature of the test used. With regard to purchase intention, there was no significant main effect ($F=1.77$, $df=3$, $p>.05$). As a result of this analysis, the first part of hypothesis two relating to change in brand attitude was partially upheld. However, the second part relating to purchase intention was not.

### 4.4.3 Hypothesis three

**$H_3$** Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

Hypothesis three suggested that a consumer’s personal values would significantly covary with any main effect between group and change in brand attitude or purchase intention. To measure personal values, Kahle’s (1983) List of Values was used. The List of Values is a 9-item, 9-point scale. For the purposes of this research, a 7-point scale was used, where one represents very unimportant and 7 is very important. The scale was summated into three categories as used by Corfman, Lehmann and Narayanan (1991), Social (security, sense of belonging, being well-respected), Self-Orientation (self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, self-fulfillment) and Emotion (excitement, warm relationships with others, fun and enjoyment of life). A multivariate analysis of covariance was undertaken to determine the significance of the differences indicated by these results. Box’s test of equality of covariance found that the multivariate assumptions of covariance were upheld (Box’s $M=12.43$, $p>.01$). Levene’s test also indicated that the assumption of variance was not violated for attitude change ($F=1.58$, $df=3,131$, $p>.05$).
p>.05) and purchase intention (F=.521, df=3,131, p>.05). The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.8.

### Table 4.8 Results of multivariate analysis of covariance: impact of consumer’s values on the relationship between treatment group and attitude change and purchase intention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ORIENTATION</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>attitude change</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase intention</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=135

The results show that the change in attitude toward the brand is not affected by a consumer’s values for any of the three categories: Social (F=2.26, df=1, p>.05), Self-Orientation (F=2.87, df=1, p>.05) or Emotional (F=.85, df=1, p>.05). In addition, the results also show that a consumer’s values do not impact on purchase intention for any of the three value categories: Social (F=.93, df=1, p>.05), Self-Orientation (F=.78, df=1, p>.05) or Emotional (F=1.13, df=1, p>.05). As such, hypothesis three is not supported.
4.4.4 Hypothesis four

H₄  Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.

Hypothesis four stated that women would have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than would men. Table 4.9 shows the mean scores for attitude to the strategy according to gender for cause-related marketing, as well as sponsorship and sales promotion. Again, the control group was not included as they were not subjected to the treatment.

Table 4.9  Means for attitude to the strategy by gender for the three treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-related marketing</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that females have a slightly more positive attitude to both sponsorship and sales promotion, but a less positive attitude to cause-related marketing. A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether
this difference was significant. Levene’s test again revealed that assumptions of variance were not violated (F=.27, df=5,90, p>.05). The results of the analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10  Results of two-way analysis of variance: attitude to the strategy by gender and treatment group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP * GENDER</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the results in Table 4.10 indicate, gender does not have a significant main effect on attitude to the strategy. In addition there is no significant interaction effect between gender and group. However, group had a significant main effect on attitude to the strategy. To determine the strength of association between the two variables, and thus the practical significance of the difference, $r^2$ was examined. As such, it was shown that group accounts for approximately 10 percent of the difference in attitude to the strategy between groups ($r^2=.098$). In addition, a pairwise comparison indicated that the significant difference existed between the cause-related marketing and sponsorship groups. No difference was shown between the sales promotion group and the other two treatment groups. As gender did not have a significant effect hypothesis four is not supported.
4.4.5 Hypothesis five

\[ H_5 \quad \text{Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.} \]

Hypothesis five proposed that the fit perceived by a consumer between the brand and the marketing strategy, whether cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion, will covary with that consumer’s attitude toward the strategy itself. The impact of gender was further explored in this analysis as an independent variable. Table 4.11 shows the mean scores for attitude to the strategy as the dependent variable, perceived fit between the brand and cause, sport or promotion as a covariate and group and gender as independent variables. Perceived fit was measured on a 3-item, 7-point semantic differential scale, with 1 representing a less favourable perceived fit and 7 representing a more favourable fit. The means shown are the results of the summated and averaged scale.
Table 4.11 Mean scores for treatment groups by gender for covariate of perceived fit, between brand and cause, sport or promotion, with attitude to the strategy as dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-related marketing</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=96

As the results in Table 4.11 indicate, when allowing for the perception of fit between the brand and the cause, sport or promotion, there appears to be a difference in attitude to the strategy by group. An analysis of covariance was then undertaken to determine the significance of this difference. Again, Levene’s test indicated that the assumption of equal variance was not violated (F=2.15, df=5,90, p>.05). The results of the analysis of covariance are shown in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12  Results of analysis of covariance: independent variables of gender and treatment group and the covariate of perceived fit between the brand and the cause, sport or promotion, on the dependent variable of attitude to the strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVRLFIT</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP * GENDER</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=96

As the results of the analysis of covariance show in Table 4.12, once again, the treatment group had a significant effect on attitude to the strategy ($F=11.45$, $df=2$, $p<.05$). Further examination using pairwise comparisons again revealed that there was a significant difference between the cause-related marketing group and the sponsorship group as well as cause-related marketing and the sales promotion group, in terms of attitude to the strategy. There was no significant difference between sponsorship and sales promotion. In addition, the covariate of perceived overall fit, between the brand and cause, sport or promotion, also had a significant effect on attitude to the strategy ($F=39.85$, $df=1$, $p<.05$). To determine the strength of association between the two variables, group and attitude to the strategy when perceived fit is taken into consideration, $r^2$ was examined. As such, it was shown that group, when taking perceived fit into account, is responsible for approximately 41 percent of the difference in attitude to the strategy between groups ($r^2=.414$). Again, gender did not show a significant effect on attitude to the strategy ($F=2.02$, $df=1$, $p>.05$), nor was there a significant interaction effect between group and gender ($F=1.43$, $df=2$, $p>.05$). As such, hypothesis five is supported.
4.4.6 Hypothesis six

\[ H_6 \quad \text{Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.} \]

Hypothesis six stated that a consumer’s loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention. Given that the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .62 achieved for the brand loyalty scale did not support its reliability, this hypothesis was not tested. In terms of standards of reliability Nunnally (1978) recommends that .70 is sufficient, but where important decisions hinge on the results, then .90 should be the desired minimum.

4.4.7 Further exploration of hypotheses

Given the results of the tests of hypothesis two and five, further analysis was undertaken. Hypothesis two indicated that there was a significant difference between the groups in terms of the change in brand attitude experienced as a result of exposure to the marketing strategies. Hypothesis five indicated that there was a significant difference in consumer attitudes to the different marketing strategies, which was affected by consumers’ perception of fit between the cause, sport or promotion and the brand. As such, this phenomenon was further explored by examining whether the consumer’s attitude to the strategy would significantly covary with the consumer’s change in attitude toward the brand.

An analysis of covariance was undertaken to determine the significance of attitude to the strategy. Levene’s test indicated that the assumption of equal variance was
not violated (F=.04, df=2.93, p>.05). The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13  Results of analysis of covariance: group as an independent variable, brand attitude change as dependent variable and attitude to the strategy as a covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTOFFER</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.13 shows, a consumer’s attitude to the marketing strategy significantly affects the change in brand attitude (F=5.53, df=1, p<.05). However, $r^2$ was examined and it was shown that attitude to the strategy only accounts for approximately 11% of the difference in attitude change ($r^2=.112$). Further examination using pairwise comparisons indicated that the change in brand attitude, as affected by attitude to the strategy, differed significantly between the treatment group exposed to cause-related marketing and the group exposed to sales promotion. However, no difference was shown between those exposed to sponsorship and the other two stimuli.

4.4.8 Summary of findings

The outcome of the hypothesis testing is summarised as follows in Table 4.14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂a</td>
<td>The change in attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.</td>
<td>Hypothesis partially supported. When controlling for attitude to strategy, the cause-related marketing group experienced a more favourable attitude change than sales promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂b</td>
<td>Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄</td>
<td>Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅</td>
<td>Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆</td>
<td>Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not tested due to lack of reliability of scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional hypothesis: Consumers’ attitude to the strategy will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude. Hypothesis partially supported. Change in brand attitude was more favourable for the cause-related marketing group than the sales promotion group.
4.5 Conclusion

This chapter outlined the findings of the research. The research sought to address the following questions as initially outlined in Chapter 1:

\textit{What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of (1) attitude to the strategy, (2) attitude toward the brand and (3) purchase intention?}

\textit{Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?}

In conclusion, the findings suggest that consumers’ have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than a sponsorship or sales promotion, when allowing for the consumers’ perception of fit between the brand and cause, brand and sporting organisation or brand and promotion. Further, cause-related marketing was able to engender a more favourable change in attitude to the brand compared to sales promotion. Despite the above findings, cause-related marketing did not have a more favourable impact on purchase intention compared to sponsorship and sales promotion. Finally, neither gender nor personal values appeared to affect attitude to the strategy, attitude to the brand or purchase intention.

Chapter 5 will discuss the implications of these findings as well as the limitations of the research and suggestions for further investigation.
5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This thesis began with an introduction to the concept of cause-related marketing and a discussion of the need for further research in this emerging field. Cause-related marketing is fundamentally a commercial partnership between a business and nonprofit organisation whereupon the business provides support to the nonprofit contingent upon consumer purchase behaviour. This strategy originated in the United States in the early 1980s and the concept has been evolving since that point. Chapter 1 proposed a need for research in this area due to the investment and growth in this strategy both in Australia and overseas. In addition, both academic and practitioner research has indicated strong consumer support for the concept of cause-related marketing, yet there has been limited research to date regarding the effectiveness of this strategy, especially in comparison to other marketing activities. Finally, in an increasingly challenging business environment, marketing practitioners are seeking to explore new strategies and the efficacy of traditional forms of marketing communications is subject to debate.

As such, Chapter 1 outlined the following research questions:

*What is the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s response in terms of attitude to the strategy, attitude toward the brand and purchase intention?*

*Do consumers respond more positively toward cause-related marketing than toward sponsorship or sales promotion?*

The chapter also provided an overview of the current research study and its delimitations.
Chapter 2 outlined the theoretical foundations that underpinned this study and presented the proposed model to be tested, as shown at Figure 5.1. The extant literature and research in the area of cause-related marketing was examined as well as the relevant literature in the parent discipline of marketing communications and related areas such as consumer behaviour, prosocial behaviour, brand alliances, social responsibility and philanthropy.

**Figure 5.1  Conceptual model for the impact of cause-related marketing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause-Related Marketing</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Attitude to the Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Attitude to Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.

The first part of Chapter 2 developed an argument for the inclusion of cause-related marketing within the marketing communications mix. In addition, the critical role of marketing communications in influencing brand attitude and purchase intention was discussed. Finally, the evolution of integrated marketing communications and the effectiveness of communications strategies were examined. The second part of Chapter 2 presented varying perspectives on the
definition of cause-related marketing. A new definition was proposed based on a synthesis of the views of both academics and practitioners. Changes in the business environment that have contributed to the interest in cause-related marketing were discussed, including increased competition, brand parity and the demands of consumers. Further, the objectives of businesses participating in this strategy were examined and primarily related to revenue generation, corporate image and brand equity. Finally, the existing literature and research relating to both the management of the strategy and consumer behaviour were examined and a number of hypotheses developed as follows:

\[ H_1 \] Consumers will have a more positive attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than they will to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2a} \] The change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_{2b} \] Consumers’ purchase intention will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion.

\[ H_3 \] Consumers’ personal values will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy (cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion) and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.

\[ H_4 \] Women will have a more positive response to a cause-related marketing strategy than will men.

\[ H_5 \] Consumers’ perceived fit between the brand and the cause, the brand and the sponsored organisation or the brand and the promotion will significantly covary with their attitude toward the cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion strategy.

\[ H_6 \] Consumers’ loyalty to a brand will significantly covary with any main effect between type of strategy and change in brand attitude or purchase intention.
Chapter 3 outlined the research philosophy and method used to test the model developed in Chapter 2. First the goals of social research were discussed and the different research paradigms were examined. A justification for the primarily positivist approach taken to this research study was presented. The chapter also outlined the experimental research design incorporating self-administered questionnaires. In addition, the rationale for sample selection and the treatment of variables was outlined. The initial screening of the data and treatment of missing values and outliers was also discussed.

Finally, Chapter 4 presented the results of the hypothesis testing. The majority of the hypotheses were not upheld. However, there was some support to indicate that under certain circumstances cause-related marketing was viewed with a more positive attitude than was sponsorship or sales promotion. Further, cause-related marketing appeared to engender a more favourable change in attitude to the brand compared to sales promotion. However, purchase intention did not appear to be more favourably influenced by cause-related marketing compared to the other two marketing communications strategies.

Chapter 5 examines these findings in the context of the literature as well as identifying the contribution of the study to both academics and practitioners. The limitations of the study also are discussed and directions for future research identified.
5.2 Discussion of findings

Cause-related marketing is a growing area of interest as reflected in both academic and practitioner marketing literature. As presented in Chapter 2, cause-related marketing is a relatively recent addition to the marketing communications mix. Cause-related marketing aligns a brand with a nonprofit organisation to which a contribution will be made by the firm, contingent upon consumers undertaking a specified purchase behaviour. In general, conceptual and empirical research suggests that consumers have a positive view of this form of marketing activity. However, it is also acknowledged that there are risks relating to the strategy, one of the most serious being the potential for consumer perceptions of exploitation of the nonprofit organisation by the marketer (Andreason 1996; Ross et al. 1992; Varadarajan and Menon 1988). Developing a clearer understanding of the efficacy of cause-related marketing as a marketing strategy is a critical undertaking for marketers.

Past research, both academic and practitioner, has indicated that consumers have primarily positive attitudes toward companies that engage in this activity (Cavill and Company 1997; Ross et al. 1991, 1992; Smith and Alcorn 1991). Further, there has been evidence to suggest that consumer purchase behaviour is favourably influenced by this strategy (Ross et al. 1991; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998) and in some cases, consumers are even willing to pay more for a product which supports the community (Barone et al. 1999; Cone Communications 1994). It has been suggested that critical success factors for a cause-related marketing strategy include: a strategic fit between cause and brand (Adkins 1999; DeNitto 1989; Higgins 2002; Lewis 2003); a positively perceived motive of the firm...
effective management of the campaign and nonprofit partner (Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Wagner and Thompson 1994); and a long term approach to the partnership (Andreason 1996; Murphy 1997; Simon 1995; Welsh 1999). However, with the exception of firm motivation, these factors have been identified primarily based on anecdotal evidence rather than systematic research. In addition, relatively few academic articles or research studies have examined the effectiveness of cause-related marketing in comparison to other marketing communications strategies.

The purpose of this study was to examine consumer attitudes to cause-related marketing and the potential for cause-related marketing to improve attitude to the brand and to influence purchase intention. Most importantly, the current research also compared this strategy with two other forms of marketing communications: sponsorship and sales promotion. As discussed, although cause-related marketing is perceived to offer significant benefits, it has been emphasised in the literature that the benefits of cause-related marketing need to be evaluated in relation to alternative strategies (Varadarajan and Menon 1988).

In general, the results of this research indicate that consumer attitudes to a cause-related marketing campaign are more favourable than consumer attitudes toward sponsorship or sales promotion when controlling for the consumer’s perception of fit between the brand and cause, sport or promotion. There was some support for the premise that cause-related marketing is more effective at generating a positive change in brand attitude, when controlling for attitude to the marketing strategy.
With regard to influencing purchase intention, this research did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the control, cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion groups. Finally, neither gender nor personal values were shown to impact consumer response in either change in brand attitude or purchase intention. The following sections will discuss these findings in detail.

5.2.1 Attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy

This study offers support for the proposition that consumers will have a more positive attitude toward a cause-related marketing strategy than toward a sponsorship or sales promotion. An initial examination of the means of the three treatment groups indicated that those respondents exposed to a cause-related marketing campaign exhibited a slightly more favourable attitude to the strategy than did the sponsorship or sales promotion groups. Unfortunately, the differences in the means narrowly missed out on achieving statistical significance (p=.06). However, when controlling for the respondent’s perception of fit between the brand and cause, brand and sponsored organisation or brand and promotion, the results indicate that attitude toward the cause-related marketing strategy was substantially more favourable. As the results indicate, the treatment group had a significant main effect on attitude to the brand, when allowing for the perception of fit.

Further examination revealed that there was a significant difference between the cause-related marketing group and the sponsorship group as well as the cause-related marketing and the sales promotion group, in terms of attitude to the marketing strategies. There was no significant difference between the sponsorship
and sales promotion groups. The covariate of overall perceived fit, between the brand and cause, sport or promotion, had a significant effect on attitude to the brand and accounted for approximately 41 percent of the difference in attitude to the strategy between groups ($r^2 = .414$).

These results echo the literature that suggests that consumers are supportive of organisations who support the community (Cavill and Company 1997; Ross et al. 1991; Smith and Alcorn 1991; Webb and Mohr 1998) and cause-related marketing strategies in general (Ellen et al. 2000). Drumwright (1996) also introduced the proposition that advertising campaigns with a social dimension engender a greater consumer response than do conventional advertising campaigns. However, it appears that the consumer’s perception of fit has a critical impact on their perceptions of cause-related marketing. A plausible explanation suggested in the literature is that a natural fit between firm and cause helps to overcome consumer scepticism or potential perceptions of exploitation of the cause (Webb and Mohr 1998).

Attribution theory may also provide some insight into these findings. Attribution theory relates to how people interpret behaviour (Kelley 1973; Kelley and Michela 1980) and is relevant to the field of consumer behaviour (Folkes 1988). As such, this theory is useful in understanding the findings of the current research regarding the issue of perception of fit. That is, consumers will question why the firm is participating in a cause-related marketing campaign. If they perceive the firm’s motivations positively, that attribution will then favourably impact on their attitude to the brand and their intention to purchase. As stated previously, a
logical association between the brand and cause may assist in forming positive attributions as to the firm’s involvement in cause-related marketing. Exploratory research conducted by Webb and Mohr (1998) did in fact identify a group of consumers amongst the qualitative sample that considered the firm’s motives prior to determining their response to a cause-related marketing strategy.

These findings provide empirical support for perceptions held by many academics and practitioners that a strategic fit between the firm and the cause is critical to the success of cause-related marketing (Adkins 1999; Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; DeNitto 1989; Higgins 2002; Lewis 2003; Till and Nowak 2000). However, the results of this research study conflict with the research of Mizerski et al. (2001) that found that the most effective cause used in a cause-related marketing campaign was one that was not normally associated with the organisation. The importance of perceived fit has been subject to some debate. It has been suggested that a strong perceived link between the company and the cause may in fact accentuate the benefit to the firm and result in a consumer backlash (Ellen et al. 2000). Research conducted by Drumwright (1996) found that advertising managers believed that consumer scepticism might occur in relation to advertising campaigns with a social dimension if the association between the company and cause was too close.

On the other hand, the positive impact of fit suggested by the current study is consistent with research on commercial brand alliances, which has also indicated that the fit between the two parties has a significant effect on attitudes toward the alliance (Simonin and Ruth 1998). Furthermore, the concept of fit has been found
to have relevance in the area of brand extensions (Aaker and Keller 1990). Finally, the sponsorship literature also suggests that an appropriate match between sponsor and event is a critical issue (e.g., Crimmins and Horn 1996; Speed and Thompson 2000). It is interesting to note that the current study indicates that this perception of fit is even more important for cause-related marketing than for sponsorship. A plausible explanation may be that a logical association between firm and social cause is more important due to the perceived vulnerability of the nonprofit and thus the potential for it to be exploited.

5.2.2 Impact on brand attitude

This study offers some support for the proposition that cause-related marketing can enhance brand attitude and that the change in brand attitude experienced by consumers will be more positive as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy than exposure to a sponsorship or sales promotion. A comparison of the means of the three treatment groups and one control group indicated that only the group exposed to cause-related marketing experienced a positive change in brand attitude. Further examination revealed that the type of group was shown to have a significant main effect on attitude change, accounting for approximately 23 percent of the difference. The significant difference, however, occurred between the control group and the other three groups. This result suggests that in terms of affecting attitude to the brand, any marketing communications strategy is better than none.

However, additional tests that did not include gender as an independent variable revealed a significant difference between the cause-related marketing and sales
promotion group. However, these results must be interpreted cautiously. Although the difference was supported by examining pairwise comparisons and the results of the posthoc test, Tukey LSD, it was not supported by the more conservative Scheffe’s test. However, this difference was further explored by controlling for attitude to the strategy. Again, it was demonstrated that for the cause-related marketing and sales promotion group, attitude to the marketing strategy had a favourable effect on attitude change for the cause-related marketing group. Therefore, this finding suggests that cause-related marketing has a more positive impact on improving brand attitude than does sales promotion. Furthermore, it appears that a positive attitude toward the strategy will assist in achieving this outcome.

The positive impact of cause-related marketing on brand attitude is consistent with the findings of previous academic research (Ross et al. 1991, 1992). However, there has been limited comparison in the literature between cause-related marketing and sales promotion or sponsorship, and no comparison with regard to their ability to influence brand attitude. It is plausible that cause-related marketing may have been able to engender a positive response in terms of an improvement in brand attitude due to a positive perception of the firm or brand’s motives. That is, engaging in an activity to benefit the community as opposed to simply driving sales. Attribution theory could also offer some support for this argument. This explanation is consistent with Meenaghan’s (2001) research that suggested that consumers perceive advertising as a self-serving act on the part of the organisation and, as a result, can trigger consumer defense mechanisms. Sales promotion is more overtly self-serving than cause-related marketing, so these
same perceptions of aggressive commercialism may be transferred to the discount promotion. The relative novelty of cause-related marketing may also aid in the improved attitude to the brand (Ross et al. 1991).

5.2.3 Impact on purchase intention

This study found that consumers’ purchase intention was not more positive as a result of being exposed to a cause-related marketing strategy as compared with exposure to sponsorship or sales promotion. In fact, none of the marketing strategies appeared to differ in their impact on purchase intention. Although an examination of the means revealed that the treatment group exposed to sponsorship appeared to have the most positive purchase intention, this difference was not found to be significant. This finding is consistent with Drumwright and Murphy’s (2001) conclusion upon reviewing the research in corporate societal marketing. Drumwright and Murphy (2001) suggest that many organisations have been disappointed with the lack of impact from corporate societal marketing initiatives on the bottom line, especially in the short term. Webb and Mohr (1998) also found that while some consumers exhibited a positive change in their view of the company’s image, it generally was not necessarily manifested in their purchase behaviour. This was particularly the case when traditional purchase criteria were important. Research conducted by Mizerski et al. (2001) similarly found that purchase intention was not affected by cause-related marketing.

Charity incentives have been found to be more effective in promoting frivolous products than practical products (Strahelivitz and Myers 1998). Given the soft drink product category used in this research and the age group of the majority of
the respondents, it is unlikely that this product would be perceived as particularly frivolous. Therefore, the nature of the product may have affected the potential for cause-related marketing to influence purchase intention. An additional reason may relate to the single exposure of the campaign not being adequate to influence this behaviour.

5.2.4 Influence of gender and personal values

It is important to consider the factors that may influence the response to a cause-related marketing strategy. Based on prior research, this study considered gender and personal values as potential covariates that may need to be controlled. However, the findings showed that neither gender nor personal values influenced the response to cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion in terms of attitude to the strategy, change in brand attitude or intention to purchase. With regard to personal values, these findings contradict an earlier study by Kropp et al. (1999). These researchers found that there was in fact a significant correlation between attitude toward cause-related marketing and the following values: sense of belonging, warm relationships with others and self-fulfillment. Interestingly, this study was also conducted using Australian undergraduate and postgraduate university students. A possible explanation as to why the findings of the current research study differ is that respondents in the earlier study indicated their attitude to the general concept of cause-related marketing as opposed to a specific cause-related marketing strategy.

Previous research undertaken to determine the characteristics of a socially conscious consumer has identified a number of differentiating sociopsychological
variables. Anderson and Cunningham (1972) describe this consumer as ‘…more cosmopolitan, but less dogmatic, less conservative, less status conscious, less alienated, and less personally competent than his less socially conscious counterpart’ (p.30). Further, Burnett and Wood’s (1988) examination of the literature relating to donation behaviour found a number of studies which suggested that individuals with a sense of social responsibility, other-oriented values and higher levels of moral reasoning were more likely to participate in giving behaviour. There are elements in both of the above descriptions that are consistent with the values identified in the Kropp et al. (1999) study, particularly the importance of external relationships and responsibilities. Therefore it is surprising that the current study did not find an individual’s values to influence their response to cause-related marketing. A potential explanation is that the sample size in the current study was not large enough to demonstrate this effect.

With regard to the influence of gender on response to cause-related marketing, past research has not been conclusive in its findings. The study by Kropp et al. (1999) suggested that women’s attitudes were slightly more favourable than were men’s, but this difference was not statistically significant. Chani and Dolli (2001) also did not find any difference in attitudes and behaviour towards cause-related marketing based on gender. On the other hand, studies conducted by Ross et al. (1991, 1992) found the opposite to be true. Their results indicated that women had a more favourable attitude to cause-related marketing and its participants (the firm and nonprofit organisation) than did men. It is interesting to note that research in the area of helping behaviour has faced similar contradictory results when examining the impact of gender on helping behaviour. In their review of the
helping behaviour literature, Burnett and Wood (1988) identified a number of studies which suggest males are more likely to help than females as well as studies which have found the reverse to be true, and still others that have found no difference.

On the basis of a review of the literature pertaining to gender-related advertising research, Wolin (2003) concludes that research supports a gender-based approach to information processing, whereby females are more comprehensive at processing messages. Further, females may process advertisements more elaborately. Meyers-Levy and Sternthal (1991) investigated the differences between males and females ‘...in the threshold at which they engage in elaborative processing of message information’ (p.85). Their findings suggest that men and women have different thresholds for the elaboration of message cues. However, Meyers-Levy and Sternthal (1991) concluded, ‘...when manipulations prompted attention to the message cues that was either above or below both genders’ threshold for elaboration, no differences in judgments were found’ (p.93). Further, these researchers found there were two factors that would determine whether gender differences would be exhibited in the consideration of specific messages. These factors related to the degree of congruity contained in the message and the response required of the individual. It was found that gender differences were more likely to occur when the average demands of these two factors were moderate.

The preceding findings may provide an explanation for the lack of gender difference observed in the current study. It can be assumed that the message
relating to the brand’s participation in the various marketing scenarios held a low degree of incongruity for respondents of both genders; that is, they were all plausible marketing strategies that the brand may undertake. Further, the response required was not particularly demanding. Therefore, it would be expected that no gender difference would emerge in their responses in terms of attitude to the strategy, change in brand attitude and purchase intention.

5.3 Conclusions and contribution of the research

5.3.1 Conclusions
The major finding of this research is that consumers have a more favourable attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than to either a sponsorship or sales promotion, however this attitude is dependent on the brand being perceived to have a natural association with the cause. Further, cause-related marketing has the ability to engender a more favourable change in attitude to the brand than does sales promotion. This change in attitude is affected by the consumer’s attitude to the strategy itself. This study did not, however, demonstrate that exposure to cause-related marketing, sponsorship or sales promotion had a significant effect on purchase intention. Finally, neither gender nor personal values have been shown to influence the above outcomes.

5.3.2 Contribution of the research
The findings of this research make a valuable contribution to the understanding of cause-related marketing. This contribution is summarised in the following sections. Implications of this research will be discussed in section 5.4 and 5.5.
Development of an expanded definition of cause-related marketing. This research has built on previous work in describing the parameters of cause-related marketing. Varadarajan and Menon (1988) presented the original definition of cause-related marketing in the academic literature. Since that time the concept has evolved and academics, practitioners and industry associations have advanced a number of views as to the parameters of this strategy (e.g., Andreason 1996; Cunningham 1997; Meyer 1999; Pringle and Thompson 1999; Smith and Alcorn 1991). These views were discussed and evaluated in Chapter 2. Comparisons were then made to the definitions of other communications strategies such as sponsorship and sales promotion as well as to the related concept of philanthropy. The following expanded definition of cause-related marketing resulted from this analysis:

Cause-related marketing is a marketing strategy whereby the firm makes a contribution, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation(s) contingent upon the customer engaging in a revenue-providing exchange that satisfies business and individual objectives. This strategy may include additional elements such as sponsorship, sales promotion, co-branding and employee involvement.

Comparison of cause-related marketing with other strategies. Past research has focused on various aspects of cause-related marketing strategies. These aspects include the geographic coverage of the cause (Ross et al. 1991, 1992), the type and characteristics of the product (Barone et al. 2000; Strahilevitz and Myers 1998), consumer perception of firm motivations (Barone et al. 2000; Ross et al. 1992), donation size (Dahl and Lavack 1995; Holmes and Kilbane 1993; Ross et al. 1991); type of cause (Ellen et al. 2000) and the characteristics of consumers most likely to respond (Kropp et al. 1999; Ross et al. 1991,1992; Webb and Mohr 1998). However, comparisons between cause-related marketing and other
marketing strategies have been limited. A study conducted by Strahilevitz and Myers (1998) compared purchase incentives in the form of a donation to charity and a monetary rebate upon purchase. In addition, a study by Mizerski et al. (2001) compared the effectiveness of advertising a cause-related marketing strategy and an ambush appeal relating to a cause. However, the current research study was the first to compare cause-related marketing to the two other marketing communications strategies to which it is most often compared: sponsorship and sales promotion.

**Evidence for the importance of perceived fit in attitude to the strategy.** Although the importance of fit between cause and brand has been alluded to in both the academic and practitioner literature, this study is one of the first to provide empirical evidence of this importance. The findings showed that a cause-related marketing strategy can be perceived more favourably than a sponsorship or sales promotion. This perception is directly related to the consumer’s perception of fit between the brand and the cause. Furthermore, the impact of a consumer’s perception of fit is more relevant to cause-related marketing than to the other strategies.

**Attitude change examined under experimental condition.** Past research has investigated the impact of cause-related marketing on the consumer’s attitude to the brand or firm (e.g., Cavill and Company 1997; Chani and Dolli 2001; Ross et al. 1991, 1992). However, this study is one of the first to examine the change in brand attitude as a result of exposure to a cause-related marketing strategy. Change in brand attitude was also measured for a sponsorship and sales
promotion. This study provides some support for the ability of cause-related marketing to improve attitude to the brand. In addition, this impact on brand attitude is more significant than that which can be achieved through sales promotion and possibly sponsorship.

**Clarification of gender effect.** This study adds to the debate regarding the role of gender in influencing attitudes to cause-related marketing and subsequent brand attitude change and purchase intention. The research findings provide further evidence that gender does not have an impact on a consumer’s response to cause-related marketing. In addition, this finding is also extended to both sponsorship and sales promotion.

**Conflicting evidence regarding the effect of personal values.** This study indicates that the response to cause-related marketing, sponsorship and sales promotion does not appear to be influenced by personal values. As this finding contradicts previous research conducted using the same scale to measure values, this study serves to highlight the contentious nature of this issue and thus encourage more research in this area.

### 5.4 Implications for theory

As addressed in the previous section, the findings of this study represent a significant contribution to the literature in the area of cause-related marketing. These findings contribute to the understanding of the factors that influence consumer response to cause-related marketing as illustrated at Figure 5.2. This conceptual model has been developed to demonstrate the process that leads to a
favourable consumer response. This research indicates that consumers perceptions of fit between the brand and the cause will affect their attitude to the strategy. Attitude to the strategy will in turn facilitate an improved attitude to the brand. In other words, a perception of a natural association between brand and cause will lead to a positive perception of the cause-related marketing strategy and ultimately a positive change in brand attitude.

Figure 5.2 Revised model for the impact of cause-related marketing

Given that cause-related marketing is also regarded as a form of brand alliance, as discussed in section 2.10, the findings of this research provide additional evidence as to the importance of the perceived affinity between alliance partners. In addition, the findings contribute to the overall discipline of marketing communications in terms of comparing the ability of different strategies in achieving two key communications effects: changing brand attitude and influencing purchase intention.

5.5 Implications for practitioners

Marketing managers are being challenged to differentiate their products in an increasingly competitive marketplace, develop financially accountable marketing programs and accommodate consumer pressure for socially responsible behaviour
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(Cunningham 1997). In addition, traditional marketing communications strategies, particularly advertising, are being re-evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in this changed business environment (Rust and Oliver 1994). As discussed in section 2.9.1, one of the primary objectives for firms that engage in cause-related marketing is to improve brand image or attitude to the brand. Further, improving brand attitude has been identified as one of the fundamental communications effects (Rossiter and Percy 1998). Research has suggested that marketing practitioners will increasingly be considering cause-related marketing as an element of their overall marketing strategy (Bednall et al. 2001; Cavill and Company 1997). There is, however, a potential risk for companies of being perceived to be exploiting a nonprofit organisation when engaging in this venture. Therefore, an increased understanding of the mechanics involved in developing an effective strategy is of utmost significance for practitioners.

This study highlights the importance to firms of choosing the appropriate cause to partner with, as this association will ultimately impact on the ability of this strategy to positively influence brand attitude. It is recommended to practitioners that they undertake research to clarify their customers’ perceptions of an appropriate match between the organisation or brand and potential nonprofit partner. Furthermore, marketers should consider clearly articulating the commonalities between the two parties instead of relying on the consumer to make the connection. For example, in relation to sponsorship, Crimmins and Horn (1996) suggest that when the link between an organisation and a sponsored event may not be easily perceived, there is a need for ‘…explicitly and repeatedly defining the meaning of the sponsorship for the consumer’ (p.19). Crimmins and
Horn (1996) cite the Texaco sponsorship of the 1992 Olympics as an example of creating an association between two parties where the connection is not obvious. Texaco, the official oil company of the Games, developed a communications campaign that related the pursuit of excellence of the Olympic competitors to the pursuit of excellence in the production of Texaco products. This connection increased the effectiveness of the sponsorship in terms of creating a more positive view of their brand in a commoditised product category. The brand extension literature also advocates the importance of an effective communications strategy in creating links between two entities in the mind of the consumer (Bridges et al. 2000; Keller 1993). Marketers who engage in cause-related marketing should also consider actively communicating the connection between their brand and the cause to enhance the effectiveness of the strategy.

In addition, given that this study was not able to establish a difference in response according to gender or personal values, it is suggested that cause-related marketing may have a broad appeal. Therefore, this strategy can be used in relation to a wide range of target audiences. Finally, when seeking to improve brand attitude, marketing managers should consider the use of cause-related marketing in preference to sales promotion, particularly price discounts.

### 5.6 Limitations

Although this study significantly contributes to the knowledge surrounding cause-related marketing, there are a number of limitations associated with the research. These limitations will be discussed as follows.
First, the ability to generalise the findings from this study is limited due to a number of factors. This research study focused on one brand within one fast-moving consumer goods product category. As such, the findings may not relate to durable goods or services, or even other fast-moving consumer goods. Furthermore, the elements of the stimuli may also limit the generalisability of the study. For example, the mention of a specific cause or nonprofit organisation, the use of a different type of sales promotion such as a gift with purchase or the sponsorship of an arts organisation instead of a sporting club may elicit a different result.

In addition, the sample selection may also limit the ability to generalise the findings to the overall population. A convenience sample of undergraduate and postgraduate students was used representing one metropolitan area in Australia. As described in Chapter 3, this sample was selected to satisfy the requirements of an experimental design for a homogeneous sample, as well as due to budgetary considerations. However, an age effect could predispose younger consumers to respond more favourably to cause-related marketing. It has been suggested that younger consumers have been indoctrinated into the consumer culture earlier than previous generations (Bakewell and Mitchell 2003) and tend to be sceptical of traditional forms of marketing communications such as advertising (Wolberg and Pokrywczynski 2001). In addition, the younger generation, although less rebellious than their predecessors, are concerned about current major problems, especially those relating to the environment (Herbig, Koehler and Day 1993). As such, the younger consumer may respond more positively to cause-related marketing than the general population.
Second, this research is subject to the limitations of an experimental design. The major criticism of non-field experiments is the difficulty in achieving external validity (Babbie 2001; Christensen 1996). It is suggested that the contrived setting, coupled with the fact that participants may attempt to please the researcher, can impinge upon external validity. Although efforts were made to minimise these weaknesses, for example by using self-administered questionnaires to reduce the influence of the survey administrator, the circumstances of the experiment were contrived. As such, there may be limitations to some measurements. For example, change in brand attitude was measured directly after exposure to the stimulus, thus not allowing for the impact of repetition of the stimulus or longer term attitude effects. It has been suggested that the effectiveness of a cause-related marketing effort is likely to be enhanced by repeated exposure over time (Till and Nowak 2000). In addition, given the focus of this research, the potential exists for a social desirability bias. However, because of the anonymity of the respondent and the lack of researcher contact, the likelihood of this bias being exhibited in the data should be minimal.

Third, the scale used to measure brand loyalty did not achieve an acceptable level of reliability and therefore was discarded. As such, the study was not able to control for brand loyalty which was hypothesised to have a significant main effect. In this study, brand loyalty was measured by adapting a scale designed to measure store loyalty. An explanation for the scale’s lack of reliability may relate to the nature of the product that was used in the study. The scale was designed to measure loyalty to a retail store, that is, a relatively high involvement service. The focus of this study, on the other hand, was a low involvement product, a soft
drink. Therefore the question asking respondents to rate Schweppes Lemonade against their ideal lemonade may have been inappropriate. It is conceivable that consumers of a relatively high involvement service may in fact be able to consciously identify several attributes that would comprise an ideal retailer and thus contribute to the consumers’ loyalty. However, for a less complex, lower involvement product, this concept of an ‘ideal’ may be less relevant in contributing to loyalty.

Finally, there are limitations in this research due to the relatively small sample size for the treatment and control groups. As a result, some minor effects may not have been detected.

5.7 Implications for future research

Future research that builds on the findings of this study and overcomes its limitations is recommended. First, it is suggested that this study should be replicated using a number of other brands and product categories to determine whether these results can be extended to other conditions. Similarly, this study should be replicated with a nonstudent sample to determine whether these findings can be generalised to the overall population. Most importantly, repetition of this study may clarify the impact of cause-related marketing on brand attitude in comparison to other communications strategies. Based on an examination of the means on this dependent variable, cause-related marketing appeared to have a greater impact on changing brand attitude. However, this result did not prove to be statistically significant, albeit by a narrow margin. As such, it would be worthwhile to repeat this aspect of the research to resolve this issue.
Second, it is recommended that future research should control for brand loyalty. Based on the discussion outlined in Chapter 2 regarding this covariate, it seems plausible that a consumer’s brand loyalty will impact on their attitude to the strategy and possibly impact on a change in brand attitude and purchase intention. Further, it would be of interest to determine the impact of cause-related marketing on consumers with differing levels of brand loyalty. Given the lack of reliability achieved by the scale used to measure brand loyalty, it is recommended that a different one be used.

Third, the findings of this research suggest that consumer perception of fit between cause and brand, in addition to consumer attitude to the cause-related marketing strategy, are critical factors in facilitating change in brand attitude. Therefore, it is suggested that future research explore these two factors in more detail. For example, with regard to perception of fit, qualitative research could provide insight into how consumers assess whether there is a natural association between causes and brands. Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to explore whether the firm could favourably influence this perception by clearly articulating the connection in the communication of the strategy. With regard to attitude to the strategy, further research should examine the impact of the consumer’s existing awareness and attitude toward the cause and the consumer’s perception of the firm’s motivation for participating in the strategy.

Finally, further research should be done to attempt to clarify the impact of gender and personal values on a consumer’s attitude and response to a cause-related marketing strategy. Research to date has demonstrated conflicting results.
5.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, as an emerging area within the marketing discipline, there is a critical need for research into the various elements of cause-related marketing strategies. The findings of this research have important implications for both practitioners and academics. This research has provided a conceptual model to demonstrate the process that leads to a favourable consumer response to cause-related marketing. Furthermore, this study has empirically demonstrated the strengths of cause-related marketing in comparison to other communications strategies. The major finding indicates that consumers have a more favourable attitude to a cause-related marketing strategy than to either a sponsorship or sales promotion, dependent on the consumer’s perception of fit between brand and cause. Cause-related marketing also has the ability to engender a positive change in brand attitude and to do so more effectively than a sales promotion. This change in attitude is contingent upon the consumer’s attitude to the strategy itself.

Given the unique win-win-win benefits associated with this strategy, it is not difficult to understand why both practitioners and academics suggest that cause-related marketing is likely to continue to grow. This research was undertaken with the intention of contributing to the understanding of the factors that can maximise the effectiveness of this strategy. This study has added to the current body of knowledge relating to cause-related marketing and has provided insight into areas that warrant further exploration.
6.0 APPENDICES
Appendix 1 - Definitions and Terminology

Definitions for the key terms used in this thesis are provided below.

- **Advertising** – ‘A form of either mass communication or direct-to-consumer communication that is non-personal and is paid for by various business firms, nonprofit organizations, and individuals who are in some way identified in the advertising message and who hope to inform or persuade members of a particular audience’ (Shimp 2003, p.621).

- **Brand** – ‘…a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or combination of them which is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors’ (Kotler, Brown, Adam and Armstrong 2001, p.352).

- **Brand alliances** – ‘…a strategy in which two (or more) brands are presented simultaneously to consumers’ (Simonin and Ruth 1998, p.30).

- **Brand attitude** – ‘…the buyer’s evaluation of the brand with respect to its perceived ability to meet a currently relevant motivation’ (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.120).

- **Brand image** – ‘…perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory’ (Keller 1993, p.3).

- **Brand loyalty** – ‘…a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior’ (Oliver 1999, p.34).

- **Brand purchase intention** – ‘…the buyer’s self-instruction to purchase the brand (or take other relevant purchase-related action). It is, in fact, an anticipated, conscious planning of the action step, the final buyer response step (target audience action)’ (Rossiter and Percy 1998, p.126).

- **Cause** – a cause is generally associated with a nonprofit organisation that exists to provide a social service as opposed to a profit-making venture. The organisation is governed by an independent group of people and any surpluses are reinvested in the activities associated with the cause (Abdy and Barclay 2001).
• Cause-related marketing – a strategic marketing activity whereby the firm makes a contribution, financial or otherwise, to a nonprofit organisation(s) contingent upon the customer engaging in a revenue-providing exchange that satisfies business and individual objectives. This strategy may include additional elements such as sponsorship, sales promotion, co-branding and employee involvement. This definition was developed for the purpose of this research and is fully discussed in section 2.7.1.

• Consumer behaviour – ‘…the behavior that consumers display in searching for, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products and services that they expect will satisfy their needs’ (Schiffman and Kanuk 1994, p.7).

• Corporate philanthropy – ‘…an investment of support (financial or otherwise) for an event or activity, where the returns are primarily expected to be to society, but are of ultimate long-term value to the company itself’ (Collins 1994).

• Corporate social responsibility – ‘…achieving outcomes from organizational decisions concerning specific issues or problems which (by some normative standard) have beneficial rather than adverse effects upon pertinent corporate stakeholders’ (Epstein 1987, p.104).

• Corporate societal marketing – ‘…marketing initiatives that have a least one noneconomic objective related to social welfare and use the resources of the company and/or one of its partners’ (Drumwright and Murphy 2001, p.164).

• Direct marketing – ‘…the interactive use of advertising media, to stimulate an (immediate) behavior modification in such a way that this behavior can be tracked, analyzed, and stored on a database for future retrieval and use’ (Stone and Jacobs 2001, p.5).

• Helping behaviour – ‘…voluntary acts performed with the intent to provide some benefit to another person. These behaviors may or may not require personal contact with the recipient, and they may or may not involve anticipation of external rewards’ (Dovidio 1984, p.364).

• Marketing communications – ‘…the collection of all elements in a brand’s marketing mix that facilitate exchanges by targeting the brand to a group of customers, positioning the brand as somehow distinct from competitive brands, and sharing the brand’s meaning – its point of difference – with the brand’s target audience’ (Shimp 2003, p.3).

• Perceived fit – the consumer’s perceived brand consistency. That is, consistency between the two participants in the marketing activity or between the brand and the activity in the case of sales promotion. This definition was adapted from the definition of ‘fit’ in the brand extension literature and is discussed in section 2.11.2.
• Prosocial behaviour – ‘...behaviour that is valued by the individual’s society’ (Burnett and Wood 1988, p.3).

• Public relations – ‘...an organizational activity involved with fostering goodwill between a company and its various publics’ (Shimp 2003, p.569).

• Sales promotion – ‘...short term incentives to encourage purchase or sales of a product or service’ (Kotler et al. 2001, p.535).

• Socially conscious consumer – ‘...a consumer who takes into account the public consequences of his or her private consumption or who attempts to use his or her purchasing power to bring about social change’ (Webster 1975, p.188).

• Sponsorship – ‘...the underwriting of a special event to support corporate objectives by enhancing corporate image, increasing awareness of brands, or directly stimulating sales of products and services’ (Javalgi, Traylor, Gross and Lampman 1994, p.48).

• Strategy – ‘...any plan for achieving goals and objectives’ (Imber and Toffler 2000, p.525).

• Value – ‘...an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence’ (Rokeach 1973, p.5).
## Appendix 2 - Examples of Cause-Related Marketing Activity in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>NONPROFIT</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>Lipstick</td>
<td>Breast cancer research</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blundstone</td>
<td>&quot;Women's Work&quot; range</td>
<td>Women's artists from Urapuntja community</td>
<td>50 cents 'royalty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>Panadol</td>
<td>Royal Flying Doctors Service</td>
<td>10 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>Children's Panadol</td>
<td>Make-A-Wish Foundation</td>
<td>$1 ($100,000 min. for 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's General Foods</td>
<td>Pancake Shakes</td>
<td>UnitingCare</td>
<td>10 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>Greeting Cards</td>
<td>Breast cancer research</td>
<td>no amount specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloggs</td>
<td>Selected cereals</td>
<td>Kid's Helpline</td>
<td>5 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenman's</td>
<td>Lollies</td>
<td>Sids and Kids</td>
<td>no pack amount specified, $375,000 over 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Clark</td>
<td>Kleenex toilet tissue</td>
<td>Guide Dogs Australia/ RNZFB Guide Dog Services New Zealand</td>
<td>no amount specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's</td>
<td>Big Mac</td>
<td>Ronald McDonald House</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Earth</td>
<td>Muesli bars</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
<td>no amount specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foods Limited</td>
<td>Pura Milk</td>
<td>Big Brothers/Big Sisters</td>
<td>$1 million over 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kid's Help Line</td>
<td>undisclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's</td>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Charity in general</td>
<td>10 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor and Gamble</td>
<td>Numerous products</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Logicin</td>
<td>Landcare Australia</td>
<td>5 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Specially designed women's t-shirts</td>
<td>Breast cancer research</td>
<td>50 cents - to $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Ben's</td>
<td>Pal Dog Food</td>
<td>Royal Guide Dogs</td>
<td>50 cents - to $200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company promotional material
| AUTHOR       | YEAR | JOURNAL                                 | STUDY TYPE & SCOPE       | TITLE/PURPOSE                                                                 | FINDINGS                                                                                     | FURTHER RESEARCH (of interest) | |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------| |
| Chaney, I.   | 2001 | International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing | Quantitative, New Zealand | “Cause-Related Marketing in New Zealand”                                       | CRM has the ability to induce brand switching and trial.                                    | In CRM campaigns consumers were more likely to remember the name of the cause than the company. |
| Dolli, N.    |      |                                         |                          | Seeks to develop an understanding of consumer behaviour and perceptions towards CRM |                                                                             | Neither gender nor income level had an impact on attitudes.                                 | CRM campaigns were perceived favourably overall. |
| Mizerski, D. | 2001 | Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing | Quantitative, US        | “A Field Experiment Comparing the Effectiveness of ‘Ambush’ and Cause Related Ad Appeals for Social Marketing Causes” | An ad which indicated verbal support for a cause could be just as effective as an ad that indicated a financial contribution for creating some perceptions about the company. |
| Mizerski, K. |      |                                         |                          |                                                                                     | The perceived association between cause and company did not affect the effectiveness of the ad. |                                                                                             |                                  |
| Sadler, O.   |      |                                         |                          |                                                                                     |                                                                                             |                                  |                                  |
| Miyazaki, A.D.|     |                                         |                          | Investigates whether and when cause-related marketing efforts influence consumer choice. | The strongest influence of CRM cues was found for choice under conditions of interbrand homogeneity, where no trade-offs were required in exchange for selecting the brand favoured in terms of CRM activities. |
| Traylor, K.A.|      |                                         |                          |                                                                                     | Although the percentage decreased, many were still willing to accept lower performance or higher price in return for perceived corporate social responsibility. | An examination of the effectiveness of various marketing strategies in making a company's CRM information accessible to consumers during their decision making. |
### Appendix 3 - Summary of cause-related marketing research focusing on consumer behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Title/Purpose</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Further Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berger, I.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Advances in Consumer Research</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Consumer Persuasion through Cause-Related Marketing&quot;</td>
<td>Females tend to have more positive attitudes toward cause claims and the associated products.</td>
<td>Develop a model of the linkages between personal values and attitudes towards CRM, and use causal modelling techniques to test such a model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiments conducted to explore how cause claims affect persuasion in print ads.</td>
<td>Cause claims enhance attention and interest in ads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozinets, R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kropp, F.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>International Journal of</td>
<td>Quantitative Australia</td>
<td>&quot;Cause-Related Marketing and Values in Australia&quot;</td>
<td>Those who place greater importance on values such as warm relationships, self-fulfillment and security are likely to have more positive attitudes towards CRM.</td>
<td>Females appear to have somewhat more positive attitudes towards CRM than males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden, S.J.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation into attitudes towards CRM among Australian consumers, with attention to the underlying differences in consumer values.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The degree to which consumers are susceptible to interpersonal influence is not related to attitudes toward CRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavadon, A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit &amp; Voluntary Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb D.J.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Journal of Public Policy</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews US</td>
<td>&quot;A Typology of Consumer Responses to Cause-Related Marketing: From Skeptics to Socially Concerned&quot;</td>
<td>Attitudes towards firms who participate in CRM were mixed, with approximately half the sample expressing negative attitudes.</td>
<td>The perceived fairness of a CRM campaign (e.g. the donation-profit ratio) will affect consumer responses to the campaign positively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr, L.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>To examine how customers think and feel about cause-related marketing.</td>
<td>Purchasing behaviour was sometimes affected.</td>
<td>The more important traditional purchase criteria are to a consumer, the less likely that person will be to change purchasing behaviour in response to a CRM campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on views, divided participants into four different types of consumers: skeptics, balancers, attribution-oriented and</td>
<td>More involved consumers tended to differentiate companies on the basis of their motives and past history of community involvement.</td>
<td>Consumers' responses to a CRM campaign will be affected more strongly by the amount of help they expect the cause to receive than by the motives attributed to the firm for participating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests that there is a potential segment of consumers that responds to CRM with purchase behaviour.</td>
<td>The more knowledgeable consumers have about CRM the more important attributions will be in determining their responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommends that companies clearly communicate the terms of the offer and the actual results as a campaign progresses.</td>
<td>For knowledgeable consumers, the consistency of a firm’s community support will affect the attributions they make about the reasons for the firm’s involvement in CRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important for consumers to trust that the campaigns were honest and nonexploitative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3 - Summary of cause-related marketing research focusing on consumer behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>JOURNAL</th>
<th>STUDY TYPE &amp; SCOPE</th>
<th>TITLE/PURPOSE</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>FURTHER RESEARCH (of interest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strahilevitz, M.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Journal of Consumer Research</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Donations to Charity as Purchase Incentives: How Well They Work May Depend on What You Are Trying to Sell.&quot;</td>
<td>Suggests that charity incentives are more effective with frivolous products than with practical products.</td>
<td>Suggest future research look at the interaction between nature of the product being promoted, price of the product and the size of the charity incentive being offered. Explore whether certain types of charities work better with certain types of products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers, J.G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on how the nature of the product, hedonic vs utilitarian, influences effectiveness of using donations to charity as a purchase incentive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacin, P.A.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses&quot;</td>
<td>What consumers know about a company can influence their reactions to the company's products.</td>
<td>A reputation based on a company's abilities may have a greater impact on both specific product attribute perceptions and the overall corporate evaluation than a reputation for social responsibility. In addition to corporate ability, corporate social responsibility associations have a significant influence on consumer responses to new products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, T.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examines the effects of two general types of corporate associations on products: corporate ability associations and perceived social responsibility associations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterhus, T.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Pro-social Consumer Influence Strategies: When and How Do They Work?&quot;</td>
<td>Normative influences do not automatically translate into behaviour.</td>
<td>High responsibility attributions increase the chance that personal norms will influence behaviour and the reverse is also true. Firms that nurture and build consumer trust stand to reap the dividends of normative influences. Managers should pursue a pro-social positioning that fits consumers' perceptions. It should be congruent with the types of issues toward which the firms' consumers feel responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, J.H.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Cause-Related Marketing: Selected Effects of Price and Charitable Donations&quot;</td>
<td>The CRM promotions did not produce negative reactions to either the message, the store, or intention to respond in comparison with messages which did not incorporate CRM. The participant's reactions toward the message, the store, and intention to respond were not diminished as the price charged increased in proportion to the amount provided to the charity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Study Type &amp; Scope</th>
<th>Title/Purpose</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Further Research (of interest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ross, J.K. &amp; Stutts, M.A. Patterson, L.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of US Marketing Science</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Consumer Perceptions of Organizations that Use Cause-Related Marketing&quot;</td>
<td>Attitudes toward the firm using CRM were generally positive and felt CRM was a good way for the cause to raise funds. Consumers attitudes were only slightly more favourable when the cause was local as compared to national.</td>
<td>Explore sex role and prosocial behaviour theories to explain why women are more favourable toward CRM than men. Investigate a model of consumer behaviour that allows for interaction of attitudes and perceptions toward the product, firm and the cause. Compare multiple firms, products and/or causes to determine which ones elicit the most favourable consumer responses. Examine attitudes towards additional giving once the consumer has donated through CRM purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, J.K. &amp; Stutts, M.A. Patterson, L.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Journal of Applied US Business Strategy</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Tactical Considerations for the Effective Use Of Cause-Related Marketing&quot;</td>
<td>Most respondents felt CRM was a good way to raise money for the cause, had purchased a product to help support a cause, and expressed favourable attitudes toward the firm and the cause.</td>
<td>Women had more favourable attitudes toward the firm and the cause than did men. Women were significantly more likely than men to try a new brand as a result of a CRM promotion if they regularly used the product category. Charities should emphasize that donations go to support local causes. Certain types of causes are more likely to result in a purchase than others. The amount of the contribution a firm makes does not necessarily affect the consumers purchase decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.M. &amp; Alcorn, D.S.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>Quantitative US</td>
<td>&quot;Cause Marketing: A New Direction in the Marketing of Corporate Responsibility&quot;</td>
<td>Respondents believed it important to make donations to a local charity and to buy products from companies that support charitable causes. The combination of the right market segment and adequate financial incentives are of primary importance in increasing brand switching even when altruistic appeals are present.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3 - Summary of cause-related marketing research focusing on consumer behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>JOURNAL</th>
<th>STUDY TYPE &amp; SCOPE</th>
<th>TITLE/PURPOSE</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>FURTHER RESEARCH (of interest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**APPENDIX 4 – ORIGINAL SCALES ADAPTED FOR THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**The List of Values**  
(Kahle 1983)

The following is a list of things that some people look for or want out of life. Please study the list carefully and then rate each thing on how important it is in your daily life, where 1=very unimportant, and 9= very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Excitement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Being well respected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Fun and enjoyment of life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Self-respect</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now reread the items and circle the one thing that is most important to you in your daily life.
**Store Loyalty**  
*(Sirgy, Johar, Samli and Claiborne 1991)*

1. **How often do you buy here?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks a month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **How would you characterize your loyalty to this store?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loyalty Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am very loyal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am somewhat loyal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am less loyal than some people</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shop around a lot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **How would you rate this store compared to your ideal store?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fit (Brand/Company)**  
*(Keller and Aaker 1992)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad fit between company and product</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good fit between company and product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all logical for company</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very logical for company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate for company</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate for company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude toward the Offer  
(Burton and Lichtenstein 1988; Lichtenstein and Bearden 1989)  

My attitude toward this deal is:  

1. favorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unfavorable  
2. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 good  
3. harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 beneficial  
4. attractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unattractive  
5. poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 excellent  
6. I like this deal:  
strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 strongly agree  

Attitude toward the Product/Brand (Hedonic)  
(Batra and Ahtola 1988)  

bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good  
unfavorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favorable  
disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 agreeable  
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant  
negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive  
dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like  

Purchase Intention  
(Baker and Churchill 1977)  

No, definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Yes, definitely  

1. Would you like to try this product?  
2. Would you buy this product if you happened to see it in a store?  
3. Would you actively seek out this product in a store in order to purchase it?
APPENDIX 5 – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Appendix 5a – Pre-treatment Survey: All Groups

Appendix 5b – Post-treatment Survey: Control Group

Appendix 5c – Post-treatment Survey: Cause-Related Marketing Group

Appendix 5d – Post-treatment Survey: Sponsorship Group

Appendix 5e – Post-treatment Survey: Sales Promotion Group
APPENDIX 5A – PRE-TREATMENT SURVEY (ALL GROUPS)

Introduction

The following questionnaire relates to soft drinks. Your participation in this research project would be appreciated and all responses will remain confidential.

There are 23 questions relating to your perceptions, attitudes and demographics.

Please read each question carefully and answer all questions. Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your help.
The following is a list of things that some people look for or want out of life.

Please study the list carefully and then rate each on how important it is in your daily life, where 1 = very unimportant, and 7 = very important.

Please circle the number that indicates your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Excitement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being well respected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fun and enjoyment of life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-respect</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What is your gender? Please circle your response.
    Male          Female

11. Please indicate your age: ________ years

    Yes          No
13. Have you bought any lemonade or diet lemonade products in the last year? Please circle your response.

Yes         No

14. Have you ever bought Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade?

Yes         No

15. How often do you buy Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade? Please circle the number that matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once in 2 weeks</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Twice a week or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How would you characterise your loyalty to Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade? Please circle the number that matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I never purchase</th>
<th>I shop around a lot</th>
<th>I am less loyal than some people</th>
<th>I am somewhat loyal</th>
<th>I am very loyal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How would you rate Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade compared to your ideal lemonade? Please circle the number that matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the number which best indicates your attitude toward Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade.

18. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
19. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable
20. disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 agreeable
21. unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant
22. negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive
23. dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like

Thank you very much for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 5B – POST-TREATMENT SURVEY: CONTROL GROUP

Introduction

The following questionnaire relates to Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade. Your participation in this research project would be appreciated and all responses will remain confidential.

There are 9 questions relating to your perceptions of the product.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all questions. Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your help.
Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade are available in a 1.25 litre bottle.

For the following questions, please circle the number that matches your response.

1. Would you like to try either of these products?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Would you buy either of these products if you happened to see it in a store?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Would you actively seek out either of these products in a store in order to purchase it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, definitely not</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the number which best indicates your attitude toward Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade.

4. bad   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

5. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable

6. disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 agreeable

7. unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant

8. negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive

9. dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like

Thank you very much for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 5C – POST-TREATMENT SURVEY: CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING GROUP

Introduction

The following questionnaire relates to Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade. Your participation in this research project would be appreciated and all responses will remain confidential.

There are 18 questions relating to your perceptions of the product and its marketing activity.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all questions. Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your help.
Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade are currently participating in a marketing campaign. For each specially marked 1.25 litre bottle sold, 20 cents will be donated to shelters for homeless youths, up to a maximum of $200,000.

My attitude toward the marketing campaign is: (please circle the number that indicates your response)

1. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable
2. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
3. harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 beneficial
4. unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 attractive
5. poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excellent
6. I like this campaign:

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

Please read each pair of statements below. The statements refer to the marketing campaign. You may not fully agree with either of the statements. Therefore, please estimate your position and circle the appropriate number on the scale.

7. Bad fit between product and cause 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good fit between product and cause

8. Not at all logical for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very logical for product

9. Not at all appropriate for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very appropriate for product
Please circle the number which best indicates your attitude toward Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade.

10. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
11. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable
12. disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 agreeable
13. unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant
14. negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 positive
15. dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 like

For the following questions, please circle the number that matches your response.

16. Would you like to try either of these products?

   No, definitely not    Yes, definitely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Would you buy either of these products if you happened to see it in a store?

   No, definitely not    Yes, definitely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Would you actively seek out either of these products in a store in order to purchase it?

   No, definitely not    Yes, definitely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Thank you very much for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 5D – POST-TREATMENT SURVEY: SPONSORSHIP GROUP

Introduction

The following questionnaire relates to Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade. Your participation in this research project would be appreciated and all responses will remain confidential.

There are 18 questions relating to your perceptions of the product and its marketing activity.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all questions. Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your help.
Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade are currently participating in a marketing campaign. They have decided to sponsor the Brisbane Lions and the football club will receive $200,000 during the 2002 season.

My attitude toward the marketing campaign is: (please circle the number that indicates your response)

1. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable
2. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
3. harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 beneficial
4. unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 attractive
5. poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excellent

I like this campaign:

6. strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

Please read each pair of statements below. The statements refer to the marketing campaign. You may not fully agree with either of the statements. Therefore, please estimate your position and circle the appropriate number on the scale.

7. Bad fit between product and sport 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good fit between product and sport
8. Not at all logical for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very logical for product
9. Not at all appropriate for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very appropriate for product
Please circle the number which best indicates your attitude toward Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade.

10. bad  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  good
11. unfavourable  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  favourable
12. disagreeable  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  agreeable
13. unpleasant  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  pleasant
14. negative  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  positive
15. dislike  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  like

For the following questions, please circle the number that matches your response.

16. Would you like to try either of these products?
   No, definitely not  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

17. Would you buy either of these products if you happened to see it in a store?
   No, definitely not  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

18. Would you actively seek out either of these products in a store in order to purchase it?
   No, definitely not  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

Thank you very much for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 5E – POST-TREATMENT SURVEY: SALES PROMOTION GROUP

Introduction

The following questionnaire relates to Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade. Your participation in this research project would be appreciated and all responses will remain confidential.

There are 18 questions relating to your perceptions of the product and its marketing activity.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all questions. Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your help.
Schweppes Lemonade and Schweppes Diet Lemonade are currently participating in a marketing campaign. For a limited time, customers will receive 20 cents off each specially marked 1.25 litre bottle.

My attitude toward the marketing campaign is: (please circle the number that indicates your response)

1. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favourable
2. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
3. harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 beneficial
4. unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 attractive
5. poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excellent
6. I like this campaign:
   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

Please read each pair of statements below. The statements refer to the marketing campaign. You may not fully agree with either of the statements. Therefore, please estimate your position and circle the appropriate number on the scale.

7. Bad fit between product and promotion 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good fit between product and promotion
8. Not at all logical for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very logical for product
9. Not at all appropriate for product 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very appropriate for product
Please circle the number which best indicates your attitude toward Schweppes Lemonade or Schweppes Diet Lemonade.

10. bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  good
11. unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  favourable
12. disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  agreeable
13. unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  pleasant
14. negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  positive
15. dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  like

For the following questions, please circle the number that matches your response.

16. Would you like to try either of these products?
   
   No, definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

17. Would you buy either of these products if you happened to see it in a store?
   
   No, definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

18. Would you actively seek out either of these products in a store in order to purchase it?
   
   No, definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Yes, definitely

Thank you very much for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.
## APPENDIX 6 – CASES WITH MISSING VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Case #</th>
<th># Missing</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause-Related</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 7 – VARIABLES WITH MISSING VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of Values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre Attitude to Brand:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad/Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable/Favourable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable/Agreeable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant/Pleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike/Like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude to Offer:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/Excellent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like - Agree/disagree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Fit between Product and Marketing Campaign:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Fit/Good fit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not logical/logical</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not appropriate/appropriate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Attitude to Brand:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad/Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable/Favourable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable/Agreeable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant/Pleasant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike/Like</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intention:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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