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Abstract

Many studies have measured the impact of cause related marketing (CRM) strategies on non-profit organizations, however few have been able to measure the impact that these strategies can have on the for-profit organizations employing them. This study hypothesizes that a co-branded CRM strategy will have greater benefits for a for-profit organization than will a jointly-branded strategy or no strategy at all. This hypothesis was tested using two studies, both with a 2x3 factorial design for firms with both a positive and negative brand reputation. It was found that, for an organization with a negative image, consumers viewed the organization more positively when they employed a co-branding strategy. It was also found that the consumer was likely to donate more to a cause supported by the firm with a negative image when they used a co-branded strategy as opposed to a jointly-branded strategy. Alternatively, firms with a positive image generated more donations for a cause through a jointly-branded strategy.
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**Introduction**

This paper presents the results of a study that examines the effects of cause-related marketing (CRM) strategies on for-profit organizations. The research shows that consumers are aware of the brands and companies that they choose to associate themselves with, and much of the research states the impact that certain for-profit brands can have on causes. However, there is a significant gap in the research in identifying how attitudes towards a for-profit company change due to a cause-related marketing strategy. It is important to note that there is a difference between the terms brand and company; however, the difference is minimal, and for the purposes of this study, the terms will be used interchangeably.

**Cause Related Marketing Strategy**

Cause-related marketing (CRM) is consistently defined as “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” (Varadarajan & Menon 1988). CRM falls under corporate societal marketing, a strategy in which businesses engage in marketing efforts dealing with both financial and social objectives (Drumwright & Murphy 2001).

Cause-related marketing became popular in the 1980’s as a marketing strategy, and it has dramatically grown around the world in recent years by many companies, both non-profit and for-profit (Baghi & Gabrielli 2013). Past research has explored CRM’s effect on many different consumer behaviors, and it has shown that CRM can offer a wide range of benefits for the firm (Westberg & Pope 2012).
There are three types of CRM as identified by Hoeffler and Keller (2002). The first is a self-branded cause strategy, in which a for-profit business creates an entirely new cause program intended to adopt the corporate or product brand. Examples of this are Dove’s Self-Esteem Fund and the Ronald McDonald House Charity.

The second type of CRM strategy is a cobranded strategy in which a corporate brand partners with an already defined and existing non-profit organization. For example, ChildFund International and TOMS Shoes build off of each other’s’ brands in order to give back to the community.

The third type of CRM strategy is a jointly branded strategy. In this strategy, a firm attaches its existing brand onto a social cause which has no defined brand or organization attached to it. Examples of this include any business’ “anti-hunger” campaigning.

Criticisms of these strategies include that it leads firms to become more vulnerable to criticism, and they cause consumers to raise unrealistic expectations of firms for the future (Drumwright & Murphy 2001).

For the purposes of this study, there is a limited focus on the second and third CRM strategies: cobranded and jointly branded. This will allow for a clear effect to be shown on a company’s perception.

**Branding and Perception**

A brand is a “name, term, sign, drawing, or any combination of these, that serves to identify a firm’s goods or services and differentiate them from those of competitors (American Marketing Association, AMA). Often times, a brand is thought of as “added value,” or how the product is bettered, due to a consumer’s experiences and perceptions of a firm (Keller 2001). This added
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value is a key goal of CRM strategies utilized by firms due to the recent increase in social activism within the consumer population.

In co-branding CRM campaigns, consumers perceive brands based upon warmth and competence (Aaker 2010). Generally, non-profit organizations are perceived to be warm yet less competent, while for-profit firms are perceived to be less warm and more competent. Combining these can have greater effects on the perception of the brand in either aspect.

Analyzing brand perception can help identify factors that lead to an increase in sales and overall profitability of a firm in the long run.

Social Responsibility
Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a principle encouraged by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a way for companies across the globe to promote and “integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and interactions with their stakeholders” (United Nations Industrial Development Organization, UNIDO). Aspects of CSR that businesses regularly implement include eco-efficiency, labor and working conditions, gender balance, and human rights, among others (UNIDO). This push to become socially responsible, although unrelated to CRM, puts for-profit companies in the mindset of giving back to their community. Both CSR and CRM are ways that corporate sponsors identify with the ethics and values of their consumers, and it is important to note that aside from the benefits of CRM, corporations have other reasons to participate in socially responsible business practices. It is important to note this because the reputation of a corporation’s brand is built upon socially responsible business practices, and this study will analyze whether or not these reputations can be affected due to CRM practices.
Social Responsibility and Attitudes Towards CRM

A 2010 study by Cone Communications indicated the following: 88% of American consumers believe it is acceptable for companies to involve CRM concepts in their marketing strategy; 83% of American consumers want more of their preferred products to benefit causes; 85% of American consumers positively change their opinion of a product or company when it supports a cause meaningful to them; and, 80% of American consumers are more likely to switch to a brand that supports a cause which is similar in price and quality to a brand which does not support a cause (Cone Communications 2010).

Attitude, Trust, and Reputation

Attitude, trust, and reputation serve as the main dependent variables for Study 1 in this paper. The literature suggests that “the impact of [corporate social responsibility (CSR)] on outcomes “internal” to the consumer (e.g., awareness, attitudes, and attributions) is significantly greater and more easily assessable than its impact on the “external” or visible outcomes (e.g., purchase behavior, word-of-mouth) (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004). The study additionally states that consumers have a “favorable attitude towards companies that engage in CSR… [and] this relationship is even stronger among consumers that perceive the focal company to have a better reputation (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004). Herein lies the link between attitude and reputation as dependent variables. Trust, which is also an “internal” outcome, can be assumed therefore to have the same effect.

Through examining the literature, a hypothesis for both studies can be stated as follows:

\[ H: \text{For a brand suffering from negative (versus positive) public relations, a co-branded strategy will be more effective than a jointly branded strategy in enhancing brand image.} \]
Study 1

Methodology

Subjects for this study were made up of 309 undergraduate business students at Bryant University. These students, in some cases, received extra credit from their professors in order to participate in the study, which was distributed through Bryant University’s marketing research lab.

The experiment followed a two by three factorial design. The independent variables of the study included the type of public relations that the fictitious firm was receiving as well as the type of cause related marketing strategy that the fictitious firm utilized. The firm either had positive public relations or negative public relations, and they used either a co-branded strategy, a jointly branded strategy, or no CRM strategy at all. The dependent variables of study one were the attitude, trust, and perceived reputation of the fictitious company by the participants.

Participants were first shown a description of Shoppers, Inc. This description included either positive public relations or negative public relations, including descriptors about their innovation, citizenship, or leadership (See Exhibit 1).

After they read the description, participants were presented with a scenario in which Shoppers, Inc. partnered with the American Cancer Society (co-branding), supported cancer research (jointly-branding), or continued on with normal business (no CRM strategy). This text was created to simulate a “press release” put out by the company in order to combat negative public relations (See Exhibit 2).

Participants were then asked to rate, on a seven point Likert scale, how they felt about Shoppers, Inc. through their attitude towards, trust in, and perceived reputation of the company. These
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questions were adapted from Bruner (2016). In total, participants were asked to answer 25 of these questions (See Exhibit 3).

They were then asked to rate their own charitable behaviors in order to measure their overall feelings towards giving back to the community as well as four demographic gathering questions (See Exhibit 4).

Results

The success of each CRM strategy was assessed through the scales for attitude, trust, and reputation as described earlier. Participants who viewed the co-branded situation for a brand suffering from negative PR (versus the jointly-branded situation or no CRM situation for a brand suffering from negative PR) reported more positive attitudes ($M_{co-branded} = 4.257$ versus $M_{jointly-branded} = 4.16$ versus $M_{control} = 3.945$; $F (2, 5.314) = 537.042, p = 0.005$) than those who did not. This was the same for organizations experiencing positive PR ($M_{co-branded} = 3.135$ versus $M_{jointly-branded} = 2.973$ versus $M_{control} = 2.288$; $F (2, 5.314) = 537.042, p = 0.005$). However, no statistically significant interaction was found between reputation of the firm and the CRM strategy used ($p = 0.296$). These results are displayed in the graph below.
There were no statistically significant results for the impact of CRM strategies on variables of trust and reputation found within the study.

**Discussion**

This study aimed to measure whether a CRM strategy could aid a for-profit organization suffering from negative public relations. It was hypothesized that a co-branded strategy would be more effective than a jointly-branded strategy at achieving these results. However, there was no significant interaction between the type of public relations and type of CRM strategy for any of the dependent variables.

Overall, attitude was the only dependent variable that showed any significant results through a main effect; it can be said that in this case, a CRM strategy will help an organization suffering from negative public relations by shifting a consumer’s attitude slightly more positive, but not by much.
After analyzing the data set from Study 1, another potential moderator was introduced: visual advertising. Study 2 attempted to mirror the results of Study 1 with this change. That is, in Study 2, the CRM strategy was introduced to the participant through a visual rather than through text only.

**Study 2**

Study 2 mirrored study one in many ways. The goal of this study was to test whether or not the results from Study 1 regarding the attitude of consumers towards a brand could be replicated across industries as well as a change in medium: from “press releases” to visual advertisements. The fictitious company engaging in CRM in this scenario was Burger Borough, a fast-casual burger restaurant.

**Methodology**

Subjects for this study were made up of 163 undergraduate business students at Bryant University. These students, in some cases, also received extra credit from their professors in order to participate in the study, which was distributed through Bryant University’s marketing research lab.

The experiment again followed a two by three factorial design. The independent variables of the study included the type of public relations that the fictitious firm was receiving as well as the type of cause related marketing strategy that the fictitious firm utilized. The firm either had positive public relations or negative public relations, and they used either a co-branded strategy, a jointly branded strategy, or no CRM strategy at all; these strategies were this time demonstrated through visual advertisements, in which a consumer was prompted to “donate,” sponsored by the company. The dependent variables of study two were attitude and trust towards
the fictitious company by consumers as well as the willingness to donate and donation amount that consumers would put towards the cause being supported by the for-profit brand.

Participants were first shown a description of Burger Borough. This description included either positive public relations or negative public relations, including descriptors about their innovation, citizenship, or leadership (See Exhibit 5).

After they read the description, participants were presented with a scenario in which Burger Borough partnered with The Hunger Project (co-branding), supported ending world hunger (jointly-branding), or continued on with normal business (no CRM strategy). These scenarios were presented through visual advertisements (See Exhibit 6).

Participants were then asked to rate, on a seven point Likert scale, how they felt about Burger Borough through their attitude towards, trust in, and donation intentions towards the company. These questions were adapted from Bruner (2016). In total, participants were asked to answer 25 of these questions. The questions were the same as study 1.

They were then asked to rate their own charitable behaviors in order to measure their overall feelings towards giving back to the community as well as four demographic gathering questions (See Exhibit 7).

Results

In Study 2, the success of each CRM strategy was assessed through the scales for attitude, trust, and donation intention. Attitude and trust was meant to mirror Study 1; the intention was to replicate similar results using visual interpretations of the CRM strategy used. In this study, the results of the CRM impact on attitude was replicated from the first study; participants who viewed the co-branded situation for a brand suffering from negative PR (versus the jointly-
branded situation or no CRM situation for a brand suffering from negative PR) reported more positive attitudes (M$_{co-branded}$ = 3.281 versus M$_{jointly-branded}$ = 2.903 versus M$_{control}$ = 2.411; F (2, 5.171) = 152, p = 0.007) than those who did not. This was the same for organizations experiencing positive PR (M$_{co-branded}$ = 4.693 versus M$_{jointly-branded}$ = 4.455 versus M$_{control}$ = 3.955; F (2, 5.171) = 152, p = 0.007). However, no statistically significant interaction was found between reputation of the firm and the CRM strategy used (p = 0.955). These results are displayed in the graph below.

![CRM Strategy Effects on Attitude - Study 2](image)

**Figure 2 – Study 2 Results**

There were no statistically significant results for the impact of CRM strategies on variables of trust and reputation found within the study.

In this study, hypothetical donation intentions were also measured. It was found that an organization with from positive public utilizing a jointly-branded strategy (versus the co-branded
strategy or no CRM strategy) could elicit higher donation amounts for the cause they were supporting (M co-branded = 28.458 versus M jointly-branded = 30.917 versus M control = 25.938; F (2, 3.087) = 71,754.62, p = 0.049). On the other hand, it was found that an organization suffering from negative public relations utilizing a co-branded strategy (versus the jointly-branded strategy or no CRM strategy) could elicit higher donation amounts for the cause they were supporting (M co-branded = 33.55 versus M jointly-branded = 21 versus M control = 13; F (2, 3.087) = 71,754.62, p = 0.049). These results are displayed in the graph below.

![CRM Strategy Effects on Donation Intentions - Study 2](image)

*Figure 3 – Study 2 Results*

**Discussion**

This second study aimed to measure whether a CRM strategy could aid a for-profit organization suffering from negative public relations, specifically if this strategy was portrayed to consumers through visual advertisements. It was hypothesized that a co-branded strategy would be more effective than a jointly-branded strategy at achieving these results. However, there was no
significant interaction between the type of public relations and type of CRM strategy for any of the dependent variables.

Attitude was again a dependent variable that showed any significant results through a main effect; in this case, a CRM strategy portrayed through visual advertisements will help an organization suffering from negative public relations by shifting a consumer’s attitude slightly more positive, but not by much.

Additionally, using a CRM strategy had a significant main effect on the donation intentions towards the cause for the consumer. When a consumer saw that an organization with a good reputation was using a jointly-branded strategy, they were more likely to donate $2.46 more to the partnered cause than when the firm used a co-branded strategy. They were more likely to donate $4.98 more than when the firm used no CRM strategy at all. Alternatively, when a consumer saw that an organization with a bad reputation was using a co-branded strategy, they were more likely to donate $12.55 more to the partnered cause than when the firm used a jointly-branded strategy. They were more likely to donate $20.55 more than when the firm used no CRM strategy at all.

We can assume that this difference in strategy preference is due to the change in reputation of the firm. When a firm has a positive image, consumers already trust the organization more. Therefore, using a jointly-branded strategy can work better because they do not need to build more credibility through the organization they are partnering with; in fact, adding an organization may even take away from their credibility for many reasons, for example if the consumer does not support, identify, or recognize the non-profit. However, when a firm has a
negative image, consumers are more likely to donate to the cause when backed by an actual non-profit; this can add to the CRM strategy’s credibility.

Implications and Limits

Overall, these studies add two major points to the literature. The first is that consumers may have a more positive attitude towards for-profit organizations when they engage in a co-branded CRM strategy. The second is that the image of the firm, herein determined through public relations, impacts the CRM strategy that should be chosen in order to solicit the most donations from consumers for a cause.

However, it is important to note the limitations for this study as well. Because this study measured charitable intentions, there may have been a social desirability bias effect in answering some questions. Additionally, future studies should investigate the full impact of the CRM strategy by measuring the independent variables both before and after showing the stimuli.

Conclusion

These two studies contributed important findings to the currently published literature regarding CRM strategies. While not all variables produced significant results, for-profit organizations can still use this information to their advantage when investigating whether or not to use a CRM strategy. While the second study’s findings do not necessarily impact the for-profit brand, they are of use in predicting success of CRM strategies for non-profit organizations or causes which partner with for-profit firms.
Appendix

Exhibit 1: Positive and Negative Public Relations Situations for Study 1

Positive Public Relations

Shopped, Inc. is a department store chain commonly found in most American cities and suburbs. The company recently celebrated their 100th anniversary and prides themselves on a long history of family business. They employ 300,000 people worldwide and have 1,500 stores. Just this year, Shopped, Inc. was named in the top 10 of Fortune's "The 100 Best Companies to Work For," and their CEO was named one of the most reliable business leaders in America. Their products range from everyday household items to specialty products.

Recently, it was announced that the company's own brand of household products, Shopped Simply, would be produced with organically sourced products, and reports emerged showing Shopped, Inc.'s positive impact on environmental efforts. Shortly after the media frenzy began, Shopped, Inc.'s CFO was praised for his business ethics and named one of the most influential leaders in the retail sector.

Negative Public Relations

Shopped, Inc. is a department store chain commonly found in most American cities and suburbs. The company recently celebrated their 100th anniversary and prides themselves on a long history of family business. They employ 300,000 people worldwide and have 1,500 stores. Just this year, Shopped, Inc. was named in the top 10 of Fortune's "The 100 Best Companies to Work For," and their CEO was named one of the most reliable business leaders in America. Their products range from everyday household items to specialty products.

Recently, it was discovered that the company's own brand of household products, Shopped Simply, was being produced without consideration for child labor laws, and reports emerged accusing Shopped, Inc.'s production of being the cause of pollutant in a city's water supply. Shortly after the media frenzy began, Shopped, Inc.'s CFO resigned due to sexual assault allegations.

Exhibit 2: Branding Strategy Press Release for Study 1

Co-Branded CRM Strategy

Shoppers, Inc.'s CEO announced yesterday that the company will be partnering with the American Cancer society in the fight for a cure. The company selected this specific non-profit due to it's research efforts as well as it's longstanding history. Through their partnership, 10% of all of Shoppers, Inc.'s profits in 2018 will be donated to the American Cancer Society.
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Jointly-Branded CRM Strategy

Shoppers, Inc.’s CEO announced yesterday that the company will be helping to fund cancer research in the fight for a cure. The company selected this specific cause due to the many non-profits in the field as well as it’s longstanding history. Through their partnership, 10% of all of Shoppers, Inc.’s profits in 2018 will be donated to cancer research.

No CRM Strategy

Shoppers, Inc. continues on with normal business.

Exhibit 3: Dependent Variable Scales for Study 1

Attitude

Please answer the following questions regarding your attitude towards Shoppers, Inc.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like this company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I admire this company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust

Please answer the following questions regarding your trust in Shoppers, Inc.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust this company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company is predictable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company is dependable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 4: Charitable Donation Behavior Scales

Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My friends and/or coworkers and I talk about charitable behaviors quite often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends and/or coworkers encourage me to donate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends and/or coworkers often point out opportunities to make donations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 5: Positive and Negative Public Relations Situations for Study 2

Positive Public Relations

Burger Borough is a fast casual restaurant chain commonly found in most American cities and suburbs. The company recently celebrated their 100th anniversary and prides themselves on a long history of family business. They employ 300,000 people worldwide and have 1,500 locations. Just this year, Burger Borough was named in the top 10 of Fortune’s "The 100 Best Companies to Work For," and their CEO was named one of the most reliable business leaders in America. Their menu items range from burgers and fries to fresh salads.

Recently, it was announced that the company's most popular menu item, The Burg, would be produced with organically sourced beef, and reports emerged showing Shopped, Inc.'s positive impact on environmental efforts. Shortly after the media frenzy began, Shopped, Inc.'s CFO was praised for his business ethics and named one of the most influential leaders in the restaurant sector.
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Negative Public Relations

Burger Borough is a fast casual restaurant chain commonly found in most American cities and suburbs. The company recently celebrated their 100th anniversary and prides themselves on a long history of family business. They employ 300,000 people worldwide and have 1,500 locations. Just this year, Burger Borough was named in the top 10 of Fortune's "The 100 Best Companies to Work For," and their CEO was named one of the most reliable business leaders in America. Their menu items range from burgers and fries to fresh salads.

Recently, it was discovered that the company's most popular menu item, The Burg, was being produced without consideration for child labor laws, and reports emerged accusing Burger Borough's production of being the cause of pollutant in a city's water supply. Shortly after the media frenzy began, Burger Borough's CFO resigned due to sexual assault allegations.

Exhibit 6: Branding Strategy Advertisements for Study 2

Co-Branded CRM Strategy
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Jointly-Branded CRM Strategy

Donate.

Sponsored by Burger Borough to end world hunger.
No CRM Strategy

Exhibit 7: Charitable Donation Amount Scales

You have $100 to donate to any cause of your choice. What dollar amount of this money are you likely to donate to Burger Borough's World Hunger Relief campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage

---

Fresh.
Tasty.
Burger Borough.
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