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INTRODUCTION:

Cause related marketing (CRM) has become a strong topic of interest in recent years. Throughout the eighties, an increasing number of articles were published (20,4,15,) covering successful cause related marketing promotions and their implications for both business and society. Marketers' need to develop new strategies to attract consumers combined with increasing need for funding on the part of charitable organizations has resulted in increasing development of cause related marketing promotions. This has resulted in an increasingly diversified use of this marketing tool.

Accepting the premise that cause related marketing is fast becoming a legitimate marketing tool leads to a need to further explore the consumers' perception of it as well as their response to it.
Cause related marketing, as defined by Varadarajan and Menon (26) 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."

Corporate philanthropy, long viewed as an indication of voluntary social responsibility, has evolved to investment status according to Stroup and Neubert (25) in their 1987 article "Doing Good, Doing Better: Two Views of Social Responsibility". During the eighties, a number of authors addressed the pros and cons of this new method of combining marketing with philanthropy. Morris and Biederman (18) and Schiller (21) address these issues and outline the concept of enlightened self interest. Grahn, Hannaford and Laverty (8) also reviewed the literature on corporate philanthropy and its relationship to marketing strategy. With enlightened self interest, non-marketing objectives include: beneficial tax incentives, personal motives of owners and social responsibility. Marketing objectives include: enhancement of corporate image, advertising complement and sales promotion. Among the topics that these authors recommend be explored, is
an examination of the effectiveness of cause related marketing by exploring the motivation and satisfaction of consumers responding to CRM promotions.

Several authors have addressed the "new bottom line" approach to corporate philanthropy. Mescon and Tilson (16) measured good works in terms of their contribution to the firm's competitive edge. Stroup and Neubert (25) expanded on corporate social responsibility as an investment. On occasion, the "investment" had a surprising negative net present value. American Express, a pioneer in the use of CRM, found that while the firm raised millions for good causes with CRM, the anticipated increase in new credit cards and the use of existing cards did not materialize. This disappointing result caused Jerry Walsh, the CEO, to view it as non-productive in marketing terms. (Josephson, 13). Hansler (11) found the notion of gaining incremental sales from social largess to be a relatively recent innovation that was here to stay.

Cameron (6) proposed a set of valuative criteria for measuring effectiveness of CRM promotions. Mihalik (17) and also Paine (19) suggested ways to evaluate and measure the public relations and corporate image enhancement effects of
CRMs. Varadarajan and Menon (26) detailed attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of cause related marketing promotions:

"In attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of cause related marketing promotions, firms have relied mainly on consumers' behavioral response measures such as the number of coupons redeemed and the percentage increases in retail sales. Trade response to these promotions are evaluated in terms of such measures as the percentage of increase in sales to retailers, in-store displays and other merchandising efforts. Research on consumer attitudes is lacking."

A review of the literature on the subject of cause related marketing reveals some interest, during the eighties, in the subject which may be due to the phenomenal growth and acceptance of cause related marketing as a legitimate marketing tool.

This review of the subject of cause related marketing (found in Appendix C) included the following publications: California Management Review, Journal of Marketing, Academy of Management Journal, Public Relations Journal, Journal of Macro Marketing, AMA Educational Proceedings, Management Science, Marketing, Marketing
Corporate philanthropy has been around almost as long as corporations themselves. Several authors suggest that when traditional elements of corporate compassion, community involvement, social responsibility, public relations and image enhancement give way to more strategic uses of philanthropy, consumers, charities, and the corporations themselves can be negatively affected. Gurin (10) outlined some possible effects on corporate philanthropic decisions on the mission and conduct of the nonprofit organizations; on the public's perceptions and attitudes toward causes and on the consumer's charitable giving behavior.

A number of authors postulated on the negative effects of cause related marketing upon the consumer. Gurin (10) commented on the manner in which CRM affects philanthropy and urged fund raisers to consider the growing influence of marketing on fund raising and its possible negative effects.

While cause related marketing appears to be an invention of
the eighties, during the seventies, authors were debating the concept of social responsibility of business. Steiner (23) wrote in 1972 that business could be a beneficial force in society and defined the social responsibility of business, and Keim (14) questioned Steiner's views in an article entitled "Managerial Behavior and the Social Responsibility Debate: Goals vs Constraints".

Ethically, the discussion centers on social responsibility and ethical concerns over the exploitation of the cause, the consumer and the government. (As most CRMs are paid for out of marketing budgets, expenses for these efforts are tax deductible). Further, one theme of the Reagan administration was praise and encouragement not only for volunteerism in social causes, but also private sector (i.e. corporate) support of social programs formerly funded by the government. Robin and Reidenbach (20), in their 1987 article, outline both the ethical problems and recommend parallel planning systems for integrating ethical and socially responsible plans into strategic marketing planning. Cadbury (5), in a 1987 article, stated that actions are unethical if they can't withstand scrutiny.

As with any new joint venture that is to profit both
partners, strategy both from a corporate and charitable viewpoint is essential. Varadarajan and Menon (26) cite numerous case histories stating that indicators of a firm's use of CRM as a strategic tool include: (1) top management's involvement in key decisions about a program, (2) a long term commitment to a program, and (3) substantial investment of resources toward the development and implementation of the program. These authors also stated that programs built around CRM concepts are characterized by a coordinated and integrated use of the advertising, personnel selling, publicity and sales promotion components of the promotion mix. In 1985, Bragdon (2) laid out a strategy for the nonprofit about to become a partner in a CRM. Included in this strategy were the nonprofit's goals including the identification of a corporate sponsor which has compatible marketing objectives in terms of target market, corporate culture and new business plans. Bragdon recommended that the nonprofit seek out the corporate connection being ever careful that its proposals reflect a pragmatic fit in order for the company to respond positively.

While little research has been done, speculation on the effects of cause related marketing promotions upon voluntary organizations and upon the consumer has been published. In
1988, Burnett and Van Wood (3) published research on public perception of and consumer attitudes toward charitable causes as well as on consumers' charitable giving behavior. Grahn and Hannaford (8) called for further research in this area to examine the effectiveness of cause related marketing by exploring the motivation and satisfaction of consumers responding to CRM.

To date, research has concentrated on the objectives of the participating charities, on the objectives of the firms involved, and on business and tactical perspectives. The research literature virtually ignores the consumer's viewpoint. Research on consumer attitudes toward aspects of cause related marketing may help to identify and further define the target most receptive to this type of promotion. As very little research attention has been paid to consumer attitudes, this study attempts to explore specific consumer attitudes toward selected aspects of cause related marketing promotions that were conducted in the Richmond, Virginia area during 1989.
PURPOSE:
The purpose of this study is to analyze consumer attitudes toward selected aspects of cause related marketing. Specifically, the study will attempt to: (1) determine the extent to which consumers are aware of cause related marketing promotions and the extent to which they knowingly participate in these promotions, (2) explore consumer perceptions of their own social responsibility as defined by giving to charity and also explore consumer attitudes toward businesses role in support of charitable causes, (3) measure consumer attitudes toward charities who join with corporations in CRM promotions, (4) measure consumer approval or disapproval of CRM promotions, (5) investigate the effect of CRM promotions on consumer willingness to try new products and (6) explore consumer feelings of having made a contribution to charity by purchasing a CRM promoted product.

Hopefully this study will add to the growing body of knowledge of consumer attitudes toward this form of marketing. This study may help to further define a target audience of consumers who share certain demographic characteristics which is somewhat more receptive to cause related marketing promotions.
METHODOLOGY:

Data for this study were collected during October of 1989 using a sample of consumers drawn from the greater Richmond, Virginia area telephone directory. To ensure a random sample of various geographical areas of the city and surrounding counties, data were collected using randomly generated telephone numbers resulting in 200 usable surveys.

The instrument was designed and tested by a random sample of 20 homes to check for bias and clarity.

The Pearson Chi Square test was employed to identify significant differences between age, education and income groups in their attitudes toward eighteen variables explored. Variables were found to be significant by the Wilks Lambda Criterion \( (p < .05) \). The appropriate analytic procedure is offered by the computer package SPSS-X.

Considerable attention was paid both to the design of the telephone survey and to the wording of the questions. The questionnaire was designed to be consistent with recommendations made by Belson (1) and also those made by
Schuman and Presser (22).

In order to verify participant knowledge of the correct definition of cause related marketing, each respondent was asked at the onset of the survey to name and describe a cause related promotion that he had seen in the previous year. This verification technique, suggested by Smith (24) in his article; "The Art of Asking Questions", alerted the interviewer at the beginning of the survey, to the respondents' understanding of the concept being discussed. As most consumers are not familiar with the term "cause related marketing", some clarification in the form of examples often had to be provided by the interviewer. All survey calls were conducted by this author. The instrument used may be found in section B of the appendix.

The survey revealed that 66% of the respondents could recall and identify by firm or brand name, one or more of two dozen cause related marketing promotions seen in the year preceding this survey. After cause related marketing was defined for them with examples, 75.5% of the respondents said that they had purchased a product or service involved in a CRM promotion in the six month period preceding the survey. Each of these respondents proceeded to identify the promotion by firm or brand name.
Variables were analyzed to generate data regarding the following: (1) the respondents' awareness of and ability to recall cause related marketing promotions, (2) the respondents' attitude toward the social responsibility of corporations as defined by their giving to charitable causes, (3) the respondents' own attitudes of social responsibility as defined by their feelings of personal obligation to give to charity, (4) the respondents' history of purchases of CRM promoted products, (5) with those respondents who recalled purchasing a CRM promoted product, variables were explored, including feelings of having made a personal contribution, reasons for purchase, need to examine the worth of the cause, degree of approval of the cause being helped by his purchase, and willingness to try a new product involved in a CRM promotion. All respondents were asked to rate (favorably or unfavorably on a Lickert scale) merchants who participated in CRM promotions. All respondents were asked about their perceptions of corporate motivation (to increase sales or to aid cause). Finally data were collected on the respondents' ages, incomes, and levels of education obtained.

Consumers who demonstrated an awareness of CRM promotions tended to be better educated, more affluent, and to fall
between 20 and 60 years of age. Purchase of a CRM promoted product occurred in 82% of the college graduates surveyed, in 71% of the high school graduates, and in 63% of the respondents who had not completed high school. The income groups most likely to purchase a CRM promoted product were those with family incomes in excess of $40,000 per year. Those found least likely to purchase a CRM promoted product have less than a high school education, earn less than $20,000 per year and fall into the under 20 and over 60 age groups.
RESULTS:

Tables 1-3 illustrate the responses to the first survey question, "Can you think of a cause related marketing promotion that you have seen recently?" This variable was compared with the values of age, education and family income. The results shown in the tables below indicate that there is a significant correlation between these demographic values and the first variable.

TABLE 1.
CAN YOU THINK OF A CRM (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>OVER 60</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 9.85979 3 .01980

TABLE 2.
CAN YOU THINK OF A CRM? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER $20,000</th>
<th>$20-$40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 12.11521 4 .01651
TABLE 3.

CAN YOU THINK OF A CRM? (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>9.93531</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of analysis of this first question indicate that awareness of cause related marketing promotions is correlated to age, education and income levels. Awareness is highest in the 20-40 year age group, and nearly as high in the 40 to 60 year age group. Awareness increases with education going from 46% in the lowest level, to 60% of high school graduates, to 75% of college graduates. Awareness also correlates to income with the two middle income groups exhibiting the highest awareness. Awareness is also correlated to education.

Whether philanthropy is an appropriate activity for business has long been a subject for debate. As businesses are the participants in these cause related marketing promotions, the respondents were asked their opinion regarding the obligation of businesses to support charities. The percentage of respondents who felt that businesses should contribute to charity was 94.5% for the lowest income group, 79.6% for the
next group, and 84.8% for the highest income group; all answering in the affirmative. Tables 4-6 illustrate the results of this survey question.

**TABLE 4.**
SHOULD BUSINESSES GIVE TO CHARITY? (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEARSON</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.46037</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.**
SHOULD BUSINESSES GIVE TO CHARITY? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60,000+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEARSON</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.67901</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage of consumers who felt that businesses should contribute to charity exceeds 80% in all three tables indicating strong agreement with the philosophy of corporate charitable support. Income was the only significant variable with 94% of the lowest income respondents, 96.6% for the next highest group, 79.6% for the next group and 84.8% for the highest income group responding in the affirmative.

Respondents were next asked to quantify the strength of their agreement or disagreement with the above statement on a Lickert scale. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated agreement at a level of 6 or higher, with 33.8% agreeing at the highest level of intensity.

Many of the articles on philanthropy referenced in the introduction addressed corporate giving and also personal
giving. In the survey, after respondents were asked their opinion on the obligations of businesses to support charities, they were then asked to define their own personal feelings of obligation to contribute. Tables 7-9 illustrate the resulting responses to the question: Do you feel a personal obligation to contribute to charity.

TABLE 7.
DO YOU FEEL A PERSONAL OBLIGATION TO GIVE? (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 12.48160 6 .05205

TABLE 8.
DO YOU FEEL A PERSONAL OBLIGATION TO GIVE? (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; THAN H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 1.89175 4 .75566
TABLE 9.

DO YOU FEEL A PERSONAL OBLIGATION TO GIVE? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEARSON</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.89059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 83% of all respondents acknowledged a personal feeling of obligation to support charity. This obligation significantly increases with age.

When measuring intensity of feelings of an obligation to contribute, demographic values were not significant. Tables 10-12 illustrate this finding.
### TABLE 10.

**PLEASE QUANTIFY THE STRENGTH OF YOUR FEELING OF PERSONAL OBLIGATION. (BY INCOME)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60,000+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.29200</td>
<td>.28606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 20</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>39.86106</td>
<td>.05279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12.
STRENGTH OF PERSONAL OBLIGATION TO GIVE (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>23.06853</td>
<td>.18797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic values were not significant in the strength of the respondents feelings of obligation to give. Seventy two percent of the respondents indicated a strength of feeling at 6 or above.

The next question asked was "Have you purchased a product where part of the price went to support a good cause?" Here,
seventy six percent of the respondents indicated that they made such a purchase. Tables 13-15 indicate that the values of income, age and education were all significant with respect to the purchase of a CRM promoted product. With the value of education, a trend was evident in that 64% of those who had not completed high school, 71% of those who completed high school and 82% of those with college degrees had purchased CRM promoted products. The value of income exhibited a trend wherein 54% of those respondents earning less than twenty thousand per year, 77% of those earning between twenty and forty thousand per year, 88% of those earning between forty and sixty thousand per year and 81% of those earning in excess of sixty thousand per year had participated. When the value of age is considered, 82% of those in the 20-40 year age group and 78% of those in the 40-60 year age group had participated.

**TABLE 13.**

**HAVE YOU EVER PURCHASED A CRM PROMOTED PRODUCT (BY AGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DON'T KNOW</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE**

| PEARSON       | 25.51421 | 8 | .00245 |
TABLE 14.

HAVE YOU EVER PURCHASED A CRM PROMOTED PRODUCT? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE   N VALUE   SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 28.19238   8         .00044

TABLE 15.

HAVE YOU PURCHASED A CRM PRODUCT (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE   N VALUE   SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 12.72995   4         .04753

At this point in the survey, the interviewer asked the next seven questions only of those respondents who had purchased a CRM promoted product.

One of the fears expressed by Gurin (10) was that consumers
participating in CRM promotions may consider themselves donors, and perhaps feel that with their purchase they have fulfilled a charitable obligation. Respondents were asked if they felt that by making a CRM related purchase, they were making a personal contribution to charity. Some respondents were quick to point out that the CRM they had participated in or read about stated that the COMPANY would make a contribution to the charity when its products were sold. However, there may be a genuine cause for concern in that almost 70% of the respondents who had made such a purchase stated that they did feel that they had made a personal contribution by doing so. Age was a significant value with respondents in the 20 to 60 year age groups significantly more likely to feel that they had made a personal contribution. Tables 16-18 confirm this.

TABLE 16.
FEEL THAT IAM MAKING A PERSONAL CONTRIBUTION (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 17.00466 4 .00927
TABLE 17.
FEEL THAT I AM MAKING A PERSONAL DONATION ( BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 8.39438 3 .21061

TABLE 18.
FEEL THAT I AM MAKING A PERSONAL DONATION (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 2.81716 3 .58887

Respondents were next asked why they purchased the CRM promoted product. Suggested answers were: (1) to support the charity (2) because you needed the product (3) both reasons 1 & 2 (4) some other reason. The demographic values had no significance. Forty three percent of all respondents stated
that they purchased the product because they both needed it and wanted to help the charity. Twenty-two percent purchased the product solely because they wanted to help the charity and 24% purchased the product solely because they needed it. The remaining 16% gave other reasons for purchasing the product such as brand loyalty. Tables 19-21 illustrate this.

TABLE 19.
REASON FOR BUYING CRM PRODUCT (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH N&amp;S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 4.94533 9 .83905
### TABLE 20.

**REASON FOR BUYING CRH PRODUCT (BY INCOME)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH S&amp;N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE**

PEARSON 7.98776 9 .53538

### TABLE 21.

**REASON FOR BUYING CRH PRODUCT (BY EDUCATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH S&amp;N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>39.85</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE**

PEARSON 7.70364 6 .26063
There is also some interest on the part of this researcher as to whether or not a consumer can be enticed into purchasing a product he really doesn't want, just because it is involved in a CRM promotion and he desires to help the cause. Thus the next question: "Have you ever purchased a product that you really didn't want, solely to support a good cause?" In this instance, demographic values proved not to be significant. Forty four percent of the respondents answered in the affirmative which may indicate that the appeal of the cause is so powerful that in 44% of the cases, it alone may result in a purchase even when the consumer really doesn't want the affiliated product. Tables 22-24 confirm this.

TABLE 22.
WOULD YOU PURCHASE UNWANTED PRODUCT? ( BY AGE )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DON'T</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE | N VALUE | SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 6.37736 | 6 | .38227
TABLE 23.
WOULD YOU PURCHASE UNWANTED PRODUCT? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; $20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 7.65933 6 .26414

TABLE 24.
WOULD YOU PURCHASE UNWANTED PRODUCT? (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S</th>
<th>H.S GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 4.84952 4 .30309

Gurin (10) in his article "Cause Related Marketing in Question", expressed concern that consumers participating in CRM promotions have less need to examine the worthiness of the cause. The next survey question asks respondents whether they feel any need to examine the worthiness of a cause when part of their purchase price is going to benefit that cause. Slightly more than 80% of the respondents felt that they did
have a need to examine the worthiness of the cause in question. Demographic values were not significant, leading this researcher to believe that Gurin may be wrong. Tables 25-27 illustrate the results of this question.

TABLE 25.
NEED TO EXAMINE WORTH OF CAUSE (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE** | **VALUE** | **N VALUE** | **SIGNIFICANCE**
--- | --- | --- | ---
PEARSON | 4.96661 | 4 | .54810

TABLE 26.
NEED TO EXAMINE WORTH OF CAUSE (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDER H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE** | **VALUE** | **N VALUE** | **SIGNIFICANCE**
--- | --- | --- | ---
PEARSON | 8.15106 | 4 | .08620
TABLE 27.

NEED TO EXAMINE WORTH OF CAUSE (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER</th>
<th>$20,000</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 3.59319 6 .73153

A second question arose naturally from Gurin's (10) statement that CRM promotions lessen the consumer's attention to the worthiness of the cause. That question is: "Would you ever purchase a product if part of the purchase price was going to a cause that you did not approve of?". The resultant data indicate that nearly 80% of the respondents would not purchase such a product. Further, demographic values are not significant. Participants were asked to rate their degree of aversion to such a CRM promotion and it is of interest to note that the strength of their aversion in 96 percent of the cases was 2 or less on a Lickert scale. Tables 28-30 illustrate this data.
### TABLE 28.

**DEGREE OF AVERSION IF CAUSE NOT APPROVED OF (BY AGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>24.16658</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.06232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 29.

**DEGREE OF AVERSION (BY INCOME)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
<th>UNDER $20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>16.60491</td>
<td>.34303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 30.

**DEGREE OF AVERSION (BY EDUCATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 30. (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>5.93153</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.82098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of companies have used cause related marketing in conjunction with the introduction of a new product. In 1988, for example, General Foods employed a combination of coupons and CRM in a Thanksgiving ad containing coupons for new products, which, when redeemed, generated a financial gift to the Second Harvest national foodbank network to help the nation's hungry.

When respondents who had purchased a CRM promoted product were asked if they would purchase a product that they had never tried before if it were involved in a CRM promotion, demographic values were not significant. Fifty-seven percent of these respondents indicated that a CRM promotion would influence them positively in their willingness to try products that were new to them. Tables 31-33 illustrate this data.
TABLE 31.

WOULD CRM PROMOTION INFLUENCE YOUR PURCHASE OF A NEW PRODUCT?
(BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; $20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 16.39090 4 .35656

TABLE 32.

WOULD CRM PROMOTION INFLUENCE YOUR PURCHASE OF A NEW PRODUCT?
(BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 20.41012 4 .15676
TABLE 33.

WOULD CRM PROMOTION INFLUENCE YOUR PURCHASE OF A NEW PRODUCT (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. Grad</th>
<th>College Grad</th>
<th>Row/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 7.83039 4 .64540

This concludes the survey questions asked only of those respondents who purchased a CRM promoted product. The next set of five questions were asked of all respondents.

A number of authors have addressed the ethical issues concerning the combination of corporate philanthropy with the promotion of a product. (7, 25, 20). In an attempt to measure consumer attitudes toward merchants who employed CRM in the promotion of their products, all respondents were requested to quantify their feelings toward merchants who employed CRM. The lower the number on the scale, the more unfavorable the rating.

The only significant demographic value was age, (see Table 36). Thirty nine percent of the respondents rated these
merchants at a level of 4 or lower, while 61% rated merchants employing CRM at levels of 7 or higher. Tables 34-36 illustrate these findings.

**TABLE 34.**
**QUANTIFY ATTITUDE TOWARD MERCHANTS USING CRM (BY EDUCATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; H. S.</th>
<th>H. S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE**

| PEARSON | 8.15365 | 18 | .97626 |

Machenberg
TABLE 35.

QUANTIFY ATTITUDES TOWARD MERCHANTS USING CRM (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 36.07796 36 .46500
TABLE 36.

QUANTIFY ATTITUDES TOWARD MERCHANTS USING CRM (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 61.55002 27 0.00016

Probing further into respondents' attitudes toward firms that employ CRM, respondents were next asked to speculate on the corporate motivation for employing CRM. First respondents
were asked if they thought firms employed CRM due to a desire to help the cause. Demographic values were not significant. Sixty-three percent of all respondents answered in the affirmative. When asked if they thought that firms employed CRM to increase their sales, 94.4% answered in the affirmative. Tables 37-43 illustrate this data.

TABLE 37.
DO FIRMS EMPLOYING CRM DO IT TO HELP CAUSE? (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 10.58897 4 .30494

TABLE 38.
DO FIRMS EMPLOYING CRM DO IT TO HELP CAUSE? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 10.74087 4 .55125
### TABLE 39.

**DO FIRMS EMPLOYING CRM DO IT TO HELP THE CAUSE? (BY EDUCATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEARSON</strong></td>
<td>3.16451</td>
<td>.78793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 40.

**DO FIRMS USE CRM TO INCREASE SALES? (BY AGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEARSON</strong></td>
<td>6.06275</td>
<td>.41620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 41.

DO FIRMS EMPLOYING CRM DO IT TO INCREASE SALES? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 6.96106 6 .54084

TABLE 42.

DO FIRMS EMPLOYING CRM DO IT TO INCREASE SALES? (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE

PEARSON 6.66498 6 .15469

The final two survey questions explored the respondents' attitudes on whether or not they felt that CRM promotions were an acceptable method for charities to use to raise funds. Gurin (10) stated concerns that commercialism could
Respondents were asked: "Do you feel that it is acceptable for charities to raise funds by participating with merchants in CRM promotions?". Respondents were then asked to quantify the strength of their feelings of acceptance or non-acceptance.

Demographic values were not significant on either of these questions. An overwhelming 91% of the respondents felt it was acceptable for charities to raise funds by joint cause related marketing ventures with merchants. Sixty eight percent of respondents gave an approval strength of 6 or higher. Tables 43-48 illustrate these findings.

---

### TABLE 43.

**IS IT ACCEPTABLE FOR CHARITIES TO ENGAGE IN CRM? (BY AGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI-SQUARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.11857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.04119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44.

IS IT ACCEPTABLE FOR CHARITIES TO ENGAGE IN CRM? (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE | N VALUE | SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON          | 4.58775 | .80059

TABLE 45.

IS IT ACCEPTABLE FOR CHARITIES TO ENGAGE IN CRM? (BY EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. GRAD</th>
<th>COLLEGE GRAD</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE | N VALUE | SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON          | 2.27930 | .68454
TABLE 46.

STRENGTH OF APPROVAL TOWARD CHARITIES WHO USE CRM (BY AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 16.15436 24 .88242
TABLE 47.

STRENGTH OF APPROVAL TOWARD CHARITIES WHO USE CRM (BY INCOME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; $20</th>
<th>$20-40</th>
<th>$40-60</th>
<th>$60+</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI-SQUARE VALUE N VALUE SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON 25.89225 28 .57897
### TABLE 48.

**STRENGTH OF APPROVAL OF CHARITIES USING CRM (BY EDUCATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; H.S.</th>
<th>H.S. Grad</th>
<th>College Grad</th>
<th>ROW/TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-SQUARE VALUE</th>
<th>N VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEARSON</td>
<td>23.17732</td>
<td>.10908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

This study attempts to define consumer attitudes toward selected aspects of cause related marketing. First the study explored respondents' ability to recall CRM promotions. Awareness was highest in the 20-40 year age group and increased with respondents' level of education. All three demographic values were significant. Respondents' feelings as to whether corporations had a social responsibility to share their profits with their communities were also explored. Eighty nine percent of the respondents felt that business had an obligation to give to charity: demographic values were not significant on this question. When asked to quantify the strength of their agreement with this premise, seventy percent indicated an agreement level of 6 or higher with income being the only significant demographic variable.

When queried concerning their feelings of personal obligation to support causes they perceived as worthy, eighty three percent of the respondents felt that they had an obligation to give. Demographic variables were not significant. Seventy two percent of the respondents indicated a strength of obligation to give at a level of 6 or above.

With the 75% of respondents who had purchased a CRM promoted
product, the areas of (1) the CRM purchase causing feelings of having made a contribution to the cause, (2) reasons for CRM purchases, (3) percent of participants who had purchased an unwanted product for the purpose of supporting the related cause, (4) respondents' need to examine the worth of the cause, (5) respondents' willingness to purchase a CRM promoted product if part of their purchase price was going to a cause they disapproved of, and (6) respondent's willingness to try a new product during a CRM promotion were also explored.

All three demographic values were significant in the purchase of a CRM promoted product. Likelihood of purchase increased with education and income, with the 20-40 age group most likely to have purchased such a product.

Age was the only significant demographic value related to feelings of having made a personal contribution to the cause with such a purchase. Sixty nine percent of all respondents felt that they had made a personal contribution with their purchase.

Reasons for purchasing CRM promoted products included (1) to support the cause (2) because respondent needed the product, (3) both reasons 1 & 2, (4) other. Demographic values had no
significance. Forty three percent of all respondents purchased the product for the dual reasons of need and desire to support the cause. Twenty two percent purchased it solely from desire to support the cause.

When asked whether they would purchase a product they did not want just to help the cause, demographic values were not significant. Forty four percent of the respondents answered in the affirmative, indicating the strong pull of the cause in sales of CRM promoted products.

Demographic values were not significant when respondents were asked if they felt a need to examine the worthiness of a cause when purchasing a CRM promoted product. The fact that slightly less than half of the respondents (45%) did not feel a need to examine the cause suggests a lessening of attention to the worthiness of the cause thus promoted. However, when asked if they would purchase a product involved in a CRM promotion when they disapproved of the cause, 80% of the respondents said they would not. Further, demographic values were not significant. When asked to quantify their degree of aversion to such a promotion, 96% of the respondents rated their aversion at 2 or less on a Likert scale indicating mild aversion to such a promotion.
When asked whether a CRM promotion would influence their purchase of a new product, more than 55% of all respondents agreed that it would favorably influence them to make such a purchase. Demographic values were not significant.

All respondents were asked to rate merchants who use CRM promotions as to their feelings of favorableness. Here, the only significant value was age with the 20-40 year age group indicating a higher percentage of favor toward merchants employing CRM. More than half of the respondents rated merchants employing CRM above 6.

Respondents' perception of the motivation of merchants who employ CRM (i.e. to help the cause or to improve sales) was explored. Demographic values were not significant. When asked if they thought firms employed CRM to increase sales, 94% said yes. When asked if they thought firms employed CRM to help the causes, 63% felt that this was true.

Finally, respondents were asked if they felt that it was acceptable for charities to raise funds by participating with merchants in cause related marketing promotions. Demographic values were not significant and 91% of all respondents indicated that this practice was an acceptable method for charities to raise funds.
CONCLUSIONS:

Research on consumer attitudes toward cause related marketing may identify and further define the audience most receptive to this type of promotion. This would eliminate some of the risks and false expectations arising from unknown factors impacting upon the success of such a promotion.

Marketers face substantial risks in interacting with consumers through the use of cause related marketing when consumer perceptions of the process are not thoroughly understood. This paper begins to define consumer attitudes toward this form of marketing and in so doing, partially begins to define a receptive target audience.

The research was limited to two hundred residents of a mid-sized southeastern city (Richmond, Virginia). The conclusions drawn herein, are thus limited. The study should be repeated on a wider geographical basis in order to give more credence to the following conclusions.

The concern of this paper has been to explore consumer attitudes toward selected aspects of cause related marketing. An attempt has been made to relate the demographic characteristics of age, income and education of the consumers
interviewed to a number of variables.

The research findings support a number of conclusions. Awareness of cause related marketing promotions as well as the ability to recall promotions by brand name was noted in 75% of all respondents. Awareness was less pronounced in age groups under 20 years and over 60 years. Awareness was most pronounced among the middle income groups earning more than $20,000 per year but less than $60,000 annually. Awareness increased with the educational level of the respondents.

A majority of the respondents expressed strong feelings of personal obligation to contribute to charity and also felt that corporations should support worthy causes in their communities. Age was the only significant demographic value against these two variables.

The propensity to purchase a cause related marketing promoted product appears to increase with income and to also be correlated with age and education.

More than half of the respondents expressed the feeling of having personally contributed to the charity involved in a CRM promotion when they purchased that product. Age was a significant variable on this question.
The study identified a high degree of approval of merchants who employ CRM promotions. The concept that it is acceptable for charities to raise money through CRM promotions was voiced by 91% of the respondents. This was found to be significantly correlated to age in that the younger the respondent, the more likely he is to agree that CRM is an acceptable fund raising method for charities.

This study suggests that additional research should be done before generalized statements are made concerning consumer perceptions and attitudes regarding cause related marketing promotions. As CRM promotions more readily are viewed as legitimate marketing activities, a need to evaluate their effectiveness against the effectiveness of alternative marketing efforts is evident.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

"Hello. Today I am talking with people about their attitudes toward cause related marketing. CRM is an offer from a manufacturer or retailer to donate money to a good cause when a consumer buys his products."

QUESTION # 1
Can you recall and describe any cause related marketing promotion that you have seen in the past six months?

(1) Yes (2) No

QUESTION # 2
Do you agree that businesses operating in our community OUGHT to give a portion of their profits to charity?

(1) Yes (2) No

QUESTION # 3
On a scale of zero to nine, with zero being not at all strongly and nine being extremely strongly, quantify the strength of your feelings concerning your answer to question # 2.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

QUESTION # 4
Do you feel that you have a personal obligation to give to charity?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 5
On a scale of zero to nine please quantify the strength of your feelings concerning your answer to question # 4.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

QUESTION # 6
Have you bought a product or service where part of the purchase price went to a good cause?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

(IF YES, GO ON TO THE NEXT QUESTION. IF NO OR DON'T KNOW, SKIP TO QUESTION # 14)
QUESTION # 7
When you purchased the CRM promoted product, did you feel that you were making a personal contribution to the cause?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 8
When you bought the CRM promoted product, did you do so to:

(1) support the charity (2) because you needed the product (3) both reasons 1 & 2 (4) Other reason

QUESTION # 9
Have you ever purchased a product that you really didn't want, solely to support a good cause?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 10
Do you feel any need to examine the worth of a cause when part of your purchase price will support that cause?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 11
Would you ever purchase a product if part of the purchase price was going toward a cause you did not approve of?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) That would not affect my purchase if I needed the product.

QUESTION # 12
On a scale of zero to nine, please quantify the strength of your answer to question # 11.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

QUESTION # 13
Would you buy a product or brand that you had never tried before just because of a CRM promotion on that product?

(1) Yes (2) No
QUESTION # 14
On a scale of zero to nine with zero being very unfavorably and nine being extremely favorably, how would you rank a merchant who used CRM?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

QUESTION # 15
Do you think that merchants who employ CRM do so because they want to help the charity?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 16
Do you think that companies who link the sales of their products to their gifts to good causes do so because they want to increase sales?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 17
Do you feel that it is acceptable for charities to raise funds by participating with merchants in this type of promotion?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

QUESTION # 18
On a scale of zero to nine, please quantify the strength of your answer to question # 17.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

QUESTION # 19
Is your age:

(1) Under 20 (2) between 20 and 40 (3) between 40 and 60 (4) Over 60

QUESTION # 20
Is your family income:

(1) Less than $20,000 per year (2) Between twenty and forty thousand per year (3) Between forty and sixty thousand per year (4) More than sixty thousand per year.
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A new method for representing attitudinal reactions is developed and related to current integration approaches. Hypotheses are tested as to the effects of expectancy value measures and affect toward the act on intentions and subsequent behavior. The findings lead to a modification and extension of current attitudinal models and their relation to intentions and behavior. Charts. References.


Report of AMEX's successful cause-related marketing since 1981 with both Project Hometown America and the Statue of Liberty Project. Both projects sponsored for the purpose of increased business growth. The company donated one dollar for each new card approved, one cent for each purchase charged, one cent for each traveler's
check purchased, and one dollar for each travel package of $500 or more. Five and one half million dollars was donated under Project Hometown America and 1.7 million was raised for the Statue of Liberty Project. Cost to the firm in ad dollars was 16 million on the former and 4 million on the later.

AMEX cause related marketing programs produce results at least as good as and frequently better than conventional marketing techniques. Volume of cardholder charges was 30% higher than normal during promotional periods.

Article also outlines experience of First Bank of Penellas, Florida in an attempt at product differentiation and niche marketing. Also, covers the pitfalls of working with nonprofit causes. When the fit is right, the profits roll.


Description of shortened question testing technique for detecting misunderstanding of survey questions. Book
includes an exploratory study designed to investigate respondent misunderstandings of survey questions. Provides insights into the processes and principles involved in such misunderstandings.

Twenty nine experimental questions were spread between four carrier questionnaires and administered to respondents two ways in separate interviews. Detailed findings presented under the following headings: (1) the portion of respondents who understood the questions as intended (2) the relationship between respondent characteristics and tendency to understand questions as intended. (3) the interpretation of commonly used words and other indicators, (4) fifteen sets of hypotheses about the nature and causes of respondent misunderstanding of survey questions.


American Express Company (New York) is successfully using cause related marketing to promote its products and
services and to benefit non-profit organizations with
cash donations and extensive publicity. In cause related
marketing, an extensive advertising campaign
highlights the non-profit group's benefits to the
community, tells how the customer can assist the group,
and links fund-raising to the use of AMEX products.
Fund-raisers looking for long term solutions to fund
raising problems can adapt this approach to meld business
with social responsibility.

Steps to take include: (1) identify where non-profit
fits into the community and what its goals are, (2)
try to locate a corporate sponsor which has
compatible marketing objectives in terms of target
market, corporate culture, and new business plans. Any
proposal for fund raising ventures must reflect a
pragmatic fit between that charity's aims and those of
the company. All continuing contributions must be related
to the business culture and new business plans. Proposals
must reflect pragmatic fit for the company to respond
positively to the charity's request.

— "AMEX Shows The Way to Benefit From Corporate
Arts groups must abandon outdated aspects of fund raising, which are just a "time cup" approach, and adopt creative, cooperative approaches to the business sector if they hope to survive.

AMEX's McCormick tells of their cause related marketing strategy and why it was at least as successful as any other marketing program they had done. Funds spent on the programs come from advertising budgets. AMEX selects charities that appeal to its upbeat customers.


Society sets the ethical framework within which those who run companies have to work out their own codes of conduct. We judge companies and managers by their actions, not pious statements of intent. Actions are unethical if they don't stand scrutiny. Shelving hard decisions is thought to be the least ethical course.

Cameron, Kim S. "Effectiveness as a Paradox: Consensus
Under different economic conditions and declining U.S. competitiveness, the topic of organizational effectiveness has been gaining widespread interest. However, research has failed to yield a consistent theory of organizational effectiveness and a criteria for its measurement. A review of the areas of consensus among organizational effectiveness theorists and their areas of continuing disagreement, reveals that, given current perspectives on organizations, consensus is unlikely. A primary reason for this is that paradoxes inherent in the effectiveness criteria have largely been ignored.

Future effectiveness research must examine the paradoxical criteria, thus requiring the generation of hypotheses that can accommodate contradictions, and the use of analytical procedures that do not focus on data midpoints that mask paradox, but produce sensitivity to date nonlinearities and outliers. Tables. Diagrams. References.

Practical guidance on question writing with a number of ways to make pilot and pretest work more fruitful. Surveys must be custom built to the specification of given research purposes. The paper is organized in three concentric circles which progressively narrow to the specific design task: (1) general strategies and cautions (2) focus on specific empirical findings that have fairly direct applicability (3) actual task at hand.

This paper gives good coverage of pilot work and pre-testing. Authors admit to having primary experience in telephone questionnaires and try to apply this to face to face questionnaires.

There is going to be a trend for corporations to associate with good causes on an exclusive basis for a long period.

Non-profits are beginning to realize that there is something new here, as it appears that contributions to charity have been woven systematically into corporate marketing strategy. What is new is that the corporations, not the non profits, have taken the initiative, according to American Express executives.

The American Marketing Association takes a different view, stating that non-profits are now on the offensive, putting a full court press on marketing departments of many companies. There are no technical assistance guidelines for either partner.

Best way for non profits to approach companies is (1) recognize the drawbacks, (2) go for more than money, (3) select your own kind of company, (4) include the contribution managers in your pitch, (5) don't get discouraged. References.
The problem of Latchkey kids (cause) attracts marketers response in several ways. (1) General Foods targets this group the way they pitch products to any age group, (2) Lever Bros. and Lipton pitch their products as solutions, (3) Whirlpool funds programs initiating cause related marketing campaigns that address the problems of latchkey kids and cast a favorable glow on their products.

Whirlpool set up Project Homesafe which trains home economists to set up after school programs for latchkey kids. While there is no direct product tie in, the company is aware that it could help build loyalty for their products.

Three concepts are examined: (1) business ethics (2) corporate responsiveness and (3) corporate social responsibility. All have been used to evaluate corporate social performance. Similarities and differences are explored. Corporate social process, a fourth concept, is introduced. This fourth concept integrates the key elements of the first three.

This process is a system of individual and collective moral reflection and choice within the corporation. It is an institutionalized system which can help improve the way in which the corporation operates in a changing social environment with value pluralism. Charts. Tables. References.

Develops a theoretical framework for understanding how ethical and unethical marketing decisions are made. The framework integrates many of the variables examined in previous research on marketing ethics. The framework, based on a contingency approach, proposes that individual decision making will be influenced by the interaction of individual and organizational factors. Individual factors include: values, attitudes and intentions individuals form through socialization, education and experience. Organizational factors include: significant others such as peers, and the existence of opportunities for ethical and unethical action. The ethical nature of an act is determined by professional codes, corporate policies, and rewards and punishments.

Research propositions are developed from the framework, as are recommendations for field testing. Charts. References.

Freeman, Douglas K. "Ethical Considerations in Fundraising." Fundraising Management 18 (June 1987) 72-7.

The credibility of the non-profit sector can be at risk if ethical considerations are swept under the rug. The
author highlights several conflicts of interest that can lead to destructive consequences, if not kept in check.

Conflicts of interest exist in nearly all facets of fundraising. Recognizing this is the first step in handling them. Fundraising policy manuals should contain the institution's treatment of these conflicts. Many conflicts can be resolved with full and complete disclosure coupled with knowledgeable waivers by affected parties.

Fry, Louis W. "Corporate Contributions: Altruistic or For Profit?" Academy of Management Journal 25 (March 1982) 94-106.

Existing literature has focused on three rationales for corporate philanthropy: Through the firm giving, corporate statesmanship, and profit motivated giving. The profit motivation argument was examined by determining the relationship between giving and advertising expenditures. The results indicate that contributions are motivated by profit considerations that influence both advertising expenditures and corporate giving.
Research conclusions: (1) marginal changes in advertising expenditures and marginal changes in contribution expenditures are significantly related. (2) firms with more public contact spend more at all income levels on advertising and contributions than firms with little public contact. (3) changes in contributions and changes in other business expenses usually considered to be profit motivated such as officer compensation, dividends and employee benefits are highly correlated. A straightforward implication of this analysis is that it would seem ill-advised to use philanthropic data to measure altruistic responses of corporations. Charts. Tables. References.

_ _ _ "Red Cross Broadens Fund-Raising Programs."
Fund-Raising Management (July 1988) 67.

When the Red Cross was looking to raise a one billion dollar annual budget, it saw cause related marketing as a supplement to its income to the tune of 10 million dollars.

The reason non-profits are embracing cause related marketing include corporate restructuring, dramatic
growth in the number of non-profits, competition for funds, tax disincentives and government cuts. The Red Cross got involved because it was running a deficit and the United Way fundraising had not kept pace. Cause related marketing is changing the way non-profits operate internally as it forces them to do long range planning.

Non-profits don't know how long this type of marketing will last, but it has become an activity and a profit center for them.


Article provides a literature review of corporate philanthropy and its relationship to marketing strategy. Non-marketing objectives include: beneficial tax incentives, enlightened self interest, personal motives of owners and social responsibility. Marketing objectives include: enhancement of corporate image, advertising complement and sales promotion or cause related marketing.
Research needs to verify correlations between expenditures for ads and philanthropic transfers as well as to develop and test hypothesis of correlation. Research also needs to examine the effectiveness of cause related marketing by exploring the motivation and satisfaction of consumers responding to cause related marketing.

Gratz, Roberta B and Fettmann, Eric "The Selling of Miss Liberty." The Nation (November 9, 1985) 465-76.

This is the story of a corporate takeover of a national landmark. Article tells how a group of businessmen assumed control of a campaign to restore the statue, and what they did with it. The slant is that U.S. heritage was used for private gain through cause related marketing.

Article also tells how the efforts backfired on original backers through imitation by other businessmen wanting to cash in on a good thing.
Author comments on reasons cause related marketing adversely affects philanthropy. It is undesirable because: (1) Corporate decisions on giving should not be based on market potential, (2) consumers participating have less need to examine the cause, (3) consumers are unaware of the small effect of their purchases, (4) consumers may consider themselves donors, (5) consumer may think that with his purchase, he has fulfilled his charitable obligations, (6) public may begin to view philanthropy as the "business of business", (7) it confuses public understanding of philanthropy, (8) voluntary organizations may be led to change their program objectives to meet the demands of a corporation, (9) commercialism could endanger public approval of charity, and (10) organization's cause could be perceived as being "owned by" or having sold out to a corporation.

One reason AMEX scored so well in the American Bankers consumer opinion poll may well be that its efforts in
cause related marketing (where it donates funds to charities each time one of its products is used) are paying off.

Gurin, Maurice G. "Is Marketing Dangerous For Fundraising?" Fund Raising Management 17 (January 1987) 72-76.

Increasing numbers of fund raisers have been welcoming marketing into the fund raising arena. Author feels that about all that marketing has added to fund raising has been its own commercial terminology as a substitute for the traditional terms that fund raising has been using for decades and that are appropriate for a discipline which serves voluntary organizations and institutions in the non-profit sector.

The billions of dollars that fund raisers have raised in the past attest to some skill at the function. It must be remembered that fund raising seeks some philanthropic contributions, not customers who are buying something. Fund raisers must consider the growing influence of marketing on fund raising and its possible adverse effects.

Article outlines Texaco's goal since the 1940's which was to win a high level of public goodwill by associating Texaco's name with the Metropolitan Opera which it has sponsored for almost 50 years.

Met fans are intensely loyal and grateful; a high level of Texaco recognition is impressive and partially due to this long time nationwide blanket of opera programing with extremely short commercial messages. More Met fans buy Texaco products than any other brand of petroleum products.

Author explores the issue of cause related marketing and philanthropy with the intent of stimulating discussion among professionals about cause related marketing. It is not a definitive treatment of the subject.

Author finds difficulty reconciling cause related marketing with philanthropy. Corporate philanthropy has been around almost as long as corporations themselves, but the notion of gaining quantifiable, incremental sales from social largesse is a relatively recent innovation.

Cause related marketing, either initiated by the corporations or a non-profit, is here to stay. Fund raisers need to thoroughly understand CRM from a corporate point of view and corporate marketers need to understand philanthropy from a non-profit's point of view.

Higgins, Kevin T. "Cause Related Marketing, Does it Pass the Bottom Line Test?" Marketing News 20 (May 9, 1985) 1,18.
"The test of all marketing is how well it helps the business." according to Jerry Walsh of AMEX. Welsh admits that Project Hometown America failed the test, as increases in new cardholders were marginal during this cause related marketing campaign.

But the real failure is of other firms that latch onto public relations programs and call them marketing and expect great results. Mention is made of the Hands Across America campaign where many large players got buried due to lack of exclusivity.

Making cause related marketing programs justify themselves as a legitimate expenditure for marketing funds may be too relevant to be classified as a fad.


American Express's campaign to merge philanthropy and marketing was begun in 1983. One cent of each credit card purchase would benefit the Statue of Liberty restoration. Funds raised were expected to reach 1.3 million.
The campaign resulted in goodwill for AMEX although that was not the original intent. The company wants to give the impression that it is socially responsible, patriotic, and public minded.

The intent is to run the program along with regular advertising to maximize the effectiveness of the firm's marketing dollars.


Corporate giving may not be entirely altruistic. Paper examines popular view of social responsibility of business as advanced by Steiner, Davis and others and also the traditional position advanced by economists.

This analysis suggests one substantial difference is a primary assumption regarding goals sales managers pursue. An attempt is made to measure change in corporate social effort as managerial discretion increases. Given that managerial discretion increases with the size of the corporation, philanthropy used as a behavioral test to indicate that the larger the corporate income, the more
the firm gives in proportion to its income. Charts. References.

Kovach, Jeffrey L. "Charitable Investments." Industry Week 223 (October 1, 1984) 29-33.

Many corporations are benefiting from their philanthropic investments by combining charitable contributions with innovative marketing techniques. Corporate contributions all contain some element of enlightened self interest. Although the result may not be true philanthropy, cause related marketing will probably continue to be popular. The philanthropic objectives of helping a charity coupled with the sale of specific products or services has generated profits and favorable publicity for many corporate sponsors including AMEX, Stroh's Brewery, Coca-Cola, Kellogg Company and Chrysler dealers.

The key to successful cause marketing is appealing to the emotions and popular interest of the general public. However, since the not for profit demand is self generating, the private sector can not continue matching it with contributions.

Coverage of another affinity card launch where teams of the NFL benefit from a cause related marketing strategy by VISA. Here, fans will be contributing to charity each time they use their credit cards. Over 100 organizations have received about 8 million dollars from NFL Charities since it was formed in 1973. This is another way of raising funds for the foundation by involving football fans.


A discussion of three ethical frameworks drawn from moral philosophy which can bring ethical insight into marketing decision making. While frameworks do not provide "the" ethical answer, they can help marketing managers better systemize their thinking when dealing with problems having ethical implications. Some factors necessary in building a comprehensive theory of marketing ethics are also presented. References.

The Lincoln Park Zoological Society, a non-profit support organization for the Lincoln Park Zoo, recently concluded a 5 year, 25 million dollar rebuilding and improvement program that was aided in part by an AMEX cause related marketing promotion initiated by AMEX. The zoo fit the company's profile of a non-profit organization appropriate to their marketing program. The firm's goals were to (1) help people become more aware of what the society was trying to do for the zoo, (2) create a heightened awareness of zoo activities, (3) increase AMEX's business by linking their products to fund raising. As a result, the zoo received $152,000 from the promotion without making a formal endorsement of American Express, nor compromising its mailing list, and without having to insert the firm's literature into its mailings.

---

Article examines the rapidly expanding movement to professionalize the corporate contribution function. Linking giving to special events in the arts and sports arenas. Documents the pressures on corporations to treat philanthropy as a bottom line function. Sponsorships of sports events have become an 850 billion dollar industry with more than 600 corporate participants. Business contributes 500 million dollars annually to the arts, representing a four fold increase over a decade ago.

The management of corporate giving has become an integral part of the strategic planning process.


Study done of nine corporations sponsoring national recreation programs. Objectives of corporations cited as: enhancement of corporate image, increase in consumer awareness of products, promotion of education and physical fitness, and awareness of social responsibility.

The forms of effectiveness evaluation used by these nine firms are: survey forms mailed to target groups, survey
forms mailed to host organizations, and counts of participants and media coverage.

Although these sponsorships are undertaken primarily to enhance corporate image, they are most often cancelled for financial reasons if the program fails to generate cash sales for the firm's products.


Article notes shrewd alignment of corporate and social
needs. Firms shied away from causes that did not further their corporate image. Although authors can not prove cause and effect relationship of "doing good" to corporate sales, they are able to document the impact of long term contributions programs on recipient communities.

Advice: Align your corporate gifts with your products and goals. Put some distance between your CEO and your contributions committee. Create the right organizational structure, either a foundation or your contributions committee. Pick a manager to give your company's money away. Expect and prepare for opposition.

Advice for dealing with charities: Treat grant seekers as customers. Do not run your contributions program as a public relations exercise. Do not automatically renew your gifts, get too involved in charities day to day operations, or try to please everyone. Do not work in isolation from other corporate givers.

News coverage of Master Card International's launch of a cause related marketing program that gives six national charities a donation each time the card is used. New twist...it allows customers to designate funds to charity of choice.

"Verdict Is Not Yet In On Charity Tie-Ins As a Promotional Tool." Marketing News (March 30, 1984)

Charity tie-ins with coupon distributions are a growing trend, but in 1984 the jury is still out on how effective these were. Charity tie-ins are different from other marketing efforts and get attention from the consumer. There is an emotional reason for participating. However, the real goal is to boost product sales. No data on how these promotions did overall.

The idea of combining social responsibility with products and marketing is older than Girl Scout cookies. In America, the power of the good deed has taken on premium value.

Out of concern with public image, companies have become more attuned to their responsibilities to the society that supports them. What Sara Lee Corp. chairman, John Bryan calls "enlightened self-interest" can be seen in actions across corporate America. Some corporations feel that you have to offer the consumer something beyond the opportunity to help others. All else being equal, product sales are even more enhanced when there is something in it for them, even something as small as a coupon. There is agreement that neither altruistic goals nor a good corporate reputation can sell inferior or over-priced products.

"Cause Marketing Gets Good Marks." Non Profit Times (December, 1989)

A survey by Independent Sector in Washington, D.C. found that 17 businesses and 13 non-profits participating in cause related marketing found some commonalities in their experiences. The survey cites several "key success
factors" and several common problems with this marketing technique.


Corporations need to know whom they are reaching, over what period of time, and with what messages. The system for quantifying the public relations effect includes: (1) collecting all press clippings, (2) evaluating the clips for negative or positive messages, (3) pulling out and counting "nuggets" taken directly from press releases or ads, and (4) production of graphs that show total number of impressions over time and total impressions specific to target audiences, percentage of positive articles over time and percentage of negative articles over time. Find ratio of positive to negative and also measure the percentage of positive articles per publication or reporter.

Results are that you can determine which customers get smothered, and which launches got the best broadcast.

Author quotes Kelly Andrews, Director of development for Cystic Fibrosis Foundation as he gives advice to corporations seeking a charity or cause to involve in marketing efforts.

Submit a written proposal. Observe protocol, get clearance from non-profit on all copy and design produced for the promotion. Do not confuse non-profit access to public service time on TV with advertising.


Corporate and social responsibility involves the social contract between businesses and society in which it operates. Business ethics require organizational or individual behavior according to carefully planned rules of moral philosophy. An approach is presented for integrating these concepts into the strategic marketing
planning process. This approach may be defined as the development or reformulation of a corporate culture.

Parallel planning systems for integrating ethical and socially responsible plans into strategic marketing planning include; (1) the organizational mission statement and ethical profile for guidance in the formulation of marketing objectives, (2) environmental analysis that considers all affected publics, (3) the development of actionable ethical core values and marketing mix, and (4) the enculturation and integration of core values into the organizational culture. There is a constant need to monitor marketing behavior to assess whether the enculturation process is working. Tables. Charts. References.


The use of the Liberty restoration has had its critics who feel that there may be back-lash from some of the "glitzy" attempts to make money and sell products through an affiliation with the charitable project. Promoters of the Liberty restoration found that they couldn't expect corporations to contribute large gifts
and give them nothing in return. Official sponsors of the project are calling this involvement a success, but unofficial sponsors who ran cause related marketing promotions in conjunction with the project fared far better in distinguishing themselves from the clutter of sponsors.


A wave of sales promotion programs is surfacing as corporate sponsors strive to meet hefty financial pledges to worthwhile causes. But there is more than altruism involved.

While sales promotions are generally defined as problem solving activities, since they seek to remedy slow product movement and marginal consumption, one other point should be included. When the private sector is called upon to raise monies for cause, sales promotion provides notable and intriguing ways to bring the dollars in.
Although cause related marketing of products is contributing about 100 million dollars annually to the coffers of charitable institutions, compared with 4.5 billion of conventional giving, these marketing tools are gaining popularity. Advocates call them "win-win" propositions. The marketer promotes a product while the non-profit partner gains visibility and funding.

However cause marketing is not for every company. The Council on Foundations recently found that 71% of corporate CEO's believe that giving policies should reflect corporate self interest, while only 33% think that charity should be linked to marketing.

Charities also must be wary of choosing corporate partners. For example, the American Heart Association feels that cause related marketing would hurt its credibility. While critics contend that the practice undermines traditional corporate giving, a recent survey found that cause related marketing actually increases direct corporate contributions. Graphs.

The book reports a set of investigations into the nature of attitude survey questions. It records ideas developed and experiments carried out systematically over more than 6 years.

Covered are: question form, the classification scheme, question constraint, attitude strength, order effects, implications of research on surveys, measuring crystallized attitudes and discovering who changes.

Asking questions and giving answers are ancient ways of exchanging information. But they take on new meanings in the context of a large scale survey. The book concentrates on the problems that confront those who seek to use the survey data.

Cause related marketing offers companies an appealing alternative to outright charitable gifts and can provide impressive results. Author focuses on Red Cross and its alliance with Searle Drug Company.

The downside of all this is that charities with worthy causes which happen to be unglamorous can't hope to take part in these promotions. Advice to charities and corporations alike is: "Try to find a good fit" between your objectives and goals.

Despite the large number of surveys conducted, very little systematic information exists about the content of the accumulated survey data, the form of questions, or how these elements have changed over time. A study examined these issues by analyzing polls from five two year time periods covering the fifty year history of polling. It was found that surveys have undergone notable changes in form and structure over the past 50 years. While the content and purpose of polling have remained basically the same, more specialized styles have evolved to facilitate information collection and allow more data to be collected.

Surveys in the 1930's were brief encounters, usually conducted face to face using natural every day language. Since then surveys have grown in size, containing more categories and words per question and more questions per poll. They have moved away from natural language with the adoption of balanced questions. Other chapters include adoption of Likert scales and scalometers. Tables. References.

While American business faces its most severe public disfavor since the 1930's, it is at the same time beneficial as a force in our society. This paradox may be a result of a lack of clearly defined business responsibilities. This article establishes concrete guidelines for the individual company to help in its definition of social responsibilities. References.


For many years there has been the idea that social responsibility involved doing good and was a duty undertaken by public spirited companies that reduced profits by consuming resources. Most corporations expressed social responsibility in the form of philanthropy. Because this charity was not required, philanthropic endeavors were viewed as voluntary reductions in corporate income. As the 20th century matured, firms were urged to respond more to social expectations than the voluntary mentality prompted.
Mandatory contributions to charity could be defined as unavoidable costs of doing business. Now, corporations are beginning to realize that the long term value of conducting business in a socially responsible manner outweighs short term costs. Firms began their social responsibility evolution by recognizing that costs incurred for this responsibility should be treated as investments. Another viewpoint, while recognizing the merit in the evolution concept, questions whether companies can (or even want to) handle social responsibility requirements as investments. References.


The book deals specifically with questionnaire construction and not with all aspects of survey design. The central thesis is that questions must be precisely worded if responses to a survey are to be accurate, and the survey valid.

Authors cover major issues to be considered in writing questions and constructing scales. Non-threatening as
well as threatening questions are discussed with ways of asking each type.

The questionnaire is considered as a whole and gives a rationale for the order of the questions. Check lists are provided as initial guides to the major points made. Glossary. References. Sample Surveys.


Article looks at a regionally focused British campaign where consumers are urged to send in Mars candy wrappers for a donation to be made to the charity of the sponsor's choice plus a donation to be made to the charity of the donor's choice. 760-800 thousand wrappers poured in daily.

Mars said that the promotion achieved its objectives in terms of sparking interest and awareness in the trade, consumers, and its own sales force. The effect on sales is undisclosed.

Author quotes that a successful sales promotion should be designed to be beneficial to all concerned (David
Shadrack, Brand Manager at Mars). Here, cause related marketing gave a tangible end product.


Cause related marketing is a marketing program that attempts to achieve two goals: improving corporate performance and helping worthy causes. This is accomplished by connecting fund raising for the benefit of the cause to the purchase of the firm's products or services. Cause Related Marketing (CRM) is different from sales promotion, corporate philanthropy, corporate sponsorship, corporate good deeds and public relations although it is often an amalgam of these activities.

Basic objectives of CRM include: increasing sales, enhancing corporate stature, thwarting negative publicity, pacifying customers, easing market entry, and increasing the degree of trade merchandising activity for the brand promoted.
CRM can be a strategic as well as a tactical marketing tool. CRM's have assisted companies in realizing corporate and marketing objectives and, at the same time, have provided much needed financial support and management know-how to deserving causes. If the majority of marketers can keep CRM from degenerating into cause exploitive marketing, it may be viewed as one of marketing's main contributions to society. Tables. Charts. References.


Cause related marketing (CRM) ties corporate contributions to charity to the purchase of the company's products or services. Through a single campaign, two objectives can be achieved: improve corporate performance and help a worthy cause. CRM is not a philanthropic project. Firms generally consider the cost of the resulting donation to be a marketing expense. Companies often spend more on promoting the program than they do on the contributions. Still, consumers are encouraged to buy because they feel an affinity for the cause that will
receive the donation. Sales promotion, which provides the consumer with economic incentive to buy, can also be incorporated in the process.

The benefits of CRM include: national visibility for the company, enhanced corporate and brand image and enlargement of the customer base.


"Enlightened self interest...the wave of the future, is no longer check book philanthropy," says Jerry Walsh of American Express, "it is a marriage of corporate marketing and social responsibility."

Charities are beginning to change their focus to attract CRM type gifts. Some who do not change focus and as a result hospitals, religious organizations and the like are losing big. There is a real trend toward bringing the contributions programs into line with corporate goals.
Cause related marketing (CRM) is a tactic by which corporations can get involved in a worthy cause while promoting an image or product. The fundraising extravaganzas that have raised millions of dollars for various causes have also attracted the attention of U.S. Corporations. Results to the corporations frequently are in inverse proportion to the amount of money given to the cause. Small CRM campaigns often benefit the corporation more than large, attention getting events and the positive spin off can be either though exposure of the company name or an increase in sales. For these reasons, CRM is considered selling rather than charitable giving and expenses are tax deductible as business expenses. American Express is an example of a company that has reaped benefits far beyond its contributions to major campaigns.