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ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the term of “caring” referring to the Caring Theory and analyzes a corporate CSR communication evaluating to what extent communication about a different level of corporate involvement in social issue may enhance the trustworthiness of the message, consumers’ positive attitude toward the brand, and purchase intention. The article emphasizes that large organizations such as social services, schools, and national corporations cannot provide actual caring as it describes in the theory; however, these organizations can act ethically providing and supporting conditions under which caring relations can prosper. The study describes a possible Caring model for CSR communications offering companies to incorporate elements of caring theory in their communication about efforts in CSR. It argues that if the company wants to be sure that its CSR commitment sounds sincere, it can follow the communication model based on Nodding’s stages of caring, which offers three stages of corporate communication about CSR: “engrossment,” “displacement,” and “recognition.”

The study revealed that perception of caring can significantly enhance the efficiency of CSR messages. Incorporating even a few elements of caring exposed a significant impact on the effectiveness of communication. Although people may perceive caring differently, the elements of caring can help enhance the believability of CSR messages. The results showed that Caring Theory can be used as a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of CSR communication. A high level of perception of caring significantly mediates attitudes toward the message, toward the brand, and, as a result, purchase intention. Thus, the study supported the recommendation from previous scholar research to focus on the content of CSR communication in order to build trust and loyalty in consumers’ minds. (Kim & Lee, 2012).
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As companies increasingly want to go beyond just talking about consumerism and working to increase awareness about social issues, CSR is becoming more and more prevalent. For example, some commercials for the Super Bowl in 2018 engaged in water charity initiatives or pediatric cancer. It is worth mentioning that a commercial for the Super Bowl costs 5 million dollars per 30 seconds of airtime (Perloff, 2014; Rulz-Grossman, 2016). Thus, one wonders if companies paying the expensive fees of advertising time rather than donations to charity sincerely care about social issues or whether they are using a new approach simply win over more customers.

Socially responsible messages basically target ethically-minded consumers and young people who are deeply involved in social and environmental issues (Atkinson, 2013). According to the 2015 Nielsen Global Corporate Sustainability Report, more than 70% of young consumers around the world are attracted to sustainable brands and ready to pay extra for their products (Nielsen Global Corporate Sustainability Report, 2015). Findings from the 2015 Cone Communications Millennial CSR Study revealed that 90% of millennials would rather prefer to consume products from the brands supporting social causes and more than 60% of millennials will use social media to demonstrate their interest and experience with CSR. Moreover, approximately 66% of the young audience is willing to make a personal contribution to solving social issues (Cone Communications Millennial CSR Study, 2015).

Therefore, socially responsible claims are increasingly perceived more positively with less audience rejection (Atkinson, 2013). Rather than viewing socially responsible messages as deceptive or self-serving, consumers accept them in much more nuanced ways, balancing the realities of the disengaged mass-consumer culture with their desire to make a positive input by socially-oriented consumption. In order to meet consumers’ needs, companies are more and more willing to communicate about their investments in corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Tata & Prasad, 2015).

Some corporations are genuinely concerned and involved with the causes they support by CSR, but other companies may use socially-related advertising merely to create a positive image in public or to gain an extra profit (Rim & Kim, 2016). Corporate social responsibility has been widely studied from a variety of perspectives, including social (Athanasopoulou & Selsky, 2015), business (Govindan, Khodaverdi, & Jafarian, 2013), legal (Harjoto & Jo, 2015), political (Fooks et al., 2011), and ethical (Simpson & Taylor, 2013). However, companies’ motivations for the corporate social responsibility of many companies are still obscure, and processes are observable only by their results in a long-term period. (Kim, 2010).

Business ethics and corporate communication, for the most part, ignore what constitutes a genuine process of caring or offer only a proforma mention
(Hawk, 2011); there is widespread skepticism creating about CSR related messages and motives behind them (Grier & Forehand, 2002; Romani, Grappi & Bagozzi, 2016; Yoon, Gurhan-Canli & Schwarz, 2006). The linkages between the actual caring motivation for CSR and the effectiveness of CSR communication as a form of advertising has not been sufficiently explored. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to develop preliminary insight into these linkages by applying the Caring Theory (Noddings, 1984) to CSR communication. The article analyzes the term of “caring,” referring to the Caring Theory and analyzes a corporate CSR communication, evaluating to what extent communication about a different level of corporate involvement in social issue may enhance the trustworthiness of the message, consumers’ positive attitude toward the brand, and purchase intention.
CHAPTER II
COMMUNICATION ABOUT CSR
Abstract

In this section, the article describes the prior scholarly research, which has been done in CSR communication. The section defines the term of CSR and analyses the nature of skepticism that has been discovered by experts in this area. Additionally, the study recommends companies use informative content in CSR communication in order to create a solid base of loyal consumers and relationship emphasizing why ethics of care might be useful for CSR communication.

Communication about CSR

CSR is a broad term and can be defined in more than 37 different ways (Dahlsrud, 2008). The scholar attempt to define CSR started with basic aspects of CSR, such as accomplishing business objectives and meeting legal requirements. Lately, these definitions were expanded by adding such values as social benefits and stakeholders’ interest (McGuire, 1963). The European Commission defines CSR as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (European Commission, 2001). During the decades scholars have developed numerous definitions for CSR, but most of them proceed on the basis of Carroll’s (1979) definition which describes CSR as an activity “entailing economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibility” (Carroll’s, 1979). The definition covers different areas of a company’s business activity emphasizing the importance of a company’s involvement in both economical and ethical aspects of CSR activity (Carroll, 1979).

The increasing influence of CSR on consumers’ attitudes towards brands makes CSR communication and promotion of pro-social behavior extremely important for most businesses (Wang & Anderson, 2011). However, some studies have shown the interference of external factors on perception of CSR campaigns (Wang & Anderson, 2011). For example, the research of Alex Wang and Ronald Anderson (2011) describes attitudes of the audience toward CSR communication as a multi-staged model. The research concluded that the attitude of the audience toward CSR can be influenced by different variables making communication about CSR essential and challenging at the same time. Being concerned about consumers’ skepticism that might evoke self-promotional CSR communication (Coombs and Holladay, 2012), many genuinely “caring” companies lack efficient communication about their activity, thus losing their opportunity to increase their credibility (Kim & Ferguson, 2016) and differentiate themselves from corporations which use socially-responsible messages merely for self-serving purposes.

The influential variables of consumers’ perceptions of socially-responsible messages were discussed by Haley (1996). Through comprehensive literature review and interviews, he created a model of Consumers’ Understandings of
Advocacy Messages. The model described the overall consumers’ understandings of advocacy advertising through the consumers’ perceptions of the organization, the issue, and the self. The research revealed that consumers found the relationship between the company and the claimed issue extremely valuable. Four main themes described this relationship: logical association, expertise, personal investment, and intent. According to Haley, an organization will be perceived credible by the audience if it has an identifiable relevance to the issue, an appropriate level of expertise in dealing with an issue, a visible amount of investment in dealing with an issue, and a cooperation of interests between organization and a local community (Haley, 1996). This research suggested that consumers’ perceptions of the “match” between an organization and an issue can be measured.

An essential role of comprehensive CSR communication was also described by Kim and Ferguson (2016), who defined six communication dimensions included six constructs. The researchers argued that the crucial variables for effective CSR communication are: informativeness or a precise description of company’s actions of being socially responsible, personal relevance to the audience examples in messages, an employment of third-party endorsements, information based on facts and consistency and transparency of messages (Kim & Ferguson, 2014). In addition, Kim and Ferguson (2014) emphasized that consumer publics are eager to know about the beneficiaries of companies CSR activities. Several studies have also noted the necessity of building a record of disclosing honest CSR information in order to overcome audience’s skepticism about companies’ self-serving motives (Coombs & Holladay, 2011; Schlegelmilch & Pollach, 2005). A company that is perceived as sincere is more effective in engaging the audience (Kim & Lee, 2012). The findings suggested that a better knowledge about company’s CSR and more trust in its commitment positively influenced company’s image and the quality of its engagement with consumers (Kim & Lee, 2012). The study recommends companies to focus on the informativeness of CSR communication in order to create a solid base of loyal consumers and relationship with them (Kim and Lee, 2012).
CHAPTER III
CARING THEORY
Abstract

This section of the paper explores the Caring Theory. The study analyses caring as an on-going process with the explanation of roles of each member, and necessary conditions for its existence. Also, this section provides readers with a possible explanation of how caring organizations may create the environment, where caring may prosper.

Caring Theory

Care is the ongoing involvement in the well-being and positive evolution of interaction between “one-caring” and “cared-for.” There are numerous valuable philosophical contributions to the evolvement of care as the extensive moral structure of ethics of care. Originally, it has developed from the feminist literature. An ethic of care was extensively studied by Mayeroff (1965), Gilligan (1977) and Ruddick (1980). Later the ethics of care was contributed by Noddings (1984), Held and Tronto (1993), and Slote (2007) who provided a comprehensive overview of ethics of care (Hawk, 2011).

This study will be focused on research created by Noddings in 1984. The main reason and interest to her research are based on the idea of caring as an on-going process. According to Noddings, caring is a process which is based on the internal desire to care using emotions and feelings but not rules and requirements. Noddings presented her view of caring in the book titled “Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education.” She began with a question about the meaning of “caring,” emphasizing that the term caring should be differentiated from “moral judgment” (Noddings, 1984). She defined rules and obligations as a traditional and masculine approach to ethics. Instead of obligational approach, Noddings offers a relational or, as she calls, “feminine” approach, in which a person does not analyze the situation before caring but reacts with desire and compassion (Noddings, 1984). For instance, if a woman hears the cry of her child at night, she will get up and care for him or her without any hesitation, because she has a strong intimate relationship with her infant. Therefore, a feminine approach is based on attitudes and relations, but not on the obligation.

Caring as a process

According to Noddings, the caring process can be divided into the following important components: “engrossment in the other,” “ displacement of own motives,” and “recognition” (Noddings, 1984). Noddings claimed that “engrossment to others” means that a caring person is attentive, s/he listens, observes, and receives any sign of needs from the “cared-for” (Noddings, 2012). When the person notes an expressed need from a “cared-for,” he or she will experience “motivational displacement,” which means that his or her energy
temporarily directs away from his/her own projects toward those of the cared-for (Noddings, 2012). The response will be based on resources for the response and an attitude to not hurt others. If a positive response might hurt others, the caring person will try to find another way to respond. A good example is caring parents make their child attend university when their child wants to pursue a military path. In this example, the parents cannot insist on their decision because their child is no longer dependent on them, so they can accept and support their child in his or her decision. As a result, a caring relationship can be presented, even though the need has been denied.

**Participants of the caring process: “one-caring” and “cared-for”**

The most crucial elements of the Theory of Caring are members of the caring process. Noddings presented terms such as “one-caring” and “cared-for.” The “one-caring” is a person who acts with care. A caring person has a dominant role in caring. His or her main functions are engrossment and motivational displacement. A caring person shows his/her compassion and support for the “cared-for,” whose main role is to accept care. However, Noddings argues that caring should not be controlled entirely by “one-caring” because this can lead to the substitution of the needs of “cared-for” by the needs of “one-caring.” Therefore, a receptive attention or “engrossment” is a vital feature of the caring interaction. Caring is more receptive than projective. Therefore, the core of this process is to accommodate a “cared-for” individual, not the “caring-one” (Noddings, 1984).

Unfortunately, many factors can block the flow of what Noddings calls “motivational displacement” (Noddings, 1984). Even if an attention takes place, “one-caring” may resist the transition to motivational displacement. She or he may think: “Uh-oh. I can see where this is leading. I don’t have time for this” (or “I can’t handle this,” or “Why me?” or “Not again!”) (Noddings, 2002). In this scenario, the encounter is no longer a fully caring individual. However, a caring process may be restored by continued conversation and compromise, and many caring encounters are satisfied by something less than what the “cared-for” initially had in mind. It is not necessary, possible, or ethically appropriate for “one-caring” to agree on every demand of “cared-for” (Noddings, 2002).

Finally, a caring process usually finishes with “reciprocity” (Noddings, 1984). The person who cares usually expects a response from a “cared-for” person. Thus, a caring process will finish only if “one-caring” receives a response from “cared-for.” As the site of the initial motive, the response from “cared-for” shows that the efforts have been received (Noddings, 2002). For instance, an appropriate response for a caring mother from her cared crying child will take place when the infant stops crying and smiles. In many mature relationships, a reciprocity establishes “mutuality.” When the “cared-for” shows reciprocity, the “cared-for” contributes something essential (Noddings, 2002). When a “cared-for” is unable to respond in a way that completes the relation because, for example,
he/she does not feel cared for, the work of “one-caring” becomes more challenging and caring in this position usually needs additional support (Noddings, 2012). The best illustration of such bias in the relationship can be observed in co-depended relationships, for example, between a wife and a husband in a conflict. Their communication usually fails because they cannot exchange care attitudes toward each other without the feeling of anger or guilt. On the other hand, in on-going healthy relationships, parties regularly exchange the role of “one-caring” and “cared-for.”

Feelings of guilt take a special place in Noddings’ theory. She mentions that feelings of guilt usually accompany a caring attitude. If a person feels guilty, it is more probable that he or she does care (Noddings, 1984). Noddings illustrates this assumption with an example of a caring teacher and a discontented student, who argues about a non-care attitude of the teacher. The teacher, in this case, might feel guilty, although she or he did care, and the main reason for dissatisfied results of the student is his or her personal noninvolvement on the subject.

The example of the caring teacher and unsatisfied student illustrates the vulnerability of a caring person. Noddings claims that the process of caring reveals real feelings of the person, which could make him/her vulnerable. However, this process also gives a person additional internal or moral strength and makes his or her activities meaningful.

Noddings also covers caring relationships toward animals, plants, and ideas. She concluded that positive responses from animals and plants create an attachment to them. However, she rejects that the process of caring about animals and plants represents a genuine caring because animals and plants cannot provide the reciprocity at the same level as people do.

**Circles and chains of the caring process**

As an ongoing process, caring starts from a caring member who creates an inner circle of care. The caring person finds oneself at the center of the inner-circle, which is a starting point of the caring process. The inner-circle includes others for whom a caring person has high regard. Noddings emphasizes that the inner-circle has an ethical sense of caring attitude. Even though the interaction between the “one-caring” and “cared-for” here may change, its emotional constituent “engrossment” here is never excluded. Even the “one-caring” may feel tired or desolate when he or she still cares and feels engrossed in the needs of a “cared-for.”

To maintain and institutionalize caring into the inner circle of care, members of the caring process have rules. It is a crucial component to maintain an ongoing process of caring on different levels. All members included in the inner-circle of genuine caring can function and feel comfortable in it if they are familiar and agreed with these rules. Therefore, any destructive roles and principles of rules, according to Noddings, should be clarified and acknowledged.
Moving outwards from the inner circles of caring, the ethical principles of a caring person guide their encounters with people outside their own circle but evaluate him or her by personal or formal relations. Noddings defines these relations as a chain between the inner circle of care and others, thereby emphasizing that the chains establish the will of the one-caring acting in an ethical and caring way. Noddings argues that the next level of the inner circle is a circle of potential caring. This statement essentially can mean an engrossment to other members who are not involved in direct caring. Even if the caring person does not directly care about others, he or she is prepared for care (Noddings, 1984).

The author also provides an overview of how an ethically-minded caring person should react toward strangers who do not have any relations or bonds with a caring system. Noddings (2012) states that a caring person remains receptive to strangers as well. The person should act in a morally-responsible way following the assumption of what must be done from an ethical point of view. Simultaneously, the natural time and the energy consuming process of caring allows the caring person to regulate the number of requests for care, as guided by the number of available resources.

Noddings emphasizes that large organizations such as social services, schools, and national corporations cannot provide actual caring as it is described in the theory; however, she also emphasizes that organizations should act ethically providing and supporting conditions under which caring relations can prosper (Engster, 2015). The author argues that organizations should support caring attitudes through their communication. However, she does not provide any sufficient explanation of possible outcomes for “carrying companies” from such communication. Therefore, the research aims to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1**: Does perception of caring messages mediate the relationships between attitude toward the message and attitude toward the brand?
- **RQ2**: Does perception of caring messages mediate the relationship between attitude toward the brand and purchase intention?
CHAPTER IV
THE HIERARCHY OF EFFECTS AND CARING THEORY:
A CARING MODEL FOR CSR COMMUNICATION
Abstract

In this section, the article explores the development the Model of Hierarchy of Effects and proposes a Caring Model for CSR Communication based on it. The section provides an explanation for each level of caring in messages and proposes hypotheses for the study.

The Hierarchy of Effects

In order to analyze how levels of caring in messages can mediate the effectiveness and perception of CSR, the article will refer to the classical advertising model of the Hierarchy of Effects (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961). The model was developed as a response to the debates among advertising practitioners and researchers about the main function of advertising. Throughout most of the history of the advertising research, the main measure for advertising effectiveness was sales. However, in 1961, Lavidge and Steiner argued that sales alone cannot serve as the only measure of the long-term effects that advertising may have. Thus, Lavidge and Steiner argued that individuals normally process advertising messages in series of stages, from awareness to an actual purchase.

Hence, for a comprehensive measurement of advertising effectiveness they outlined and defined six stages that consumers move through on the way to actual purchases: unawareness of the product or the service, awareness about product existence, knowledge about product benefits, favorable attitudes toward the product or service, preference for the product or service over other purchase options, conviction of the product’s value, and actual purchase (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961). Lavidge and Steiner also described different conditions or statuses that might locate consumers at different “distances” (referring to mental stages which they did not define precisely) from the purchase. For example, consumers that have a negative attitude toward the product or the brand may be “located” further from the stage of “purchasing” than those consumers who are completely unaware of the product or the brand.

Lavidge and Steiner argued the stages of consumers’ processing relate to the three main functions of advertising. The first function of advertising, according to them, is to increase knowledge and awareness of the product, which is directly related to “information and ideas.” (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961) The second function of advertising is to develop a favorable attitude toward the product and a brand which is referred to customers’ feelings. The third function of advertising is to persuade customers to take an action, which is related to the customers’ behavioral intentions. It is not surprising that all three functions of advertising described by Lavidge and Steiner, relate to the psychological definition of people’s attitudes and behaviors, which includes three components: a cognitive component (intellectual and rational states), an effective component (the state of
Based on the idea of a multistage process of forming attitudes and behaviors, Lavidge and Steiner proposed that measures of advertising effectiveness should account for changes at each stage of customers’ movement from awareness to purchase, not just the stage of purchase intention. These measurements, according to Lavidge and Steiner, may include the determination of how many customers are at each stage, as how much their attitudes change.

Lavidge and Steiner’s proposal of a new function for advertising evoked a strong response in the research and The Hierarchy of Effects became a wide area for further development, application, and criticism in scholarly research on advertising. Approximately at the same time, Rogers (1982) developed another version of the Hierarchy of Effects for launching a new product (Barry, 1987). According to him, customers usually go through the following five steps: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption. Later in 1971, Robertson proposed a new view of the Model of the Hierarchy of Effects proposing awareness, comprehension, attitude, legitimation, trial, and adoption (Barry, 1987). Also, Mendelson, working with the framework of mass communication, argued that a multistage informational process would facilitate a more profound understanding of how people process information and respond to it. Mendelson’s research referred to similar psychological stages of human reactions to information as did Lavidge and Steiner and included cognition, affect, and conation (Barry, 1987). However, he enhanced his model by incorporating active response to information that included “entailed recall” and “emotion.”

During the decades, researchers continued developing the Hierarchy of Effects maintaining a dynamic model of consumers’ processing of information, but adding additional attributes according to the requirements of the market and the advertising industry. Ray (1973) offered three additional models of Hierarchy of effects including the process of consumers’ learning, Anderson and Barry (1987) added “brand loyalty,” Vaughn (1980) supported the model with the low involvement theory and developed four additional models which helped advertisers to group their target audience, Preston (1982) added associations with advertising messages to the classical model of the Hierarchy of Effects (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961) and created his own version of the model associated with high involvement of the audience (Barry, 1987).

Some researchers noted weaknesses in the model of the Hierarchy of Affect. For instance, Palda in 1996 summarized all methodological shortcomings of the model emphasizing the feeling of uncertainty that it creates during the analysis of customers’ thinking process. A possible explanation of researcher’s concerns might be Weibacher (2001) argument that the Model of Hierarchy of Effects highly simplifies the complexity of human brains and ignores the comprehensive approach of marketing campaigns, analyzing only isolated advertising efforts. But even though, the Hierarchy of Effect has met with external dissent from
psychologists, who argue about the primacy and consistency among affects and beliefs in the formation of attitudes (Barry, 1987), this model is still often used both in research and by practitioners to analyze advertising and marketing effectiveness.

A Caring model for CSR communication

In this section, the article describes a possible model of how caring CSR messages can be combined together. The model offers companies to incorporate elements of caring theory in their communication about efforts in CSR. If the company wants to be sure that its CSR commitment sounds sincere, it can follow the communication model based on Nodding’s stages of caring, which offers three stages of corporate communication about CSR: “engrossment,” “displacement,” and “recognition.”

“Engrossment” or recognition needs
Engrossment is the first stage for the organization to become genuinely caring. For an organization, this stage may include work with data and research to identify community’s needs. An organization uses a caring approach for its communication analyses to reveal the needs of a society or participates in a real voluntary activity to increase the awareness of issues. The collection and analysis of data are crucial because it creates a base for genuine motives for dealing with a particular issue. The company should evaluate what bothers its employees and leaders. The company’s activity and the social issues that CSR supports should match the company’s values, mission, and corporate culture. Messages at this stage provide the audience with the information: “Why we care about the issue.”

“Displacement” or devotion of resources
In the context of genuine caring in CSR communication, “displacement” means a focus on building a dialogue between the organization and its community, customers, suppliers, government etc. This stage in the caring process is crucial, because, to obtain necessary information, the company needs a mutual, honest and collaborative communication with its audience (Kent & Taylor, 2002). It should provide useful and precise information about social issues and events to show the audience strong arguments and actual actions the organization is undertaking to deal with the issue. The company will be able to create trustful communication with the audience if messages show benefit for the community rather than for itself. Besides, this stage should be ethically oriented. All messages should have a purpose to protect its “cared-for” subjects, implying their vulnerability. The company also should invest its time and resources to solve the problem. The audience at this stage of communication is provided with information: “How we care about the issue.”
“Reciprocity”
“Reciprocity” means an availability of actual results of the social event or campaign for the audience. Communication at this stage should be organized on a regular base because constancy may increase a credibility of the communicator. Using the transparency of company’s CSR activity, the company should publish reports about its activities, making the audience aware of actual CSR results. The benefit for the audience from such disclosure may evoke a personal relevance toward company’s CSR. The messages at this stage answer the question: “What we have already done about the issue and who benefitted.”

“On-going process”
When a company is involved in the issue, devoting resources, and building reciprocity through activity, the company has become genuinely involved in the process of caring. The reciprocity of this process provides the company with the benefits of involvement with meaningful activity. At this stage, an on-going caring process is necessary for the company to become an expert in dealing with social issues and to create an environment where caring can flourish and prosper. The company at this stage of devotion to CSR activity provides the audience with valuable information, changing the role of the communication messages from manipulative to educational using facts, numbers, and examples. The information at this stage of caring communication answers the question: “What company’s long-term commitment to support the issue.”

In order to analyze the effectiveness of caring messages and evaluate how communication of different levels of caring influence people perception of CSR messages, the study proposes to use the Association Model, which was developed by Preston in 1982 based on the Model of the Hierarchy of Effects (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961). The crucial difference between the Association model and other models of the Hierarchy of Effects is that the model posits several steps of awareness, incorporating integrated perception, integrated evaluation, and integrated stimulation of advertising messages (Preston, 1982). According to advertising research, this model is applicable for measuring advertising effectiveness at a high level of involvement of the audience (Barry, 1987), thus it might be extremely helpful for measuring the effectiveness of CSR messages, which often expose the information about social issues. This model also takes into account the value of advertising messages and implies that consumers may perceive these messages differently depending on their own associations. Thus, the Association Model separates advertising awareness from product awareness, emphasizing that consumers may perceive messages differently depending on evoked perceptions and feelings. Preston suggests assessing awareness by standard recall measures analyzing the percentage of consumers who can recall the message after receiving a clue about the product or the brand, or who can describe some specific elements of the message. Thus, caring messages may be measured by the degree to which the customers can identify some specific elements of caring described in messages.
The Association model also includes a complex element of perception which incorporates “product perception,” “prior perception,” and “integrated perception” (Preston, 1982). According to Preston, “prior perception” represents consumers’ knowledge about the product or the brand gained from different resources in the past. “Product perceptions” characterize an immediate effect of exposed advertising, defining what consumers see in the message. And, as an overall result, the model offers to measure “integrated perception,” which combines prior and immediate perceptions of advertising, and represented by the measure of what consumers decide to believe in from the message (Preston, 1982). Thus, the “perception of caring” in messages communicating about caring efforts may be deliberated using the measure of believability.

The next stage of Preston’s Association models is an “evaluation,” which is similar to “perception” includes three components: “product evaluation,” “prior evaluation,” and an “integrated evaluation.” Preston argues that the stage of Evaluation represents what customers feel about the product or the brand based on their previous or immediate attitude toward the product or the brand. He proposes to evaluate this stage by the standard measurements of favorable attitudes (Preston, 1982). For caring messages, “evaluation” can be also measured by analyzing the attitudes toward the message and the brand.

The final stage of the Association model is “stimulation.” This stage is prior to the actual action. Similar to the previous stages, Preston proposes to compute an “integrated stimulation” from “product stimulation” (using an immediate effect of advertising) and “prior stimulation” (from the previous knowledge or experience). These components, according to the researcher, reflect a favorable stimulus to make a purchase and can be measured by asking questions about purchase intention. Caring messages at this point might be measured by defining the intention to make an action, such as purchase, donation, or volunteer participation.

Thus, combining two prominent theoretical models, Caring Theory and the Association model, the study offers a new construct of “caring perception” which may have a significant effect on processing advertising messages about CSR. The following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: As messages incorporate more elements of caring (engrossment, displacement, recognition, and on-going process) consumers’ perception of the message sponsor as a caring organization (perception of caring) increases.

H2: Consumers’ perceptions of caring are positively related to consumers’ attitudes toward the message.

H3: Consumers’ attitudes toward the message are positively related to consumers’ attitudes toward the brand.

H4: Consumers’ attitudes toward the message are positively related to consumers’ brand interest.

H5: Consumers’ attitudes toward the brand are positively related to purchase intentions.
Figure 1. A Caring model for CSR communication
CHAPTER V
STUDY
Abstract

In this section, the article describes an implemented study of testing the Caring Model for CSR Communications, shows its results, explaining the outcomes, limitations and the development of future research.

Introduction

The study explored how messages that expressed different levels of caring could influence consumer perceptions of a company’s CSR advertising investigating whether messages that reflected levels of caring as suggested by Noddings (1984) could help demonstrate such things as “investment” and the perception of corporate CSR motives as genuine (factors identified as important in the advocacy advertising and CSR communication literature) thereby leading to a more positive evaluations of a company’s CSR activity.

Method

To explore this idea, the study used the context of CSR communication about a corporation’s efforts at combatting breast cancer: detailed information about CSR activities that company supported, why the company supported it, how long the company had supported it, and what kind of impact the company’s commitment had made on the issue (Kim & Ferguson, 2016). This context had an external validity in Delta Airlines, which has an on-going commitment to devoting company resources to the battle against breast cancer. Through advertising campaigns, the company tries to increase awareness of the disease, raising money for the research by hosting fundraising events and selling consumer products.

The study was based on the assumption that breast cancer has a great potential to have a personal relevance for the audience because it is a prevalent health issue. According to the American Cancer Society, in 2018 breast cancer was the second after the lung cancer most prevalent cause of cancer death in US women. Nationally, an average probability of women’s death from cancer is almost 3%. Additionally, breast cancer is 0.3% more common among African American women, in comparison to women of other ethnicities (The American Cancer Society, 2018).

Today, there are more than 3.1 million breast cancer survivors in the United States. The number includes women who are still being treated and those who have completed treatment (American Cancer Society, 2018). In 2018 American Cancer Society estimates almost 1,800,000 new breast cancer incidents and more than 600,000 cancer death, which means that the number of breast cancer survivors and death will increase (American Cancer Society, 2018). Because of the prevalence of the issue, consumers are likely to have some involvement with it at varying levels from general awareness to knowing someone who has breast cancer or having breast cancer her/himself.
Design and procedure

The study employed an experimental design (Campbell and Stanley, 1966) using CSR advertising from a fictitious company. The fictitious airline company was created to exclude any “prior perception,” “prior evaluation,” or prior stimulus” (Preston, 1982) about caring activity, the brand, or the product. This condition allowed us to analyze caring messages using only Integrated Perception, Integrated Evaluation, and Integrated Stimulus using measures proposed by Preston (1982).

In order to collect the data, the study used Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a web service providing data samples with a strong test-retest reliability on a rewarded bases (Holden, Dennie, & Hicks, 2013). When the participants demonstrated a consent to participate in the survey, they were exposed to the stimulus material on a random base, and then they were asked to answer the survey questions.

Participants

The sample size has included 160 participants. The profile of the participants was derived from the Simmons OneView database based on information about Delta airlines customers. The basic information about participants was: male/female, 25-64 years old, full time employed, located in the US, traveled by plane at least once a year. In order to qualify participants for the study, the following parameters were used as screening questions in the survey: age – 25-64 and intention to fly in coming 12 months. Only participants who met those two parameters could proceed with the survey.

Pre-test of stimulus materials

In order to validate questions and statements, and to measure the success, a four-item manipulation check among 20 young scholars from communications and linguistics majors was conducted. 70% of respondents could successfully match each statement with one of the categories demonstrating a level of caring. After this procedure, an attention check was included in the survey. The audiences’ attention toward the messages was controlled by asking a question gained from the pre-test of stimulus materials about the content of the messages (Appendix B). The success was measured with four 7-point Likert items: “the company claims why it cares about the issue” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree), “the company claims what it is doing care for the issue” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree), “the company claims what it has already done about the issue and who benefitted” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree), “the company claims about long-term commitment for the issue” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree). Three pre-test procedures were conducted. The following results were received from the pre-test procedure with different audience: first
round of the pre-test (108 respondents) – 94.18% (“strongly agreed,” “agreed,” “somewhat agreed”), the second pre-test (206 respondents) -85.23% (“strongly agreed,” “agreed,” “somewhat agreed”). As a result, among 160 respondents from the control group 86.87% respondents could evaluate the message as it was designed by this study (“strongly agreed,” “agreed,” “somewhat agreed”).

**Stimulus materials**

The study developed CSR advertising claims from a fictitious company named “Gamma airlines.” Messages described company’s efforts in battling breast cancer. The CSR messages contained advertising messages promoting the company’s effort in raising funds and increasing awareness of its support of breast cancer research. The content of the messages was similar to the content of CSR advertising for Delta Airlines’ “Breast Cancer One” campaign. The content of the messages was constructed in a particular way to demonstrate the company’s effort from different levels of caring (Noddings, 1984) enhancing informational part of the messages with data gained from the website of the Randy Shaver Cancer Research and Community Fund.

Each participant was shown one of the following experimental conditions.

**Level one of caring – “engrossment” – “why we care about the issue”**

Every two minutes a woman in the US is diagnosed with breast cancer. More than 3 million US women are breast cancer survivors. Since 70% of “Gamma Airline’s” employees are women, the company has chosen breast cancer research as its mission. Gamma’s employees invite you to support vital research to put an end to breast cancer. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure (Delta Airlines, 2018).

**Level two of caring – “displacement” – “how we care about the issue”**

“Gamma Airlines” donates 10% of any purchased “Gamma's” pink ribbon-themed item to research and awareness programs. Today “Gamma airlines” fully funds seven research projects. The company’s support spans from London, Australia/New Zealand, Paris, New York, Seattle, Michigan, California, and Indiana. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure (Delta Airlines, 2018).

**Level three of caring – “reciprocity” – “what we have already done and who benefitted from CSR activity”**

20 “Gamma Airlines” funded grants have been spent on technology and tools that have enhanced early detection of cancer, supported research projects at the University of Texas that helped prevent cancer relapses, and promoted 25 programs that enhance the lives of Minnesota’s cancer community by providing aid and assistance. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and
help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure (Delta airlines, 2018; Randy Shaver Cancer Research and Community Fund, 2018).

**Level four of caring – “on-going” – “long-term commitment and expertise development”**

Today “Gamma Airlines” celebrates its 10th anniversary of the “Breast Cancer Fight” and cooperation with the Breast Cancer Research Fund. “Gamma Airlines” is announcing its plan for supporting the Breast Cancer Research Fund for 15 of years to achieve prevention and a cure for breast cancer. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.

**Control variables**

“Awareness” was determined by asking each participant the question about the message which revealed their possibility to define some specifics from the message (Preston, 1982).  
‘Involvement in the issue” is another control variables. People with a high level of involvement in an advocated issue will more likely comply with claims and behavior from CSR advertising (Lee, 2017). Therefore, the study included three 7-scale Likert questions measuring issue involvement: “breast cancer disease is an important issue to me” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree), “breast cancer disease is a great concern to me” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree), “I am supportive of breast cancer research treatment” (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) (Lee, Haley, & Mark, 2012). These three items measuring involvement in the issue showed a high reliability, α=.852.

**Dependent measures**

“Perception of caring” was defined following the Preston’s Association model as an “integrated perception” (Preston, 1982) of caring which measured by the measure of “believability” retrieved from the previous research. The scale offered a five-item with a bipolar 7-point semantic differential scale which included: “informative/not informative,” “trustworthy /untrustworthy,” “accurate/inaccurate,” “convincing/unconvincing,” and “believable/not believable” (Hallahan,1999; Wang, 2011). These items measuring perception of caring showed a high reliability, α=.892.

Three dependent measures were proposed to measure “evaluation stage” of advertising effectiveness (Preston, 1982): “the attitude toward the message,” “the attitude toward the brand,” and “brand interest.” “Attitude toward the message” was measured by requesting respondents to complete the following sentence: "The message from Gamma airlines is..." with a 5-item scale composed of “interesting/boring,” “attention-getting/not attention-getting,” “good/bad,” “likable/unlikable,” and “fun/not fun” (Hallahan, 1999; Wang, 2011).
The items measuring attitude toward the message showed a high reliability, \( \alpha = .817 \).

There were two dependent variables to measure the “affective component” of the Hierarchy of Effects (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961): “attitude toward the brand” and “brand interest” (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961). “Attitude toward the brand” (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961) was measured by asking respondents to complete the sentence: “I would describe “Gamma airlines” as …” with a 6-item scale contained following variables: “good/bad,” “pleasant/unpleasant,” “high quality/low quality,” “likable/unlikable,” “desirable/not desirable,” and “favorable/unfavorable” (Hallahan, 1999; Wang, 2011). The items measuring attitude toward the brand showed a high reliability, \( \alpha = .952 \).

“Interest” (Ford & Kent, 2009) was measured with a 5-point Likert item: “I’d like to learn more about “Gamma Airlines” (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree) (Ford & Kent, 2009).

The “stimulation stage of the Hierarchy of Effects” (Preston, 1982) was measured with one dependent variable of “purchase Intention” with four 7-point Likert items: “likely to purchase,” “will probably purchase,” “will possibly purchase, and “will consider purchasing” (Lee, 2017; MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch, 1986). The items measuring purchase intention showed a high reliability, \( \alpha = .715 \).

**Results**

Messages were assigned randomly to four independent groups created by The Qualtrics Web Survey. Each group included 40 respondents \( (n=160) \), 92 were female and 68 were male, 21.3% were age 25-29, 33.1% were age 30-34, 13.8% were age 35-39, 8.1% were age 40-44, 6.9% were age 45-49, 6.9% were age 50-54, 10% were age 55 or older; 85.7% - responded that they “support breast cancerresearch” (40%-strongly agreed, 34.4%-agreed, 11.3%- somewhat agreed); 85.7% thought that “breast cancer is an important issue” for them (31.3%-strongly agreed, 37.5%-agreed, 16.9% somewhat agreed); 80% evaluated “breast cancer disease as a great concern” (27.5%- strongly agreed, 31.9%-agreed, 20.6%- somewhat agreed).

From the descriptive statistics from Table.1 (Appendix A) we can conclude that the all messages exposed to the all groups were perceived above the average in terms of Caring Perception \( (M =5.48, SD=.977\) (messages with level of Caring 1), \( M=5.43, SD= 1.28\) (messages with level of Caring 2), \( M=5.44, SD= 1.13 \) (messages with level of Caring 3), \( M=5.11, SD= 1.09 \) (messages with level of Caring 4).

In order to define patterns in the whole group, it was decided to investigate a relationship between “perception of caring” and the “attitude” toward the message within the full sample \( n=160 \). The test of normality was conducted. The sampling group demonstrated a satisfactory level of normal distribution \( (p=.001) \), thus the Pearson’s correlation test between two variables, “perception of caring”
and “attitude toward the message,” was conducted. Both variables were significantly correlated, \( r = .686, p < .01 \) at Table 2 (Appendix B). The analysis also revealed a significant correlation between variables of “attitude toward the message” and “attitude toward the brand,” \( r = .689, p < .01 \) from Table 3 (Appendix C); a significant correlation between variables of “attitude toward the message” and “brand Interest,” \( r = .553, p < .01 \) from Table 4 (Appendix D); as well as a significant correlation between variables of “brand Interest” and “purchase intention,” \( r = .666, p < .01 \) from Table 5 (Appendix E). All measures were tested on the normal distribution and a satisfactory level of normal distribution (\( p = .001 \)). All of these results have supported the hypothesis H2, H3, H4, H5. From the statistical analysis, we can conclude that perception of caring can significantly enhance the efficiency of CSR messages. Incorporating even few elements of caring has a significant impact on the effectiveness of communication, even though people may perceive caring process differently.

The next step of analysis aimed to answer a research question and H1 describing how to incorporate different elements of caring can influence the perception of caring messages. The analysis of computed variables on homogeneity and normal distribution did not reveal satisfactory results for running ANOVA or the Pearson’s correlation tests, thus the procedure of running several tests among single variables was conducted. As a result, an intriguing increasing correlation between items of “perception of caring” (“informativeness, trustworthiness, accuracy, convincement, and believability”) and “issue involvement” (“a great concern”, “a big issue,” and “support of breast cancer research”) was discovered.

The statistical analysis revealed that the audience with a high level of issue involvement is more influenced by caring messages. This type of the audience found them trustworthy, informative, accurate, convincing, and believable. The analysis also revealed a significant correlation between variables of “Breast cancer is a great concern to me...” and “informativeness” \( (r = .409, p < .01) \), “trustworthiness” \( (r = .439, p < .01) \), “accuracy” \( (r = .387, p < .01) \), “convincingness” \( (r = .524, p < .01) \), and “believability” \( (r = .578, p < .01) \) at the level 3 of caring messages from Table 6 (Appendix F) demonstrates high correlations between variables of “informativeness” and the variable of “issue involvement.” These results can be explained by a strong expectation of the qualitative content among this type of the audience.

A similar pattern in correlations we could observe between variables of “perception of caring” (“informativeness, trustworthiness, accuracy, convincement, and believability”) and variable of “Breast cancer is an important issue to me...” The analysis also revealed a significant correlation between variables of “Breast cancer is an important issue to me...” and “informativeness” \( (r = .362, p < .01) \), “trustworthiness” \( (r = .409, p < .01) \), “accuracy” \( (r = .330, p < .01) \), “convincement” \( (r = .554, p < .01) \), and “believability” \( (r = .590, p < .01) \) from Table 7 (Appendix G) on a level 3 of caring messages, which represented a level of reciprocity from Caring Theory. The second level of caring in messages had
strong correlations between involvement into issue and variables of “convincement” (r=.343, p< .05) and “believability” (r=.425, p< .01) from Table 7 (Appendix G).

The analysis also revealed a significant correlation between variables of “issue involvement” and “trustworthiness” on the first level of caring messages. Decreased level of correlations between other variables, in this case, can be explained by a low involvement of the audience in the issue. It still demonstrated a strong response toward the third level of caring in massages, but overall the content is less important than it was for the group which named “breast cancer as a great concern.” The intriguing increase in correlations was observed in variables of “accuracy,” “convincement,” and “believability”: the higher level of care demonstrated in messages - the more items demonstrated increasing correlations between variables.

Additionally, the analysis revealed a significant correlation between variables of “I am supporting research for treatment of breast cancer disease” and “informativeness” (r=.462, p< .01), “trustworthiness” (r=.467, p< .01), “accuracy” (r=.361, p< .01), “convincement” (r=.621, p< .01), and “believability” (r=.669, p< .01) from Table 8 (Appendix H) on the first level of caring messages, which represented a level of engrossment from Caring Theory. The analysis also showed a significant correlation between variables of “I am supporting of research for treatment of breast cancer disease” and believability (r=.369, p< .01) at the second level of caring messages. Simultaneously, the first level of caring in messages demonstrated very low or absence of any correlations at the first level. The variables of accuracy and believability demonstrated even a negative value. At the same time, we could observe in Table 8 (Appendix H), that the increased level of caring in messages demonstrated increasing correlations in more items of the “perception of caring.”

Limitations and future research

Assuming that this study and its results, will be reviewed by the experts with a high involvement and expertise in scholarly research, there is no doubt that it may evoke some skepticism and questions about the validity of communicating about CSR efforts using Caring Theory. Somebody may doubt any evidence of existing of caring in messages, articulating the success of only one particular message, which is reciprocity. Therefore, further research will aim to identify more elements representing each stage of caring and test more messages representing different levels of caring. The future study also will be focused on enhancing its validity for the manipulation check of stimulus materials increasing understanding of levels of caring in messages up to 85%. In other words, the research will be focused on the content and particular wording that can represent each stage of caring.

Besides, further research needs to be focused on the content of the fourth message, represented a fourth level of caring. Noddings, the originator of Caring
Theory, described three main stages of caring, emphasizing the on-going nature of this process. Therefore, the on-going process of caring should be analyzed separately. Perhaps, the message representing a “reciprocate” stage of caring in the study included this on-going process, defining company’s accomplishments that could not be achieved by implementing only one CSR campaign. Therefore, an “on-going process,” which tends to enhance the credibility of the communicator, should be defined as a necessary condition for existing of the Caring Model for CSR communication. To overcome a possible skepticism of high involvement in the issue audience, the communicator needs to communicate about its efforts in dealing with social issues continuously describing how the company creates a caring environment and why the audience should believe in the effort of this particular company.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study revealed that perception of caring can significantly enhance the efficiency of CSR messages. Incorporating even a few elements of caring exposed a significant impact on the effectiveness of communication. Although people may perceive caring differently, the elements of caring can help enhance the believability of CSR messages. The results showed that Caring Theory (Noddings, 1984) can be used as a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of CSR communication. A high level of perception of caring significantly mediates attitudes toward the message, toward the brand, and, as a result, purchase intention. Considering that the measurement for perception of caring incorporated informativeness, trustworthiness, accuracy, convincingness, and believability, the study has supported previous scholarly research about CSR communication, which has noted that the employment of third-party endorsements, information based on facts, consistency, and transparency of messages are crucial for the effective CSR communication (Kim & Ferguson, 2014). Additionally, this study quantitatively verifies that a company which is perceived as sincerer is more effective in engaging the audience into CSR campaigns, supporting the recommendation from other researchers to focus on the content of CSR communication in order to build trust and loyalty in consumers’ minds (Kim & Lee, 2012).

It is also important to mention that communicating from a different level of caring influences differently on the audience with different levels of involvement in issues. Even though the audience with a high level of involvement may be characterized as the most challenging for communicating, it will respond positively to caring messages. The study revealed that this type of the audience exposed the highest level of attention toward the informativeness of the message. This attitude might be explained by Caring Theory which described that caring makes its members vulnerable (Noddings, 1984), thus, the request to the informative part of the messages may represent a form of self-defense.

Additionally, caring audience similar to members of the caring process may go through different stages of caring (Noddings, 1984). Once the audience at the stage of engrossment, they will need additional information about the issue. Thus, the company which is motivated to implement its CSR programs attracting highly involved in the issue people, such as donors or volunteers, will need to communicate from the third level of the Caring Model for CSR Communication, fulfilling the informational need of the audience.

Therefore, it can be concluded that companies should communicate about their caring attitude toward the issues (Noddings, 2012), but in order to make this communication efficient, messages should provide their audience with information incorporating elements of caring: engrossment, displacement, and reciprocity. This is one of the most important conditions for creating an environment where caring can prosper (Engster, 2015). Besides, sincerely caring
companies should consider the level of involvement in the issue of their audience. In other words, if a company communicates about its CSR it should know precisely who its audience is, what the goal and objectives of its communication. Using the “reciprocate” stage, communicating about company’s accomplishments and beneficiaries, maybe the most efficient for the high-involved audience, such as donors or third-party experts. Simultaneously, an ongoing process of this communication will help to enhance its efficiency overcoming a possible skeptical attitude toward socially responsible messages in the audience.
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APPENDICES
## Appendix A

### Table 1: Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Caring</th>
<th>Dependent measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Caring 1</td>
<td>Brand Interest</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Caring</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Caring 2</td>
<td>Brand Interest</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Caring</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Caring 3</td>
<td>Brand Interest</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Caring</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Caring 4</td>
<td>Brand Interest</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Caring</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

Table 2: Correlations between variables of “perception of caring” and the “attitude toward the message”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude toward the message</th>
<th>Perception of caring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward the</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.686**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>message</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of caring</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.686**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix C

Table 3: Correlations between variables of the “attitude toward the message” and the “attitude toward the brand”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward the message</th>
<th>Attitude toward the brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>.689</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td><strong>.689</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).


Appendix D

Table 4: Correlations between variables of the “attitude toward the message” and “brand interest”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude toward the message</th>
<th>Brand interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the message</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.553**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand interest</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix E

Table 5: Correlations between variables of the “attitude toward the brand” and “purchase intention”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude toward the brand</th>
<th>Purchase intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
## Appendix F

Table 6: Correlations between variables of “perception of caring” and “breast cancer is a great concern to me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informativeness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Convinement</th>
<th>Believability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 1</td>
<td>.333*</td>
<td>.390*</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>.374*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 2</td>
<td>.352*</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.348*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 3</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.578**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 4</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.308*</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Appendix G

Table 7: Correlations between variables of “perception of caring” and “breast cancer is an important issue to me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informativeness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Convinceent</th>
<th>Believability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring message level 1</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message level 2</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.343*</td>
<td>.425**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message level 3</td>
<td>.362*</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>.590**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message level 4</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.386*</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
## Appendix H

Table 8: Correlations between variables of “perception of caring” and “I am supporting research for treatment of breast cancer disease”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informativeness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Convincement</th>
<th>Believability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 1</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 2</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 3</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.467*</td>
<td>.361*</td>
<td>.621**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 4</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix I

Survey questionnaire

1. My age is

2. My gender is:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female
   ____ Other

3. Breast cancer disease is an important issue to me
   Strongly Disagree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Agree

4. The debate over the breast cancer disease is relevant to me
   Strongly Disagree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Agree

5. Breast cancer disease is a great concern to me
   Strongly Disagree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Agree

6. I am supportive of breast cancer research treatment
   Strongly Disagree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Agree

7. Airplane travel is
   Unimportant to me
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Important to me

8. Airplane travel is
   Uninteresting to me
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Interesting to me

9. I think about airplane traveling…
   Never
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Very often

“Gamma” airlines was created by a woman and chooses women’s health as its priority. Thus, the company battles breast cancer. Gamma’s employees invite you to support vital research and awareness programs aimed at putting an end to breast cancer. Buy a ticket to any direction from “Gamma airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.
10. In this message “Gamma Airlines” claims why it cares about breast cancer research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. In this message “Gamma Airlines” claims what the company is doing to support breast cancer research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. In this message “Gamma Airlines” claims what the company has already done to support breast cancer research and who benefitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. In this message “Gamma Airlines” claims about long-term commitment to support breast cancer research and who benefitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. The information in this message is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not informative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconvincing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not believable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. The message from Gamma airlines is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not attention-getting</th>
<th>Attention-getting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likable</th>
<th>Likable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not fun</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Based on what I read in this message I would describe Gamma Airlines’ service as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Quality</th>
<th>High Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unlikable</th>
<th>Likable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not desirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. I'd like to learn more about “Gamma Airline” after reading this message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. After reading this message I would like to purchase the ticket from Gamma Airlines

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

19. After reading this message I will probably purchase a ticket from Gamma Airlines

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

20. After reading this message I will possibly purchase a ticket from Gamma Airlines

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

21. After reading this message I will consider purchasing a ticket from Gamma Airlines

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
Appendix J

Manipulation check

1) Why the company cares about breast cancer research
2) What the company is doing to support breast cancer research
3) What the company has already done to support breast cancer research and who benefited
4) What company’s long-term commitment to support breast cancer research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comments or thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every two minutes a woman in the US is diagnosed with breast cancer. More than 3 million US women are breast cancer survivors. Since 70% of “Gamma Airline's” employees are women, the company has chosen breast cancer research as its mission. Gamma's employees invite you to support vital research to put an end to breast cancer. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today “Gamma Airlines” celebrates its 10th anniversary of the “Breast Cancer Fight” and cooperation with the Breast Cancer Research Fund. “Gamma Airlines” is announcing its plan for supporting the Breast Cancer Research Fund for 15 of years to achieve prevention and a cure for breast cancer. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 “Gamma Airlines” funded grants have been spent on technology and tools that have enhanced early detection of cancer, supported research projects at the University of Texas that helped prevent cancer relapses, and promoted 25 programs that enhance the lives of Minnesota’s cancer community by providing aid and assistance. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Gamma Airlines” donates 10% of any purchased “Gamma's” pink ribbon-themed item to research and awareness programs. Today “Gamma airlines” fully funds seven research projects. The company’s support spans from London, Australia/New Zealand, Paris, New York, Seattle, Michigan, California, and Indiana. Buy a ticket to any destination from “Gamma Airlines” and help carry breast cancer research closer to a cure.
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