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Using an experimental design, the present study examines the impact of media richness, media engagement, and cause involvement along with their interactions on the attitudes and behavioral intent to purchase or buzz products that support a social cause in a CRM campaign. The results showed that media engagement has a positive impact on consumers’ attitudes and behavioral intentions and that media richness and cause involvement have a partial positive impact on consumers. Specifically, highly engaged consumers in social media exhibited more positive attitudes and greater intention to purchase and word-of-mouth than less engaged consumers. Moreover, consumers exposed to rich media showed stronger purchase and buzz intention than those exposed to lean media. However, this study did not find a strong impact of cause involvement and its interaction with media-bound factors.

This study provides various theoretical and practical implications to researchers and practitioners in the advertising and media industries. First, the current research extends the realm of media richness theory from the traditional media into the new media context, especially in the CRM context. Moreover, of particular interest is that results of this study offer theoretical contributions that shed light on the missing link between attitudes and behavioral intentions in
which strong purchase and WOM intentions were found even when there were no significant positive attitudes when the message was delivered in rich media. In the same vein, even though consumers had more positive attitudes, they were not willing to buy or buzz the brand.

This study suggests that media-bound factors should be considered for holistic media planning. From a management perspective, refined media planning based on the media-bound factors is needed such that targeting consumers who are more engaged in media may be required to provide information via rich media to deliver CRM messages. Furthermore, this study sheds light on and reveals the differences between media vehicles, supporting that media planners must give attention not only to medium-wide outcomes, but also to vehicle-specific variables.
Consumers have evolved from being mere purchasers of commodities to being socially responsible citizens who expect more from their purchases. The Cone Cause Evolution Study (2010) found that 83 percent of Americans want more of the products, services and retailers they use to support causes. Based on the noticeable growth in a highly principled group of “aware” and “ethical” consumers, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has gained enormous attention from both industry and the academic world.

Ethical consumers play a pivotal role as a main driving force behind the popularity of CSR (Harrison, 2003) since consumers express their sense of responsibility and their appreciation of socially conscious corporations through ethical consumption behavior derived from their growing cause-involvement. As Varadarajan and Menon (1988) stated in “Do Better by Doing Good,” the rise of ethical consumerism empowers CSR to be a marketing strategy, such as cause-related marketing (CRM). CRM appears to be on the rise given that in part because, as a practice, it offers greater efficiency in differentiating products associated with cause-related agendas from ordinarily traded products (Wright & Heaton, 2006).

Cause-Involvement in CRM

Since Bowen wrote “Social Responsibility of the Businessman” in 1953, years of research has accumulated that contain a proliferation of academic theories and practical approaches with regard to CSR. Among them, Kotler and Lee (2004) distinguished CSR from corporate social initiatives and organized them into six categories; cause promotions, cause-related marketing (CRM), corporate social marketing, corporate philanthropy, community volunteering, and socially responsible business practices. According to the authors, CSR is “a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and
contributions of corporate resources” (p. 3). This definition implies a broader range of tactics available to carry out the goal relative to CRM. Corporate social initiatives are “major activities undertaken by a corporation to support social causes and to fulfill commitments to CSR” (p. 3), which suggests that the initiatives are more representative of tangible, if not tactically-driven, actions. CRM as a form of corporate social initiatives is a very specific CSR output that occurs when “a corporation commits to making a contribution or donating a percentage of revenues to a specific cause based on product sales” (p. 23).

On one hand, corporations are expected to behave in a socially conscious way to meet the higher expectation of principled consumers (Auger, Devinney & Louviere, 2006). On the other hand, marketing practitioners make use of corporate social initiatives such as CRM as strategies to increase the company’s profits, thereby taking advantage of consumers’ growing cause-involvement. Moreover, corporations’ CRM campaign activities can vary in range and scope. For example, one corporation’s CRM campaign may evaluate its effectiveness based on specific dollar amount in donations for each product sold. Another corporation may measure effectiveness according to a percentage of net profits donated, and a third corporation may account for effectiveness in terms of the number partnerships it acquires with various organizations that support a specific cause. Given that involvement is defined as the motivation for message recipients to process information (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979), cause-involvement refers to the extent of personal relevance to a specific cause (Zaichkowsky, 1986).

Even though a plethora of research that deals with CRM in the research context has been initiated, there has been little attention paid to incorporating past literature into a cause-involvement context, especially from a media perspective. As the level of cause involvement increases, customers tend to find CSR messages more important to form a reasoned opinion
about the cause (Broderick, Jogi, & Garry, 2003; Celsi & Olson, 1988), not only because of their interest in the cause itself, but also because of the framing cues used to present the cause. The framing cues include the corporation as sponsor to the cause-related, message cues applied to promoting the cause communication, or the media platform utilized to deliver the cause-related communication to a specific consumer/audience. It is reasonable to believe that consumers that are involved with a cause will be more motivated to devote cognitive processing to persuasive communication attempts. In this regard, it follows that consumers who are highly involved in a particular cause also may have different media usage behaviors relative to those who are less involved with the cause. Yet, there has been a lack of academic effort to tease out the effects of media in the CRM context related to cause-involvement. The goal of this research is to close this apparent gap and to bring greater understanding to the relationship between CRM outcomes, cause involvement, and media delivery and usage.

Media planning should be perceived as a complete tutorial on how to use marketing information in order to best reach a socially responsible audience who are highly involved in a cause with the appropriate advertising message. Considering that CRM requires a different approach from traditional advertising because of the audience’s cause-involvement, media strategy for CRM also should be different from traditional media strategy. All in all, a critical question about strategic media planning for CRM communication has yet to be answered fully with objective evidence. The intent of this research is to shed new light on how the media influences those audiences who are highly involved in social causes as shown in CRM campaigns. This is done through close examination of important media-related concepts.

**Media-Bound Factors**

In 1964, McLuhan challenged conventional notions, stating that “The medium is the message.” With this claim, he stressed how each medium differs from the other, not only in
terms of what it conveys (content), but also in how it awakens and alters thoughts and senses with its own characteristics (channel). Given that consumers react to various components of advertising’s message, delivery, and creative execution, media also works synergistically with these elements to influence an audience’s response.

Basically, media have been defined in the advertising context as means of conveying a specific kind of information—an advertising message—about a product, service to consumers, or a brand (Katz, 2010). Media help fulfill two basic needs—to inform and to entertain audiences. Media users seek information from newspapers and TV news stories, and from Web sites. In addition, they watch TV shows and view magazines for their entertainment function. Yet, media’s ability to its users has been narrowly defined in terms of its most utilitarian function, the delivery of messages to audiences. This notion reinforces the main roles of media—communicating and conveying information about products and services to potential consumers—but perhaps overlooks other important functions it has come to play with the advent of new media formats.

Media have been classified in various ways, such as differences of outlet (print versus electronic), controllability by users such that how much consumer control there is in the medium’s use (lean-back versus lean-forward) (Katz, 2010), and the business billing practices of advertising agencies (above-the-line versus below-the-line) (Hackley, 2010). However, the recent advent of advanced technological media platforms such as tablets, social media, and mobile applications increases the diversification in media environments and makes classifications indistinct. The advent of new formats, media convergence, and diversification of consumer target markets force advertisers to reconsider and reconfigure campaign metrics in order to better understand why advertising works, not just whether it does. How consumers
decide which brands and products to buy, as well as the process they go through when purchasing an item, is of critical importance.

In this context, accountability for traditional media planning has focused on measuring brand awareness and advertising recall using surveys or holding focus group interviews with consumers (Katz, 2010). Media placement decisions are predominantly based on the quantitative impact of the medium context of the advertisement. Hence, the main objective of conventional media planning has been to reach as many people as possible within the target market in a cost-efficient way, given that audiences are perceived as receivers of the ad message that the medium has delivered.

However, it is generally agreed that the intrinsic message impact is only part of the story within an ever-changing and complex media landscape (Pavlik & McIntosh, 2011). Considering that ads do not directly influence audiences in a vacuum, the effects of advertising also cannot just be a function of the ad itself. Media vehicles not only allow an audience of a certain composition and size to have the opportunity to see the advertisement, but they may also influence how the advertisement will affect the audience (Katz, 2010). Yet, an exploration of prior research suggests that insufficient effort has been made to consider a media planning paradigm that diverges from a conventional impression-based model in favor of a new engagement-based model (Abdul-Ghani, Hyde, & Marshall, 2011).

**Purpose of the Study**

This study focuses on a specific subset of media-related factors and explores how those factors have an impact on the attitudes and behavioral intent in the context of cause-related marketing ads. Among a range of media-related factors, media richness and media engagement are taken into account due to their novelty in scholarly and practical value in academia and industry. For the purpose of this study, media richness refers to the ability of a medium to carry
information (Trevino, Lengel, & Daft, 1987) to reduce message ambiguity. And, media engagement addresses the link between a user's usage of the media vehicles and their attention/receptivity to the media (Kilger & Romer, 2007). In order to elaborate the role of cause-involvement in CRM communications, the context for exploration is CRM advertisements. Media richness is suggested as a way to understand the differences among media vehicles regarding their ability to deliver information reducing message ambiguity. Richer media facilitate feedback and provide multiple cues to decrease message ambiguity. Therefore the research proposes that richer media will have more impact on the attitudes and behavioral intention of CRM audiences than leaner media. For example, face-to-face communication with its superior ability to promote feedback and deliver multiple cues is considered richer than texts.

Media engagement is explored in social media contexts. One of the dimensions in social media engagement was investigated to see the association with audience outcomes. Moreover, whether media engagement has any interaction with media richness and cause involvement has been investigated. Finally, this study examined the moderating role, if there is one, of cause-involvement in the change in attitudes and behavioral intent of audiences in CRM communication. Depending on the level of cause-involvement, how media richness and engagement have moderated has been investigated.

**Overview of the Study**

In order to establish a common foundation for understanding the goals for research, Chapter 2 attempts to provide a comprehensive review of the existing literature related to media to provide a better understanding of challenges CRM communicators face in negotiating the ongoing debate about media-related factors such as media richness and engagement. Also, an expanded review of the current popularity of CSR is provided to elucidate the concept as distinguished from CRM. In addition, the concept of cause-involvement is discussed due to its
importance in CRM communications and its expected moderating role in this study. Then, the
suggested research questions and hypotheses follow. Chapter 3 describes the suggested research
design, experimental procedure, participant recruitment, stimulus development, measurement of
the variables, and pretest. Chapter 4 presents results of the study, including reliability checks,
manipulation checks for independent variables, and hypotheses testing. Chapter 5 provides a
discussion of the research conclusions, in addition to theoretical and practical implications,
limitations, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Media

In general, media in a broad sense refers to the main means of mass communication, especially television, radio, newspapers, and the Internet, that reach or influence people widely. Basically, media help fulfill two basic needs—to inform and to entertain the audience. We look for information by reading newspapers and watching news stories, or clicking to a Web site. In addition, we watch television situation comedies and read magazines for their entertainment function. Narrowing down the definition to the advertising context, media have been defined as a means of conveying a specific kind of information, in particular an advertising message, about a product or service to consumers (Katz, 2010). That is, the main role of media in advertising is communicating and conveying information about products and services to potential consumers.

Traditionally, advertising media have been classified by the differences among the physical outlets—print versus electronic (Katz, 2010). While print media include magazines, newspapers, outdoor billboards, direct mail, and yellow pages, electronic media involve television, radio, and the Internet. Another way to classify media types is how much consumer control there is in the medium’s use, or the so called lean-forward (active) versus lean-back (passive) media. The media are considered lean-forward media when consumers can choose what they read, such as information in magazines, newspapers, direct mail, yellow pages, television (via DVRs, Video on Demand), and the Internet, which are under their readers’ control. In contrast, regular TV, radio, and outdoor billboards are regarded as lean-back media, or as being consumed in a passive manner. The media decide what contents to air, and when.

From an industrial perspective, another way to categorize media is above-the-line (ATL)/traditional versus below-the-line (BTL)/beyond traditional media (Hackley, 2010; Katz, 2010).
These category names of ATL and BTL originated from the business billing practices of advertising agencies. ATL media essentially include traditional mass media such as television, radio, newspaper, and magazines, while BTL media involve all the other media types beyond traditional, including point-of-purchase (retail or in-store), sponsorships, word of mouth, Yellow Pages, mobile and social networks. Traditionally, agencies make a certain percentage of commission on placement of advertisements in mass media such as television, radio, newspapers, and magazines. On their invoice to clients, the fee appears “above the line.” In contrast, for other forms of promotion, agencies charge their clients a fixed or actual amount of fee which appears “below the line” on the bill.

Nevertheless, in today’s ever-changing media world, these distinctions are fast becoming obsolete. When the same TV show is offered online, for example, when “Grey’s Anatomy” is on “Hulu.com,” it is difficult to classify the medium types as either television or the Internet. Furthermore, current video-on-demand services ask viewers to opt into free viewing with ads before the video. In this case, the ad exposure is difficult to classify as being either in a lean-forward or lean-back media format since the viewer voluntarily chooses to be exposed to, or has control over, their exposure to the advertisement.

In addition, it is important to think about the expansion of media in the advertising context. Twenty-five years ago, there were no commercial messages at supermarkets, schools, doctors’ offices, or on ski slopes. However, today advertisers can reach people in all of these places. The advent of advanced technology media platforms such as tablets, social media, and mobile applications contribute to the increasing diversification in media environments. Considering that consumers are being offered more and more media choices, greater efforts are needed to surround the target audience with holistic media campaigns that present them with the
same message about the brand in engaging, memorable, and creative ways. Therefore, due to the diversification of forms and types of media, it is important for holistic media planning to understand media not just by classification of medium types, but also from each medium’s nature and strength.

**Theoretical Foundations of Media-bound Factors**

To better understand media, it is important to figure out how they work in our communication. In this research, Lasswell’s model has been proposed to understand media’s position and role in the big picture.

**Lasswell’s Communication Model**

Lasswell (1948) proposed a simple, linear model of communication, and the model has been accepted as a classic conceptualization of communication. The model consists of five elements, including a communicator or sender (who), message (says what), medium or channel (in which channel), audience or receivers (to whom), and effect (with what effect), usually summarized as SMCRE. While Lasswell’s model (1948) has been criticized for simplifying mass communication processes to a large extent (Greenberg & Salwen, 2008), it has drawn sufficient attention to the key elements in communication. In this study, the key elements of Lasswell’s model serve as a good starting point for the research.

To outline and define related constructs in CRM communications, this study borrows two influential factors from Lasswell’s model, audience-related and channel-bound factors. The study then focuses on these factors with three main variables for outlining and defining related constructs. Specifically, audience-related factors are linked with the receiver’s element (to whom), and media-bound factors are connected to a channel element (in which channel). In that message senders (who) in CRM communications are mostly designated as specific companies, a communicator-related factor will not be explored in this study context.
inherent factors have been studied in various other perspectives such as message framing (i.e., Chang, 2008; Grau & Folse, 2007) and are not of interest in this study. Since the communication effect is more about the results of CRM communication, an effect-related dimension (with what effect) will be investigated with a cause-and-effect explanation, so to speak, as a dependent variable.

To look closely into the media-bound factors, a better understanding of the differences between the philosophies of Aristotle and Galileo is beneficial. When a stone falls to the ground, Aristotle explains that the reason is that the stone contains “gravity.” That is, the stone itself has as part of its own nature the concept of falling down. However, Galileo accounts for the reason with the concept of a “relationship” between the stone and its surrounding field. According to Galileo, what matters is not the stone but the context (Gladwell, 2008). These dichotomous approaches are found in media theories conceptualizing the characteristics of media, whether these characteristics are objective or subjective. For the impact of media, on one hand, Aristotle might state that the media have an impact based on their own intrinsic attributes, which suggest that media and their inherent features are objectively defined and independent from users’ perceptions. On the other hand, Galileo might suggest that the relationship or interaction between the media and their audience is more important than the medium itself. Media and their characteristics are socially constructed, and personally- and socially-informed perceptions of media are the ultimate drivers of use.

**Summarizing the Previous Approaches to Media**

The objective approach of a medium has been supported by media richness theory (i.e., Daft & Lengel, 1984) along with social presence theory (i.e., Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976) and media synchronicity theory (i.e., Dennis, Speier, & Morris, 1998). These theories identified media characteristics as primary factors that determined the user’s communication experience.
For example, social presence theorists argued that media vary in the degree to which they allow communicators to feel co-present and that these variations determine how media users interact. Essentially, these lines of theory suggest that the primary determinant of a user’s perceptions of a medium lie outside of the user and are objectively identified by the communicative capabilities of the medium itself.

In contrast, channel expansion theory (i.e., Carlson & Zmud, 1999) and social influence theory (i.e., Fulk, Schmitz, & Steinfield, 1990) moved away from the objective conceptualization of media. For instance, social influence perspectives suggest that user evaluations of a medium and task are informed by personal attitudes about media, observations of colleagues’ media use and attitudes, direct statements from others, and other forms of social information. Based on the understanding of these distinctions, the constructs of media richness and media engagement are discussed in the following sections.

**Media Richness**

**Media Richness Theory**

Media richness refers to the degree to which a medium can carry information to reduce message ambiguity and to facilitate feedback (Trevino et al., 1987). Media richness researchers propose that communication media have varied abilities to resolve ambiguity, to negotiate diverse interpretations, and to facilitate understanding. Media richness was first introduced by Daft and Lengel in 1984. The theory was originated primarily to describe and evaluate strategic communication mediums within an organization. Media richness theorists focus on the objective dimensions of a medium’s richness. Moreover, they assert that the degree to which a medium’s richness matches the equivocality of a message has important implications for managerial performance and communication effectiveness (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Daft, Lengel, & Trevino, 1987).
Briefly, each medium differs in richness, and media choice is dependent on the right match between media richness and task equivocality. Thus, an effective manager would make a rational choice that will match a particular communication medium to a specific task and to the degree of richness required by that task. Trevino, Daft and Lengel (1990) presented a media richness hierarchy of the time based on four criteria: 1) the availability of instant feedback, 2) the capacity of the medium to transmit multiple cues such as body language, voice tone, and inflection, 3) the use of natural language, and 4) the personal focus of the medium. According to the four criteria, face-to-face communication is considered the richest communication, followed by telephone, email, letter, note, memo, special report, flier, and bulletin. Rich media are considered more efficient for highly ambiguous communication than lean media. However, this does not mean that richer media are desirable all the time, since leaner media work better for non-equivocal tasks (Daft, Lengel, & Trevino, 1987).

As an alternative point of view, channel expansion theory (Carlson & Zmud, 1999) emphasizes a subjective and perception-based orientation toward media usage. Channel expansion theory combines media richness theory with the social influence model, arguing that media richness consisted in part of socially-constructed characteristics that may be perceived differently by different users (Lee, 1994). The basic proposition of the channel expansion framework is that organizational members’ knowledge-building experiences determine perceptions of the richness of a medium. Thus, the knowledge that users gain about the medium is related to individuals’ varying richness perceptions (Carlson & Zmud, 1999). Consequently, richness differs by individual, not by medium types.

Nevertheless, a strong correspondence between the individuals’ richness perceptions about a medium and the richness of the medium itself has been supported. For example,
Timmerman and Madhavapeddi (2008) found that users perceive different media as having different levels of potential richness mainly based upon the objective characteristics of media, not strictly from their perceptions. Moreover, since this study mainly focuses on media richness from a media-bound perspective, media richness is considered objective, and the physical characteristic of a medium influences how individuals build their attitudes and decide their purchases.

**Rich Media versus Hot Media**

Media richness is more likely to be considered an objective norm which is related to the physical characteristic of a medium, while media hotness includes both an objective and a subjective norm which involves the concept of definition and participation. In 1964, McLuhan stressed the importance of medium itself beyond its contents, claiming that “the media is the message.” In this regard, medium theory, also known as channel theory, emphasized that the channels are the main force that influence society and culture. In the beginning part of the book *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, McLuhan (1964) contrasted cool media with hot media in terms of definition and participation. According to McLuhan, “any hot medium allows less participation than a cool one, as a lecture makes for less participation than a seminar, and a book for less than a dialogue” (p. 25). For definition, hot media usually emphasize one sense, such as sight or sound, over other senses in high definition. Thus, a person does not have to exert much effort to understand what is being said in hot media. This type of media is called low participation; radio, film, the lecture, and photography would be included in the hot media category. In contrast, cool media require more attentive participation with active perception and comprehension. Consequently, these types of media require a great deal of interaction and provide low definition. Cool media include telephone, television, the seminar and cartoons (McLuhan, 1964).
The distinctions between hot/cool and rich/lean media have both similarities and dissimilarities. These concepts seemingly force media to belong to one of the binary categories, but both distinctions exist on a continuum from rich to lean and also from hot to cool. In addition, both the channel theory as outlined by McLuhan (1964) and the media richness theory as explained by Daft and Lengel (1986) were developed before widespread use of new and non-traditional media (Huang, Yang, Baek, & Lee, 2015). The differences lie in the dimensions of each distinction. Whereas rich and lean media are distinguished simply by one dimension, which contributes to their capacity to deliver multiple/simple cues, hot and cool media are characterized according to two dimensions, their definition and participation. To better understand the objective attribute of a medium, this study concentrates the research interest on media richness, but expands the research range into new media context.

Medium-Wide versus Vehicle-Specific

To refine the research context, another challenging question should be answered: are the objective characteristics of a specific medium applied across all medium vehicles similarly or differently? This study investigates only social media as a research context, so the question becomes, “Are the objective characteristics of social media applied the same or differently across specific categories of social media?” regardless of the fact that a breadth of vehicles are classified under the banner of social media, each social media vehicle has varied features, so there might be variations in richness within the social media category. For example, while microblogs only allow people to use a limited amount of text, social networking enables people to utilize not only text but also images, video, and hyperlinks, resulting in stronger media richness (Ledford, 2012). Moreover, each vehicle of social media – Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, for example – is considered to have different levels of media richness because of its diverse technical attributes. It is reasonable to assume that the technical restrictions of a vehicle
may influence users to limit the richness of the medium. Thus, in the social media context, richness should be taken into consideration from a vehicle-specific, not medium-wide standpoint. This study investigates social media from a vehicle-based perspective to focus on the levels of richness of each vehicle as the key factor, regardless of the media outlet types, people might use for the vehicle.

Ledford (2012) compared media richness among five new social channels, such as online photo/video sharing, online social networking, microblogs, weblogs, and mobile apps. Online photo/video sharing vehicles include Instagram and YouTube sites. In contrast, Facebook and Google+ represent online social networking sites. Microblogging is “a form of web logging (i.e., weblogs) that limits users to brief text updates or micromedia to be viewed by the public or a restricted group” (p. 181). Twitter (www.twitter.com) is considered the most popular platform of microblogs in which the messages, or “tweets,” are limited to 140 characters.

Ledford (2012) presented the richness level of each channel depending on the four richness determinants, including ability to send feedback, multiple cues, language variety, and personal focus (see Table 2-1). According to his typology, microblogging is regarded as a lean medium given the quantified character limit of tweets and the use of abbreviations to fit within those limits (Gilpin, 2010). Online photo/video sharing sites are considered rich in cues with visual elements and language variety with natural language. The comparison suggests that microblogs and online photo/video sharing sites demonstrated the most discrete richness differences since social networking site support three determinants for media richness (see Figure 2-1). They also have a comparable number of users among American online adults—Instagram 26% and Twitter 23% respectively in 2014 (PEW research center). Accordingly, Twitter as a basic form of microblog, which does not involve any visual or html link elements
and Instagram in online photo/video sharing, have been examined in an editorial context for this study. Based on the discussion above, the following hypotheses are proposed in relation to the impact of media richness.

**H1.** Rich media will more positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than lean media.

**Overview of Media Planning**

In addition to the understanding of media richness, which focuses on the objective attributes of the medium itself, the relationship between medium and viewers and the way in which they interact is also of critical importance. This is largely because, in reality, advertising tends to be delivered through varied media based on holistic media planning. Thus, the medium-audience relationship, known as media engagement, also needs to be investigated to figure out the role of each medium in the whole media planning process. Generally, media planning considers the marketing information available about the product and then uses that information to determine how best to reach the target audience with the brand message through available media (Katz, 2010).

In the advertising industry, the media-audience relationship in media planning is less well studied and accounts for less in media placement decisions than numerical analyses, such as impressions. That is, in traditional media planning, advertising is evaluated by the number of individual viewers who are exposed to the ad message. The early age of advertising planning also relied heavily on one-way media due to the limited media platform options. Thus, the traditional perspective of media planning was that only advertising content influenced the audience and media’s only role was to mechanically deliver ad messages. This perspective assumed that the media served to influence the audience in one very discrete way and did not interact with the audience in any other way.
In this context, media planning focused on measuring brand awareness and advertising recall using consumer surveys or focus groups to ensure that advertising had a significant impact on the audience. Media planners spent their media budgets trying to be as efficient and selective as possible in choosing where to place their messages. Media placement decisions were predominantly based on the quantitative impact of the medium’s context. Traditional media planning prioritized the quantitative analysis regarding competitive issues and geographic skews based on numeric evaluations. Share of voice/market and brand/category development index (BDI and CDI) are common metrics applied to media placement decisions. The main objective of conventional media planning has been to reach as many people as possible in a cost-efficient way to perceive audiences merely as receivers of the ad messages delivered by the medium (Hackley, 2010).

However, it is generally agreed that this intrinsic message impact is only part of the story. It is noteworthy that the effects of advertising are not just a function of the ad itself, since ads do not directly influence audiences in a vacuum. The current advent of advanced technological media platforms, such as tablets and mobile applications, contributes to the increasing diversification in media environments. With an ever-changing and more complex media landscape, there has been an increased desire to look beyond the simple message-oriented approach. Considering the broad media choices, greater efforts are needed to surround the target audience with holistic media campaigns in engaging and memorable, creative ways.

The emphasis on impression-based reach and frequency has become more problematic due to the diversified new and advanced media options that fragment the mass audience and intensifies the competition to attract viewer attention. In response, media planning has started to embrace the notion of “engaged audiences” to reveal the bidirectional relationship that an
audience experiences when interacting with the media. That is, with the profound changes in media platforms and the emerging empowerment of consumers, the concept of “engagement” has emerged as a demand creation paradigm that seeks to engage consumers in the media experiences more than past paradigms that were focused mainly on impressions.

Medium vehicles not only allow an audience of a certain composition and size to have the opportunity to see the advertisement, but also may influence how the advertisement will affect the audience. As Norris and Colman (1992) stated, “The same source delivering the same message to the same audience on separate occasions might produce different effects depending on the differing programming or editorial contexts in which the message appears” (p. 38). To illustrate, a print ad may have a different effect when presented in Time magazine as compared to Sports Illustrated magazine due to distinct editorial environments of each respective publication. The advent of social media such as Facebook, as well as BTL media such as promotional events, opened a new era of interactive media that enables the audience to watch the ads and to respond to them with a simple mouse click. Yet, prior research in the advertising industry has not paid sufficient attention to this phenomenon, and academic research has yet to catch up with the idea of a new media planning paradigm that favors an engagement-based model (Abdul-Ghani, Hyde, & Marshall, 2011).

**Media Engagement**

**Struggling to Define “Engagement”**

Since engagement was first explored by Kahn (1990), there have been differing conceptualizations of the term. Early in this century, research interest in engagement regenerated, and a variety of conceptualizations of engagement came up. The term “engagement” has been used in diverse disciplines such as sociology, political science, psychology, and
organizational behavior (Brodie et al., 2011) and each area has utilized engagement in a unique perspective.

Despite the growing popularity of the term, previous research has not yet led to an unequivocal understanding regarding “media engagement.” Moreover, there is considerable variation in the meaning applied to the term engagement, primarily in the fields of advertising (i.e., Ephron, 2006). There has been no agreement about whether the concept of engagement should be evaluated as a construct (i.e., Calder & Malthouse, 2008) or a metric (i.e., McGarrigle & News, n.d.). That is, while academic researchers in the advertising discipline look at engagement as a qualitative construct, practitioners in advertising and marketing industries focus more on the quantitative measures of engagement for the sake of media planning.

Hollebeek (2011) presented an overview on engagement conceptualization. She revealed three main observations in common among various disciplines, as summarized in Table 2-2. First, the definitions indicate positively-valenced expressions across disciplines. Second, whether it is explicit or implicit, engagement involves a highly interactive nature. Finally, the overview shows a multidimensional perspective of engagement. Based on the conceptual exploration on engagement in various disciplines, this research examines engagement which is similar to and different from other concepts, such as involvement, in order to enhance academic understanding.

**Industrial Approaches: Measuring Engagement**

In an engagement-focused Media Magazine's Outfront Conference, the panels agreed that “engagement is real and meaningful, but its usefulness is limited by the lack of a single measurement currency” (MediaDaily, 2006). By the same token, engagement has been broadly studied, mainly for the purpose of measurement. The Advertising Research Foundation (ARF) has been the most enthusiastic organization for engagement research. Many other companies, such as the Magazine Publishers of America (MPA), also joined the journey to engagement. In
2006, MPA released a report entitled Engagement: Understanding Consumers’ Relationships with Media, which compiled then-recent findings on engagement from 35 third-party research studies. Even though the MPA did not provide an explicit definition for engagement, the title assumed that engagement is “a consumers’ relationship with media content.” This definition presents a serious problem in that the relationships are complex and multidimensional. While neither organization offered a precise definition, they succeeded in bringing the engagement debates to the table to boost discussion on the topic in industries.

Instead of conceptualizing the term engagement, the advertising industry was more likely to focus on presenting a wide range of metrics to measure engagement. As Table 2-3 summarizes, there have been various alternative proposals for measuring engagement. For example, MRI+, a leading database by GfK Mediamark Research & Intelligence that reports statistical data on magazine usage within product user categories, outlined a multi-faceted approach for measuring engagement in the magazine context (Amico, 2006). This approach took into account three components of engagement: an ad’s receptivity, the product, and the media component. For the ad receptivity component, willingness to buy, attention level, and influence of the ad were measured. For the product component, demographic variables of the consumers associated with using the product or product category were measured. Last, an index of how thoroughly the publication was read was presented to measure the engagement of the media component. Even though each component was conceptually investigated for engagement, the multi-faceted model inherently faces restriction of application, especially in areas other than the magazine medium.

Along with the effort from the magazine industry, the ARF distributed a white paper entitled “Measures of Engagement” that summarized and organized measures of engagement
under three broad categories: 1) measures of brand impact/brand idea, 2) measures of the brand idea and surrounding context, and 3) measure of the media context (Plummer, Cook, Diforio, Sokolyanskaya, & Ovchinnikova, 2006). Later in 2007, the ARF published a second volume with measures of engagement which were much denser in both quantitative and qualitative ways (Plummer, Cook, Diforio, Schachter, Sokolyanskaya, & Korde, 2007). In this volume, the ARF suggested a slightly different categorization involving: 1) measures of brand message, 2) measures of context, and 3) measures of brand idea. Table 2-4 summarizes each company’s methodological approach.

Recently, engagement has been investigated in online situations in particular. The Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB) published a report on online engagement (Gluck, 2012) and provided a broad conceptual framework that consisted of three major forms of engagement, including cognitive, physical, and emotional. According to the report, cognitive engagement measures attention metrics such as awareness, interest, and intention, while emotional engagement attempts to measure affect such as feeling and liking. Physical engagement tracks physical interaction with ads. However, although this report accurately explained how each engagement is measured with its own metrics, it was more about what engagement consists of and how to define its core metrics rather than what engagement is.

All in all, each measure has its own strengths and weaknesses based on the methodological approach utilized. In spite of the methodological diversity, most of the measures are rooted from one or more of the following three conceptualizing approaches (Askwith, 2007), as outlined in Table 2-4.

1. Viewer Attitudes. Some of the measures treat engagement as a function of viewers’ attitudes toward the content. The attitudes are determined and quantified through surveys and questionnaires which ask respondents to rate their agreement to the item statements. That is, the stronger the positive feelings, the higher the engagement scores.
2. Viewer Behaviors. This category of metric proposes that engagement can be described as a function of viewers’ behaviors related to the content. In this regard, as the viewer becomes more persistent and more loyal, they indicate higher engagement scores.

3. Viewer Attentiveness. The third approach suggests that engagement refers to the “degree of attention” of viewers so that they can recall details which the specific program addressed. Thus, as the viewers recall the content in more detail, the media get higher engagement scores.

However, all the metrics seem insufficient to fully quantify engagement because each of the measures might measure incomplete or partial aspects of engagement. It is difficult to define media engagement beyond the loose agreement of its conceptualization. Therefore, what follows is an introduction to a series of definitions and a deeper investigation into media engagement from an academic perspective.

### Definitions and Dimensions of Media Engagement in Academia

Just as in industry, a clear definition of engagement is lacking in academia. A systematic and integrated synthesis of existing research findings might provide a solution to the clarification of the term “engagement.” Consequently, a closer look at each study follows.

As mentioned above, in the beginning of the engagement debate, the Advertising Research Foundation (ARF) launched a joint endeavor entitled Measurement Initiative: Advertiser, Agencies, Media and Researchers (2005). The research consortium M14 was charged with two tasks, which included finding a working definition of engagement and developing metrics to measure engagement. The proposed working definition of engagement was described in the following way, “Engagement is turning on a prospect to a brand idea enhanced by the surrounding media context” (ARF, 2006). However, Mandese (2006) indicated that the ARF definition is problematic due to its imprecise language. For example, “turning on a prospect” could imply a range of possible relationships including awareness, interest, and/or actions. In contrast, Forrester Research (Haven, 2007) suggested another definition for engagement. This
definition included four components: “Engagement is the level of involvement, interaction, intimacy, and influence an individual has with a brand over time” (p. 4).

Extending the academic efforts, Eubank (as cited in Kilger & Romer, 2007) proposed three main components in the engagement linkage—media engagement, advertising engagement, and brand engagement. She further suggested three mechanisms involving cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes. Regarding media engagement, the cognitive mechanism refers to the relevance of the media to the consumer, while the emotional mechanism indicates the extent to which one likes the media. The behavioral mechanism accounts for paying attention to the media. These mechanisms are hypothesized to link media to consumers, which in turn correlates to eventual purchase of the products or service.

A study by Heath (2007) defined engagement as the amount of subconscious feeling going on when an advertisement is being processed. He suggested that engagement was measured by external behaviors such as eye tracking, facial recognition, and skin conductivity. This study considered engagement mainly from an emotional perspective.

Later, Kilger and Romer (2007) addressed the definition of media engagement as the link between the content of the media vehicle and a user’s attention/receptivity to the advertising. Furthermore, the authors identified the dimensions of engagement according to media channels. They defined six dimensions that are globally common across different media types including TV, the Internet, and magazines, as inspirational, trustworthy, life enhancing, social involvement, personal timeout, and advertising attention/receptivity. In contrast, they specified local engagement dimensions for each medium, such as personal connection and near and dear for TV, interactivity/community and enjoyment/attraction for the Internet, and image impact for magazines.
The Northwestern School has consistently studied media engagement (see Calder & Malthouse, 2008; Calder, Malthouse, & Schaedel, 2009; Malthouse & Peck, 2011; Mersey, Malthouse, & Calder, 2010). It has made the point that the definitions suggested from other researchers, including that of the ARF, are more about what engagement does rather than what it is. That is, most of the suggested definitions are “consequences of engagement” rather than engagement itself. Calder, Malthouse, and Schaedel (2009) stated that “engagement is antecedent to outcomes such as usage, affect, and responses to advertising” (p.322). Thus, the school concluded that engagement is a second-order construct that people cannot measure directly without various first-order experience constructs (see Fig 2-2). An experience refers to a set of a consumer’s beliefs and thoughts concerning how the media brand fits into his/her life (Mersey, Malthouse, & Calder, 2010). Malthouse, Calder, and Eadie (2003) stated that the reason for using the term “experience” is because it “captures the concept that this is what people think and feel when they read and because it is not a unidimensional continuum” (p. 285).

In line with this, Bronner and Neijens (2006), through their Dutch Media Monitor Experience Study, have identified eight experiences as important for media. They described experience as an emotional, intuitive perception that people have while using the media (Bronner & Neijens, 2006; Koppe, 1998). The eight dimensions of experience include information, transformation, negative emotion/irritation, pastime, stimulation, identification, social interaction, and practical use.

Putting together all the definitions and dimensions, it yields a result showing that engagement has been a catchall for a variety of interactions (Gluck, 2012), as presented in Table 2-5. Overall, the primary controversy regarding the definition of engagement stems from how we define the concept. McLeod and Pan (2005) specified eight common approaches to define a
concept. They include 1) by example, 2) by exclusion, 3) by comparing and contrasting subsets of units, 4) by procedures, 5) by drawing analogies, 6) by identifying function, 7) by identifying antecedents, and 8) by concept explication. According to their explanation, the struggle to define engagement comes from the diverse perspectives that regard engagement either as a measurable and tangible indicator or as an explicated concept or construct (McLeod & Pan, 2005).

In this regard, adopting the Northwestern standpoint, discussion on the essential elements of engagement consists of the following, instead of stating a precise definition of engagement:

1. Experiences. As stated previously, this study adopts the Northwestern standpoint (see Calder & Malthouse, 2008; Calder, Malthouse, & Schaedel, 2009; Malthouse & Peck, 2011; Mersey, Malthouse, & Calder, 2010) that identifies the term “engagement” as a second-order construct which is not directly measurable but implied by the measures of indicators which are experiences that refer to all media context variables.

2. Interaction and/or co-creation. The underlying conceptual foundations of engagement are interactive and co-created. In the big picture, by definition, engagement referred to “specific interactions and/or experiences between a focal engagement subject and object” (Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric, & Llic, 2011, p. 254). In line with this definition, media engagement also requires interaction and/or co-creation between the media and the audience.

3. Multidimensional. Since engagement is a second-order concept, engagement needs to be investigated with a multi-faceted approach to its measurement. The dimensions are different depending on the media types.

**Conceptual Framework of Media Engagement**

A substantial number of studies have found that when audiences are highly “engaged” with a media vehicle, they can be more responsive to advertising (i.e., Aaker & Brown, 1972; Bronner & Neijens, 2006; Cunningham, Hall, & Young, 2006; De Pelsmacker, Geuens, & Anckaert, 2002; Gallagher, Foster, & Parson, 2001; Kilger & Romer, 2007; Wang, 2006). There have been several theoretical bases to explain why engagement influences responses to advertising. For example, Dahlén (2005) provided three theoretical explanations for the relationships. First, the mood congruency-accessibility hypothesis serves to explain the relationship, claiming that “the ad context makes a certain mood or affect more accessible and
relieves the processing of stimuli with similar moods or affects” (p. 90). Second, the congruity principle also supports the relationship that “the medium and the advertised brand converge and become more similar in consumers’ minds” (p. 90). Finally, the medium serves as a cognitive prime which “activates a semantic network of related material that guides attention and determines the interpretation of the ad” (p. 90).

Moreover, the relationships between media engagement and responses have been investigated mainly in a practical and empirical context. For example, Aaker and Brown (1972) paid attention to the perceived product price and perceived quality under some conditions. Cunningham, Hall, and Young (2006) based their research on the flow of attention and emotion. Kilger and Romer (2007) revealed a positive relationship between the engagement dimensions and purchase likelihood. Accordingly, Bronner and Neijens (2006) supported a positive relationship such that media experiences spilled over into advertising experiences. Also, Wang (2006) examined the relationships among engagement, message involvement, and advertising effects such as recall, message believability, attitude toward the message, and attitude towards advertising, all of which contributed to revealing the effect of engagement levels.

The previous studies varied regarding the investigating channel, media and/or vehicles, of research interests: while some researchers examined print media (i.e., Moorman, Neijens & Smit, 2002), others looked into the Internet (i.e., Mersey, Malthouse, & Calder, 2010). Yet, regardless of the media types, the study findings have been consistent, with positive relationships between the engagement levels and outcome variables. The challenge is in deciding whether the measure of media engagement could be applied across media types or should be compared within a specific medium type. On one hand, Kilger and Romer (2007) utilized engagement measures across media types including TV, the Internet and magazines. Also Peacock, Purvis, and Hazlett
(2011) applied electromyography to compare TV and radio. On the other hand, there have been several studies that used engagement only within a medium across vehicles. Typical examples include MRI Plus in the magazine industry and Experian Simmons who conducted explorations within various media such as television, online, mobile, print, radio, and social media.

In line with this, the realm of this research is vehicle-specific within a medium type, not medium-wide, as mentioned in the previous media richness context. As discussed above, the concept of engagement has emerged in accordance with advances in interactive media. Thus, comparisons of one-way media to two-way media may not be necessary since the engagement of a two-way media type would be more suitable than a one-way media type. Moreover, since the engagement concept inherently implies interaction and experience, it seems unreasonable to expect engagement with one-way or lean-back media. Therefore, this study limits the research domain only to interactive and controllable media types. Among diverse media types of interest, social media have been investigated in the research context due to their popularity and practical values, as presented in the media richness section.

With regard to media engagement, this study adopts the measures of Kilger and Romer (2007) from Simmons, an Experian company, which proposed a multi-dimensional model for media engagement. The dimensions generally consist of a global dimension that is applicable across all media types, and a local dimension which is specific for each media type. Kilger and Romer (2007) proposed a total of eight dimensions for the Internet (Table 2-6). Global dimensions include “trustworthy,” “inspirational,” “life enhancing,” “social involvement,” “personal timeout,” and “advertising attention/ receptivity.” Local dimensions further involve “interactivity/ community” and “enjoyment/ attraction.” Thus, a specific dimension of
“interactivity / community” is chosen for the research context, because it is believed to exhibit the most exclusive and prevalent attribute of social media.

Based on the literature discussed above, higher media engagement is expected to be more effective on the attitudes and behavioral intention of CRM audience than less engagement. Also based on the aforementioned discussion, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H2. High media engagement rather than low media engagement will more positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention.

Cause-Involvement

Engagement versus Involvement

Involvement has been used in industry and academic literature without any consensus over whether or how it is different from engagement (Calder, Malthouse, & Schaedel, 2009). To shed light on the conceptual refinement, involvement also needs to be investigated, since the two terms have been compared to each other and are often used interchangeably. Thus, after the concept of involvement is defined, the distinction from engagement will follow.

Involvement has been developed in various disciplines, including psychology (Funk, Ridinger, & Moorman, 2004; Luschen & Sage, 1981; Shank & Beasley, 1998), marketing (Hawes & Lumpkin, 1984; Keller, 1987; Slama & Tashchian, 1987; Zinkhan & Locander, 1988), and leisure literature (Bloch & Bruce, 1984; Unger & Kernan, 1983). Due to the diversity of disciplines, the construct of involvement has had various conceptualizations. With respect to advertising, two main approaches have been developed, an internal state indicating arousal, interest (Bloch, 1982), and a drive invoked by a stimulus or a situation (Andrews, Durvasula, & Akhter, 1990). That is, involvement has been viewed as a cognitive, affective or motivational
concept implying state of mind (Smith & Godbey, 1991), or perceived personal relevance (Celsius & Olson, 1988; Richins & Bloch, 1986; Zaichkowsky, 1985).

The most popular definition of involvement in academia is “perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values, and interests” (Zaichkowsky, 1985, p. 342). Past literature has suggested various outcomes of involvement such as greater external search behavior (Beatty & Smith, 1987), greater depth of information processing (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983), more elaboration through peripheral or central routes of persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), and more experience gained through product trials (Krugman, 1965; Robertson, 1976). In this context, Vivek (2009) pointed out that “involvement may be differentiated as a precursor to behavioral conceptualization of engagement” (p. 31). In other words, engagement is distinguished from involvement in that involvement is related to a cognitive process while engagement is associated with behavioral manners and outcomes. Within this line of reasoning, it is reasonable to suggest that involvement is an antecedent of engagement, that latter of which being a behavioral construct that focuses on actions related to experiences.

**Summarizing the Previous Approaches to Cause-Involvement**

Historically, after Bloch (1982) studied product involvement in purchase process, Antil (1984) made an attempt to gain a conceptual and operational understanding of involvement-related studies, followed by Zaichkowsky (1985) who then conceptualized it as personal relevance. Later, Johnson and Eagly (1989) identified three types of involvement based on intense literature review: value-relevant, impression-relevant, and outcome-relevant involvement. Value-relevant involvement is defined as “the psychological state that is created by the activation of attitudes that are linked to important values” (Johnson & Eagly, 1989, p. 290). Impression-relevant involvement indicates individuals’ concerns with the consequences of their actions or opinions. Outcome-relevant involvement (i.e., issue involvement) refers to “the extent
to which the attitudinal issue under consideration is of personal importance” (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979, p. 1915) or “degree of personal relevance to the receiver” (Zaichkowsky, 1986, p. 5).

By definition, value-relevant involvement is related to an individual’s enduring values, while impression-relevant involvement deals with the responsive impression that people make on others. In contrast, issue involvement seems to be more appropriate in CRM communication since it addresses the motivation by the message recipients to process information about the issue (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). Moreover, since most CRM campaigns have been associated with social causes, personal relevance or interest in a specific cause might bring about different results. To illustrate, a consumer who is deeply committed to a human rights cause will be more likely to be enraged at sweatshop issues in Asia while another consumer interested in environmental issues might be more infuriated at deforestation issues in South America.

In the CRM context, cause involvement can be a conceptual alternative to issue involvement. In reality, the rise of ethical consumerism empowers CRM, as Varadarajan and Menon (1988) stated in “Do Better by Doing Good.” For this reason, marketing practitioners have made use of CRM as a strategy to increase the company’s profits, taking advantage of consumers’ growing cause-involvement. Corporations carry out a variety of CRM campaigns partnering with varied organizations supporting specific causes.

In accordance with industrial prominence, cause involvement has been viewed as a critical factor that influences consumers in academic research. Consequences of cause involvement are posited in the domain of consumers’ favorability toward a sponsor (Stipp & Schiavone, 1996), information processing and comprehension processes (Broderick et al., 2003; Celsi & Olson, 1988), the perceived likelihood of the campaign's success (Drumwright, 1996), attitude toward the cause-brand alliance, as well as towards the campaign (Trimble & Rifon,
2006), and repurchase loyalty (Olsen, 2007). Moreover, there has been research on what condition generates or increases cause involvement including perceived vividness (Berger, Cunningham, & Kozinets, 1999), importance and immediacy of the cause (Ellen, Mohr, & Webb, 2000), the consumer’s affinity for the cause (Barone, Norman, & Miyazaki, 2007), and local versus global issues (Grau & Folse, 2007; Smith & Alcorn, 1991).

The Role of Issue Involvement in Elaboration Likelihood Model

A dual-process model such as the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) has been widely used to explain the influences of issue involvement. According to this model, people are more easily persuaded by information-oriented messages related to issues in which they are highly involved (i.e., central-route attitude change). When people are more involved in the content of the message, elaboration is high. Then, the elaboration involves cognitive processes such as evaluation, recall, critical judgment, and inferential judgment. Likewise, when an individual perceives a specific cause to be more personally relevant, he or she tends to be motivated to treat cause-related information more centrally or thoughtfully because the information is processed more diligently with increased cognitive elaboration (Berger, Cunningham, & Kozinets, 1999).

In contrast, under low-involvement conditions where message content is not heavily processed, non-message cues, such as the attractiveness of the message source or the length of the message, have a greater persuasive impact (i.e., peripheral-route attitude change). Harben (2009) suggested two reasons why issue-relevant arguments are more important in attitude change under high-involvement conditions: First, individuals have a greater motivation to create an informed opinion about an issue in which they are highly involved. Second, when people experience greater relevance to the issue arguments, they tend to initiate established thoughts and schema about issues.
Given that CSR communication cannot be managed apart from cause-related issues, individual differences in cause-related involvement should influence consumers, as explained by ELM. The role of cause-involvement for ethical consumers has been highlighted to explicate the impact of CRM (e.g., Myers, Kwon, & Forsythe, 2012). As the level of cause involvement increases, customers find CSR messages more important in order to form a reasoned opinion. Thus, they become more motivated to devote cognitive processing to persuasive communication attempts. In the same vein, people highly involved in a particular cause might have a different media usage behavior compared to less involved ones. Despite the paradigm shift of media environments, there has been lack of academic effort to tease out the effect of media in the CRM context related to cause-involvement. Therefore, considering that CRM requires a different approach from traditional advertising due to the audience’s cause-involvement, media strategy for CRM also should be different from traditional media strategy.

**H3.** Highly-involved individuals in the promoted cause will have more positive a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than less-involved ones.

With regard to the interaction effects between media variables and cause involvement, it is conceivable that cause involvement would moderate the impact of media-bound variables on consumers. Largely based on ELM (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), when a person is highly involved in a particular social cause, his or her response would be increased with rich media usage since rich media provide more cues to help the person who is already motivated to process cognitive information. That is, it is expected that the differences in personal relevance to the promoted cause will affect the way people perceive media richness, and in turn, will influence the perception and behavioral responses. Moreover, as ELM revealed (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986),
when a person has low involvement with a cause, the response is expected to be related to peripheral cues, implying that lean media would be more effective than rich media. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H4.** Cause involvement will moderate the effect of media richness. Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in lean media rather than rich media, while highly-involved individuals will have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in rich media rather than lean media.

In the same vein, when a person is highly involved in the promoted cause, his or her attitudes and behavioral intention would be stronger with high media engagement since such engagement enables the user to react to the message more positively. On the contrary, for those who are less involved in the promoted cause, low media engagement would have a more positive influence on the attitudes and behavioral intention given that they are likely to process the information with less consideration. Thus, the individual differences in cause-involvement in a specific social cause might have an impact on the user’s media engagement, and in turn, would influence the attitudes and behavioral responses, suggesting Hypothesis 5 as below:

**H5.** The cause involvement will moderate the effect of media engagement. Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in low media engagement rather than high media engagement, while highly-involved individuals will have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in high media engagement rather than low media engagement.
Summary of the Hypotheses

In brief, the present study tests media-bound variables such as media richness and media engagement, to explore what determinants would affect the attitudes and behavioral intent in a CRM ad context. The hypotheses to be tested and explored in the study are as follows:

**H1.** Rich media will more positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than lean media.

**H2.** High media engagement rather than low media engagement will more positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention.

**H3.** Highly-involved individuals in the promoted cause will have more positive a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than less-involved ones.

**H4.** Cause involvement will moderate the effect of media richness. Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in lean media rather than rich media, while highly-involved individuals will have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in rich media rather than lean media.

**H5.** The cause involvement will moderate the effect of media engagement. Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in low media engagement rather than high media engagement, while highly-involved individuals will have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in high media engagement rather than low media engagement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Multiple Cues</th>
<th>Language Variety</th>
<th>Personal Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social networking site</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online video sharing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weblogs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microblogs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile applications</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-2. Overview of Engagement Conceptualizations (Hollebeek, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Concept and Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Themes/dimensionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student engagement by Fredricks et al. (2004)</td>
<td>The multifaceted nature of student engagement exists in the following dimensions: (a) cognitive, e.g. willingness to master certain skills; (b) emotional, e.g. positive/ negative reactions to teachers; &amp; (c) behavioral, i.e. participation (e.g. in academic/ extracurricular activity)</td>
<td>Multidimensional: 1. Cognitive 2. Emotional 3. Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Concept and Author(s)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Themes/dimensionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Evaluations, Inc.</td>
<td>Q scores</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative Media</td>
<td>Favorite Program Study</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starcom MediaVest Group (SMG)</td>
<td>EnQ</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GfK Mediamark Research &amp; Intelligence</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innerscope Research</td>
<td>inGage, inCite, inForm</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester Research</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from *Television 2.0: Reconceptualizing TV as an Engagement Medium*, by Askwith, 2007.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>APPROACHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simmons Research</td>
<td>National Multimedia Engagement Study</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Cognitive, behavioral, emotional involvement with programming</td>
<td>Viewer Attitudes, Viewer Behaviors, Viewer Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG Research</td>
<td>Program Engagement</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Recall of program details</td>
<td>Viewer Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen Media Research</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Recall, awareness, attitudes towards brands and products</td>
<td>Viewer Attitudes, Viewer Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Summarized from *Measures of Engagement*, by Plummer et al. (2006) and revised in the research context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marc (1966)</td>
<td>How disappointed someone would be if a magazine were no longer published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF (2006)</td>
<td>Turning on a prospect to a brand idea enhanced by the surrounding media context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA (2006)</td>
<td>A consumer’s relationship with media content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappaport (2007)</td>
<td>Engagement centers on the “high relevance of brands to consumers and the development of an emotional connection between consumers and brands”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang (2006)</td>
<td>A measure of the contextual relevance in which a brand’s messages are framed and presented based on its surrounding context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath (2007)</td>
<td>The amount of subconscious “feeling” going on when an advertisement is being processed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilger &amp; Romer (2007)</td>
<td>The link between a user’s engagement with the content of the media vehicle and their attention/receptivity to the advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern School Calder &amp; Malthouse (2008); Calder, Malthouse, &amp; Schaedel (2009); Mersey, Malthouse, &amp; Calder (2010); Malthouse &amp; Peck (2011)</td>
<td>The collection of experiences that readers, viewers, or visitors have with a media brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Timeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising Attention/ Receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TV</td>
<td>Personal Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Near and Dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Internet</td>
<td>Interactivity/Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyment/Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Magazine</td>
<td>Image Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-1. Media Richness Continuum (Adapted from Ledford 2012)
Figure 2-2. Engagement and its Consequences
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Research Design Overview

The purpose of this study is to examine media’s effects on audience outcomes (i.e., attitude and intent to behave) with relation to cause involvement. This research pays close attention to perceived media richness, media engagement, and their association with cause involvement in strategic media planning. This chapter describes the research methods employed for this study, including the research design, information on the measurement instrument, suggested procedure to test the hypotheses, and development of stimuli.

An experimental design of a 3 (media engagement: high, medium, and low) × 2 (perceived media richness: rich vs. lean) × 2 (cause involvement: high vs. low) was used to shed light on the explicit relationships between the variables as the hypotheses proposed. This study consisted of three independent variables: 1) media engagement, 2) perceived media richness, and 3) cause involvement. The first independent variable, media engagement, related to media experiences, split the respondents into three groups: high, medium, and low levels. To distinguish the group differences, the means of high and low groups were compared to each other. Perceived media richness, defined as the capacity to convey multiple messages and cues, was divided into two levels: rich and lean. The third independent variable, cause involvement, defined as personal importance and relevance to a specific cause, varied at two levels: high and low. The dependent variables included attitudes toward the brand and behavioral intention such as purchase and word-of-mouth. Overall, the proposed design consisted of a total of twelve test conditions, with a minimum of 30 people for each cell, resulting in at least 360 participants. Table 3-1 presents a visual representation of the assigned variables by condition.
Procedure

The study was conducted to examine the relationships between media engagement, perceived media richness, and cause involvement with responses of people such as attitudinal and behavioral changes. The research subjects were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (M-Turk). Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (www.MTurk.com) is a relatively new open website for Web-based data-collection. MTurk boasts more than 100,000 “workers” from over 100 countries who complete tasks which were created by “requesters.” Workers can browse available tasks and are paid by requesters upon successful completion of each task. Previous research has supported reliable results from online panel data such as M-Turk which have been used in consumer behavior research (Straughan & Roberts, 1999). In particular, Amazon MTurk has been used to obtain data which is more demographically diverse inexpensively and rapidly (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011).

A survey instrument was developed to capture subjects’ responses. The instrument consisted of four sections: (1) a pre-manipulation section, (2) measures of media engagement levels, (3) an advertisements exposure, and (4) a post-manipulation section. Subjects clicked the Qualtrics survey link. Qualtrics is an online survey generation, delivery, and analysis tool. On opening the survey, subjects were asked to read the informed consent form highlighting the purpose of research and the fact that no risks are associated with study participation. The form reinforced the fact that their responses to all information requests would be confidential and requested that they indicate their agreement to the terms of research participation by clicking an “Accept” button at the bottom of the first page. After consenting to participate, subjects were asked to answer two filter questions to verify their ages and whether they are current users of both Twitter and Instagram. The frequency of usage for both vehicles also was asked to establish
the baseline for engagement. The instrument was self-guided, and took less than 30 minutes. Subjects were not allowed to go back to the previous page due to the manipulation check.

Next, subjects were directed to the second section, which asked them to indicate their experiences and impressions on social media. Individuals’ engagement levels on social media were measured in the beginning of the experiment. In the second section, they were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement intended to measure their actual levels of media engagement in Instagram/Twitter.

After identifying their engagement levels, subjects were randomly assigned to view one of four ad stimuli (high involvement in rich media, high involvement in lean media, low involvement in rich media, and low involvement in lean media) using a tool for randomization available in Qualtrics. This resulted in subjects’ random assignment to one of the four versions of fictitious ads related to a social cause with high and low involvement in two vehicles that are meant to represent either rich or lean media (see Appendix B). With this random assignment, the researcher assumed that the four groups were equivalent (Aronson et al., 1990) thereby increasing the study’s internal validity.

According to Ledford’s typology (2012) and the supportive results from pretests, microblogs (i.e., Twitter) and online photo/video sharing (i.e., Instagram) represented lean and rich media vehicles respectively. Based on the pretest results, the social causes of student loan debt and Head Start were used and manipulated to represent high and low level of cause involvement. The manipulation was developed according to the previous involvement studies (i.e., Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). Subjects in the high involvement conditions were exposed to a CRM ad message that highlighted the issue of student loan debt in the U.S. Subjects in the low involvement conditions were exposed to ads the highlighted support to the cause of Head Start
and the need to help the preschool children from low-income families. A manipulation check question asked subject to rate their perceived media richness of Instagram and Twitter usage. Next, they were asked to answer a self-administered questionnaire that asked about their attitude toward the brand in each advertisement, and behavioral intention—purchase and word-of-mouth—in the given condition.

Finally, the subjects answered demographic questions (i.e., gender, age) in the post-manipulation questionnaire. Subjects were informed that the classification information only would be used to confirm that they participated in the research, and their identity would be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Last, they were thanked for their participation. The time required to complete the questionnaire was less than 30 minutes.

**Sample**

The sampling frame for the study was American residents who were adults between the ages of 18-49. The age group of 18-49 has been selected based on the demographics of social networking site (SNS) users (see Table 3-2, PEW Research Center, 2014). The majority over 80% within age groups of 18-29 and 30-49 are currently using SNS. Considering the relatively smaller size of the age groups of 50-64 and 65+, the older groups were not considered.

Since this study dealt with some specific media vehicles including Instagram and Twitter, only current users of the vehicles participated in the study. Moreover, because the vehicles were mainly used online, an online survey tool, Qualtrics, administered via Amazon MTurk was used for the generalizability by enhancing the experimental realism, or ecological validity.

**Development of Stimuli**

A pretest survey was conducted to gauge perceived levels of cause involvement to apply in the editorial content for the study. A total of 133 American adults between the ages of 18-49 participated in a Web-based survey. Past literature has proposed that the involvement of people
in a specific issue can influence individuals’ attitudinal and behavioral changes when they are exposed to a situation within that social issue (Broderick, Jogi, & Gerry, 2003; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Sherif & Hovland, 1961). The cause of education was chosen given its high level of involvement according to two resources, Ogilvy (2011) and myphilanthropedia.org (2014). The *Dynamics of Cause Engagement* study released by Ogilvy Public Relations Worldwide and Georgetown University’s Center for Social Impact Communication found education as one of the top causes which Americans have widely supported. In the same vein, Nonprofits Ranking from myphilanthropedia.org (2014) also has chosen education as one of the major 13 national causes.

A series of pre-tests were executed to select the social causes. First option was choosing two causes in different areas with high and low involvement level. Animal welfare and prolife were tested. However, this approach was rejected given that it might compare orange and apple. Second approach was to manipulate the involvement level into high and low level with the same cause. Feed the hungry was chosen and the levels were manipulated with the physical distance: for high involvement level, the ad support the local community while for low involvement, the ad support the globe. But, the statistical analysis did not exhibit the significant differences between high and low levels. Lastly, two social causes within a social cause were chosen; student loan debts and Head Start program under the realm of education were selected to represent high and low levels of social causes. All in all, the last approach has been employed for this study.

To examine the effects of cause involvement and perceived media richness on dependent variables, a total of four advertisements were developed according to the research design for cause involvement and media richness conditions specified by this study: student loan debts
(high involvement) and Head Start (low involvement) in Instagram (rich media) and Twitter (lean media). A fictitious local bank was chosen as the message sponsor to eliminate any confounding variables that might be associated with a recognized advertiser (e.g., brand awareness, brand familiarity, or brand favoritism) and to improve the ecological validity of the research. Cause-related marketing messages presented in the ads established a relationship between the hypothetical bank (Royal Oaks Bank) as the cause-related marketer and the social cause, which was either student loan debts or Head Start depending on the cell assignment.

To manipulate the involvement level, related news articles were adapted from the real news stories, and then were produced and presented prior to subjects’ exposure to the ad. To prime the involvement level for the high condition, a news article was produced about student loan debt. The article suggested that student loan debt would be a serious problem. In contrast, to prime the involvement level for the low condition, a different news article was produced that described circumstances surrounding the Head Start program and its efforts to increase its funding (see Appendix B).

For the perceived media richness manipulation, total of four stimuli were developed. The Instagram version of the stimulus delivered a visual image; the Twitter version of the stimulus carried only texts with the same messages. The media richness cells were presented in these media as follows: 1) high involvement cell for student loan debts on Instagram, 2) high involvement cell for student loan debts on Twitter, 3) low involvement cell for the Head Start on Instagram, and 4) low involvement cell for Head Start on Twitter. The developed news articles and advertisements are presented in Appendix B.

**Measures**

According to the procedure of the study, a series of measures are provided in each section. For the pre-manipulation section, filtering questions that asked participants’ age and
whether they were current users of each vehicle were presented to validate their qualification for the experiment. In the second section, measures of media engagement levels were offered. In the third section following exposure to the ad stimulus, manipulation check questions of perceived media richness and cause involvement were asked. In the last section, dependent variables of the attitudes toward the advertised brand, purchase intention, and WOM intention were asked to the subjects.

**Media Engagement**

Media engagement levels were measured with established media engagement measures developed by the Experian company (Kilger & Romer, 2007, see Table 3-3). The items included:

- [Vehicle] does a good job of getting visitors to contribute or provide feedback.
- I’m as interested in postings from other users as I am on my [Vehicle] profile.
- I’ve gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn’t have because of others on [Vehicle].

The items also were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with anchoring values of 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree). This scale was selected because it is the only known between- and within-channel measurement tool for engagement. Moreover, in practice, this scale has been utilized by national advertisers and integrated with national consumer studies that were intended to identify those media vehicles with which consumers are most engaged (Kilger & Romer, 2007).

The media engagement groups were assigned by measuring the subjects’ media engagement levels using their respective mean score of the scale items. This established the measure for the participant’s actual media engagement level, not the perceived or manipulated one. Based on the sample responses, media engagement composite means were used to assign subjects into three groups, and the means of high and low engagement group were compared. Splitting the sample into three groups was employed in order to better establish a baseline from
the sample distribution which strengthens the validity of the comparison conditions and minimizes the weakness of a pure median split.

**Perceived Media Richness**

Since pure media richness can be measured only according to the perceptions of respondents, perceived media richness was measured for the manipulation checks. The perceived richness of the two media vehicles was measured using seven items for each of the media vehicles; four items from Carlson and Zmud (1999) and three items from a scale developed by Dennis and Kinney (1998). The measurement items selected were adapted from established studies about media richness (i.e., Carlson & Zmud, 1999; Lo & Lie, 2008; Van den Hooff, 2005). Recent studies (i.e., Fernandez, Simo, Sallan, & Enache, 2013; Hasty, Massey, & Brown, 2006; Huang, Yang, Baek, & Lee, 2015) also have used the items because this scale has consistently shown a satisfactory level of reliability (see Table 3-4) and an ability to identify media types on a media richness continuum. The seven items include the following:

- Instagram/ Twitter allows us to give and receive timely feedback.
- Instagram/ Twitter allows us to tailor our messages to our own personal requirements.
- Instagram/ Twitter allows us to communicate a variety of different cues (such as emotional tone, attitude, or formality) in our messages.
- Instagram/ Twitter allows us to use rich and varied language in our messages.
- I could easily explain things using Instagram/ Twitter.
- Instagram/ Twitter helped us to communicate quickly.
- Instagram/ Twitter helped us to better understand each other.

The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with anchoring values of 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree). The scales were factor analyzed to provide evidence of discriminant validity.
Cause Involvement

Consumers’ involvement in a specific issue was measured with six self-administered involvement statements adopted from Zaichkowsky’s (1986) Personal Involvement Inventory (PII). Subjects were asked to evaluate the following statements:

- The cause in this ad matters to me.
- The cause in this ad is relevant to me.
- The cause in this ad means nothing to me.
- The cause in this ad is important to me.
- The cause in this ad is of no concern to me.
- The cause in this ad is significant to me.

The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with anchoring values of 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree).

The Dependent Variables

This study hypothesized that the subjects’ attitudes toward the advertised brand, purchase intention, and WOM intention would differ depending on the relationships between perceived media richness, media engagement, and cause-involvement. To determine the main and interaction effects, three dependent variables, such as attitude toward the brand, purchase intention and WOM intention, were measured using items from previous studies in advertising and consumer behavior. The attitude towards the brand was measured by three items that were selected from an extensive list of items deployed by several researchers in the past, as adapted from Keller’s items (1993) for this research context. A 5-point semantic differential scale was used. Intention to purchase has been a common effectiveness measure that are often used to anticipate a response behavior (Li, Daugherty, & Biocca, 2002). Purchase intention of the product in the advertisements was measured by an established three-item, 5- point semantic differential scale developed by Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). For the measurement of customers’ WOM intentions with regard to giving positive referrals about the brand to others, a
scale with three items was adapted from Price and Arnould (1999). All statements were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Very Low, 5 = Very High). Table 3-4 presents the items associated with each variable.
Table 3-1. $3 \times 2 \times 2$ Factorial Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Cause Involvement</th>
<th>Low Cause Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Media</td>
<td>Lean Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Media Engagement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Media Engagement</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Media Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2. Social Networking Site User Demographics (PEW Research Center, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>% of users within the age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson &amp; Zmud, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task A</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task B</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task C</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Hooff, 2005</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasty, Massey, &amp; Brown, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Message</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Voice</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Whiteboard</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, Yang, Baek, &amp; Lee, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-4. Items Measuring Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Measure Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td><strong>Media Richness:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter allows us to give and receive timely feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter allows us to tailor our messages to our own personal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter allows us to communicate a variety of different cues (such as emotional tone, attitude, or formality) in our messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter allows us to use rich and varied language in our messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>I could easily explain things using Instagram/Twitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter helped us communicate quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Richness</td>
<td>Instagram/Twitter helped us to better understand each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Engagement:</strong></td>
<td>[Vehicle] does a good job of getting visitors to contribute or provide feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity/Community</td>
<td>I'm as interested in postings from other users as I am on my [Vehicle] profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause Involvement:</td>
<td>I've gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn't have because of others on [Vehicle].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Involvement</td>
<td>The cause in this ad matters to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>The cause in this ad is relevant to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>The cause in this ad means nothing to me.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>The cause in this ad is important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>The cause in this ad is of no concern to me.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>The cause in this ad is significant to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td><strong>Attitude towards the Brand:</strong> I like brand x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>I associate positive things with brand x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>I find brand x favorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>The probability that I would consider buying this product is…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>My willingness to buy this product is…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>I would recommend brand x to someone who seeks my advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>I say positive things about brand x to other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>I would generally recommend brand x to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse coding
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The data of the experiment were analyzed and are presented in this chapter. This chapter first presents a description of the subjects of the study, followed by the results of reliability tests and manipulation checks. For the hypotheses testing, independent sample t-tests and univariate analyses were performed using IBM PASW Statistics 23 software at a 95 % confidence level.

Description of Subjects

A total of 416 subjects participated in the experiment, and they were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental groups. Among them, the responses from nine subjects who failed to complete the questionnaire were excluded; thus, 407 responses were included for the data analysis. Specifically, the number of subjects in the rich (Instagram) and lean (Twitter) media conditions was 196 and 211 respectively. Also, 208 subjects assigned to the high involvement condition completed the study, while the 199 in the low involvement condition completed the study. To explore group differences between a highly engaged group and the other group with low engagement, the sample was split into three groups of high, medium, and low media engagement, based on the distribution of media engagement level on a 5-point scale. Considering the average score of 4.00 has the highest frequency (n=98) and is close to the median (M=3.91), 98 respondents with a 4.00 score were recoded as medium, below 4.00 as low, and over 4.00 as high engagement group (Table 4-1). Consequently, 145 were enrolled in the low engagement group, while 164 were in the high engagement one, excluding 98 in the median group (Table 4-2).

Males and females comprised 57.5 % (n=234) and 42.5 % (n=17) of the sample, respectively. The age of the subjects ranged from 18 to 49 years old, and the mean age was 29.7 (SD = 6.8). Approximately 70.0 % of the subjects were Caucasian, 11.8 % Asian, 8.6 % African-
American, 5.2 % Hispanic, and 4.4 % other races. Subjects reported that in the past week, they spent 42.7 minutes ($SD = 67.6$) using Instagram and 40.8 minutes ($SD = 64.1$) per day actively using Twitter respectively. The sample profile is summarized in Table 4-3.

A series of t-tests were performed to find out whether there were any differences in media usage levels across the experimental groups. However, no significant differences were found across conditions on subjects’ usage of Instagram /Twitter, suggesting random assignment of participants across all conditions. Additionally, another series of t-tests and ANOVAs were conducted to examine any potential effects of subjects’ demographics (i.e., gender, education level, and ethnicity) on dependent variables (i.e., attitude toward advertising, attitude toward product, and purchase intention). However, no significant differences of the subject demographics were found in any dependent variables.

**Reliability Checks**

The internal consistencies of variable measures with a multi-item scale were tested. The perceived media richness, media engagement, and cause involvement, and three dependent variable scores were computed by averaging all items in each measurement based on the reliability analyses. Regarding the independent variables, reliability analyses were conducted for perceived media richness, media engagement, and cause involvement. The reliability estimate for the perceived media richness (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .76$), media engagement (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .72$), and cause involvement (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$) was acceptable. Additionally, the reliability estimates for three dependent variables of attitude toward the brand (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$), purchase intention (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$) and word-of-mouth intention (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$) were acceptable as well.
Manipulation Checks

Regarding the media engagement manipulation, the subjects were asked to rate the media engagement items. As expected, a t-test confirmed that high engagement subjects ($M_{high} = 4.32$, $SD = .34$) rated that it was more important to them to do what they wanted to do than what they ought to do, compared to the subjects in the low engagement condition ($M_{low} = 3.16$, $SD = .57$), $t = 21.93$, $p < .001$. Thus, the manipulation of media engagement was successful.

Another t-test was conducted to examine the manipulation of perceived media richness. As intended, there were significant manipulation effects of advertising appeals. That is, subjects who were exposed to rich media, Instagram, ($M_{rich} = 3.77$, $SD = .63$) scored significantly higher than subjects who were exposed to lean media, Twitter ($M_{lean} = 3.56$, $SD = .62$), $t = 3.01$, $p = .003$ on perceived media richness.

Additionally, another t-test was performed to verify whether the manipulations of cause involvement differed significantly. The results showed that there were significant manipulation effects for cause involvement. The mean score of the high involvement condition ($M_{high} = 3.78$, $SD = .92$) was significantly different from that of the low involvement condition ($M_{low} = 3.29$, $SD = .81$), $t = 4.99$, $p < .001$. All in all, all independent variables were successfully manipulated as intended.

Hypotheses Testing

This study employed a series of t-tests to test the group differences in media engagement, media richness, and cause involvement which were suggested in hypotheses 1-3 and ANOVAs to test their interaction effects which were proposed in hypotheses 4-5. Hypothesis 1 predicted that rich media would more positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than lean media. The results of t-tests revealed that the mean difference between rich media (Instagram) and lean media
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(Twitter) reached statistical significance for purchase intention \((M_{rich} = 3.40, SD = .84 \text{ vs. } M_{lean} = 3.18, SD = .80, t = 2.30, p = .022)\), and intention of word-of-mouth \((M_{rich} = 3.39, SD = .84 \text{ vs. } M_{lean} = 3.19, SD = .91, t = 1.99, p = .048)\), but not for the attitude toward the advertising \((M_{rich} = 3.68, SD = .74 \text{ vs. } M_{lean} = 3.53, SD = .77, t = 1.79, p = .074)\). The results for hypothesis 1 showed that there were significant differences between rich and lean media conditions in terms of purchase intention and word-of-mouth. When subjects were exposed to the rich media, they showed significantly greater intention to purchase or buzz (word-of-mouth) than lean media. Thus, H1b and H1c were supported; however, H1a was not supported. Means and standard deviations for all dependent variables are summarized in Table 4-4.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that high media engagement would positively influence the audience’s a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention. The results for hypothesis 2 with t-tests revealed that the mean difference between high engagement and low engagement reached statistical significance for attitude toward the advertising \((M_{high} = 3.86, SD = .64 \text{ vs. } M_{low} = 3.32, SD = .79, t = 6.58, p < .001)\), intention of word-of-mouth \((M_{high} = 3.47, SD = .74 \text{ vs. } M_{low} = 3.09, SD = .87, t = 4.10, p < .001)\), and for purchase intention \((M_{high} = 3.54, SD = .78 \text{ vs. } M_{low} = 3.01, SD = .90, t = 5.47, p < .001)\). When subjects were highly- or less-engaged in a specific vehicle, they showed significantly more positive attitudes toward the advertising and greater intentions to purchase or buzz (word-of-mouth). Thus, H2a, H2b, and H2c were all supported. Means and standard deviations for all dependent variables are summarized in Table 4-5.

Hypothesis 3 suggested that high involvement in the promoted cause was more likely to positively lead to a) attitude toward the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention. The results of independent sample t-tests for hypothesis 3 revealed that
the cause involvement had significant main effects on attitude toward the brand, \( t = -2.18, p = .030 \), but no significant effect on intent to purchase the product, \( t = .35, p = .73 \) or word-of-mouth (WOM) intention, \( t = 1.07, p = .27 \). However, the direction of the result was opposite to the hypothesis. When subjects were under the low involvement condition compared to the high involvement condition, they showed significantly more positive attitudes toward the brand (\( M_{\text{high}} = 3.52, SD = .84 \) vs. \( M_{\text{low}} = 3.70, SD = 0.65 \)). Hence, H3a was supported. Means and standard deviations for all dependent variables are summarized in Table 4-6.

Hypothesis 4 proposed an interaction effect between media richness and cause involvement. Specifically, those who are less-involved in the promoted cause would have more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) in lean media than rich media, while those highly-involved in the promoted cause would have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in rich media than lean media. A two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to examine H4. The results showed no significant two-way interaction effects on any dependent variables. Therefore, H4a, H4b, H4c, H4d, H4e, and H4f were not supported. Means and standard deviations for all dependent variables are summarized in Table 4-7.

In the same vein, hypothesis 5 proposed an interaction effect between media engagement and cause involvement. Specifically, those who are less-involved in the promoted cause would have more positive a) attitude towards the brand, b) intent to purchase the product, and c) word-of-mouth (WOM) in high media engagement than low engagement, while those highly-involved in the promoted cause would have more positive d) attitude towards the brand, e) intent to purchase the product, and f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in low media engagement than high engagement. A two-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to examine H5. The
results showed no significant two-way interaction effects on dependent variables. Therefore, H5a, H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e, and H5f were not supported. Table 4-8 summarizes means and standard deviations for all dependent variables. All in all, Table 4-9 presents the overall statistical results of each variables and interaction, and Table 4-10 summarizes the results for each hypothesis test.
Table 4-1. Distribution of Average Media Engagement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Recode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>Low (n=145, 35.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>Medium (n=98, 24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>High (n=164, 40.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Cause Involvement</td>
<td>Low Cause Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Media</td>
<td>Lean Media</td>
<td>Rich Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Media Engagement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Media Engagement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Media Engagement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>29.7 (6.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes of Instagram usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>42.7 (67.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes of Twitter usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>40.8 (64.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. Means and Standard Deviations (Media Richness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Richness (H1)</th>
<th>Rich Media (n=156)</th>
<th>Lean Media (n=153)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>3.67 (.74)</td>
<td>3.53 (.77)</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>3.40 (.84)</td>
<td>3.18 (.80)</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>3.39 (.84)</td>
<td>3.19 (.91)</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level

Note: Numeric values are means in each condition (standard deviation in parentheses).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Engagement (H2)</th>
<th>High Engagement ($n=164$)</th>
<th>Low Engagement ($n=145$)</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>3.86 (.64)</td>
<td>3.32 (.79)</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>3.47 (.74)</td>
<td>3.09 (.87)</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>3.54 (.78)</td>
<td>3.01 (.90)</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numeric values are means in each condition (standard deviation in parentheses). * Significant at the .05 level
Table 4-6. Means and Standard Deviations (Cause Involvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause Involvement (H3)</th>
<th>High Involvement (n=161)</th>
<th>Low Involvement (n=148)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>3.52 (.84)</td>
<td>3.70 (.65)</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>3.27 (.90)</td>
<td>3.31 (.74)</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>3.24 (.92)</td>
<td>3.35 (.82)</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numeric values are means in each condition (standard deviation in parentheses).
* Significant at the .05 level
Table 4-7. Means and Standard Deviations (Media Richness × Cause Involvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Richness × Cause Involvement (H4)</th>
<th>Rich Media (n=156)</th>
<th>Lean Media (n=153)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Involvement</td>
<td>Low Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=81)</td>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Involvement</td>
<td>Low Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=80)</td>
<td>(n=73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>3.57 (.83)</td>
<td>3.80 (.61)</td>
<td>3.46 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>3.45 (.88)</td>
<td>3.34 (.78)</td>
<td>3.10 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>3.35 (.91)</td>
<td>3.42 (.76)</td>
<td>3.13 (.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level

Note: Numeric values are means in each condition (standard deviation in parentheses).
Table 4-8. Means and Standard Deviations (Media Engagement × Cause Involvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Engagement (n=164)</th>
<th>Low Engagement (n=145)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Involvement (n=82)</td>
<td>Low Involvement (n=82)</td>
<td>High Involvement (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>3.80 (.73)</td>
<td>3.91 (.52)</td>
<td>3.22 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>3.50 (.78)</td>
<td>3.43 (.70)</td>
<td>3.04 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>3.53 (.81)</td>
<td>3.54 (.76)</td>
<td>2.94 (.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numeric values are means in each condition (standard deviation in parentheses).
* Significant at the .05 level
Table 4-9. A Summary of T-test and ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Media Richness (H1)</th>
<th>Media Engagement (H2)</th>
<th>Cause Involvement (H3)</th>
<th>Media Richness × Cause Involvement (H4)</th>
<th>Media Engagement × Cause Involvement (H5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward brand</td>
<td>t = 1.794</td>
<td>t = 6.581*</td>
<td>t = -2.179*</td>
<td>F = .346</td>
<td>F = .507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>t = 2.301*</td>
<td>t = 4.098*</td>
<td>t = .351</td>
<td>F = 2.403</td>
<td>F = .985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM intention</td>
<td>t = 1.985*</td>
<td>t = 5.469*</td>
<td>t = 1.068</td>
<td>F = .114</td>
<td>F = .707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1. Rich media will more positively influence the audience’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attitude toward the brand,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than lean media.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2. High media engagement rather than low media engagement will more</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positively influence the audience’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attitude toward the brand,</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3. Highly-involved individuals in the promoted cause will have more</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attitude toward the brand,</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention than less-involved ones.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4. Cause involvement will moderate the effect of media richness.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attitude towards the brand,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in lean media rather than rich media,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while highly-involved individuals will have more positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) attitude towards the brand,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in rich media rather than lean media.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5. The cause involvement will moderate the effect of media engagement.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, less-involved individuals will have a more positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attitude towards the brand,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in low media engagement rather than</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high media engagement,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while highly-involved individuals will have more positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) attitude towards the brand,</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) intent to purchase the product, and</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) word-of-mouth (WOM) intention in high media engagement rather than</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low media engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Opposite direction
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Using an experimental design, this study examined two types of media-bound factors and explored the effect of the factors and their interaction with individual’s involvement levels in a social cause. Specifically, in light of heightened scholarly and industrial interest in CRM, the present study examines the impact of media richness, media engagement, and cause involvement along with their interactions on the attitudes and behavioral intent to purchase or buzz products that support a social cause in a CRM campaign.

A total of five hypotheses were proposed and tested through various statistical analyses that included independent sample t-tests and analysis of variance. Overall, the results showed that the media engagement has a positive impact on consumers’ attitudes and behavioral intentions and that media richness and cause involvement have a partial positive impact on consumers. Specifically, as the hypotheses expected, highly engaged consumers in social media exhibited more positive attitudes and greater intention to purchase and word-of-mouth than less engaged consumers. Moreover, consumers exposed to rich media showed stronger purchase and buzz intention than those exposed to lean media. With regard to cause involvement, a statistically significant difference was found between high and low involvement consumers solely on their attitudes towards the brand.

This chapter discusses the findings from the data analysis with possible explanations for the results. Then, it clarifies and highlights the theoretical contributions and practical implications to both researchers and managers. It concludes with a discussion of limitations and future research suggestions of the study.
Summary of Findings

Effects of Media Richness

The present study highlights the importance of media-bound factors in CRM campaigns. This study postulated that the media richness would have a positive impact on consumers. Drawing on media richness theory (i.e., Trevino et al., 1987), the first hypothesis predicted that rich media would be more positive than lean media to have more positive attitudes toward the brand, intent to purchase the brand, and word-of-mouth.

Indeed, the study found the influence of media richness on consumers’ behavioral intentions to be statistically significant in the positive direction, but not on consumers’ attitudes towards the brand. Basically, the manipulation analysis revealed that people perceived Instagram richer than Twitter in support of the previous study (Trevino et al., 1990), which suggested that rich media (Instagram) is more capable of transmitting multiple cues such as visual images and to use natural language than lean media (Twitter). Furthermore, the results confirmed previous studies arguing that richer media is superior to the lean media to generate a stronger intention to purchase and buzz the brand, but did not build a more positive attitude toward the brand. In other words, when a medium is rich, which means more capable of carrying information, reducing message ambiguity, and facilitating feedback, the audience is more likely to exhibit a greater behavioral intention to purchase and buzz the brand, regardless of building strong attitudes.

The finding of this study related to the insignificant differences in attitude building between rich and lean media affirmed that media richness is an objective and physical characteristic of a medium (Timmerman & Madhavapeddi, 2008). That is, users perceive different levels of media richness mainly due to the objective characteristics of media, not in relation to their perception. Thus, the media richness, which is not associated with any
perception, did not exert a significant effect on consumers’ attitude building, which is mainly a cognitive process, but rather had a direct influence on behavioral intentions.

**Effects of Media Engagement**

Previous studies have demonstrated the positive relationship between media engagement and mainly attitudinal and cognitive outcomes. For example, Wang (2006) revealed the positive relationship of media engagement with message recall and believability, attitudes toward the message and advertising (Wang, 2006). In this regard, to explain the effects of media engagement, this study expected that media engagement would have a positive influence on consumers.

As expected, this study found significant differences between high versus low levels of media engagement, which supports previous findings of a positive relationship (i.e., Aaker & Brown, 1972; Cunningham et al., 2006; Kilger & Romer, 2007; Wang, 2006). Furthermore, this study extends the positive association of media engagement not only with attitudes but also with behavioral intentions. In general, consumer attitude theory has argued that individuals behave in a consistent way with their attitudes, as past studies have shown the positive relationship between attitude and behavior (Arbuthnot, 1977; Kellgren & Wood, 1986). Unlike media richness, media engagement supports the linear relationship between attitudes and behavioral intentions. Considering that media engagement originated from the concepts of “experience” and “interactivity,” the relationship between the users and media involves both cognitive and behavioral aspects. Thus, the positive attitudes engendered from the high engagement generated stronger intention to purchase and buzz the brand.

In spite of the significant importance of the relationships, it is noteworthy that the findings suggest a positive correlation but cannot guarantee causality, given that this study split respondents into three levels instead of manipulating them into high and low levels. In other
words, the positive relationships between the media engagement and outcome variables imply a strong association between the two but not a cause-effect relationship. Thus, those who are highly engaged in a specific media could exhibit a strong and positive response, while those who have a strong and positive response might be more likely to be engaged with the medium.

**Effects of Cause Involvement**

Another important element of CRM is the consumers’ involvement in the social cause promoted in the campaign (Broderik et al., 2003). Regardless of disciplinary differences, there has been considerable agreement that high involvement has greater personal relevance and consequences or elicits more personal connections than low involvement. In this regard, the present study examined the effectiveness of cause involvement on each of the dependent variables.

However, in contrast to the previous studies (i.e., Drumwright, 1996; Trimble & Rifon, 2006), the study observed unexpected findings such as the significant effect of cause involvement in terms of attitudes toward brand but in an opposite direction and no significant effects regarding the purchasing and WOM intentions. That is, people who were less-involved in a cause had more positive attitude relative to those who were highly-involved, but no differences were found between them for intention to purchase or to buzz the brand in this study.

Given that the concept of involvement is inherently associated with cognitive information processing, the influence of cause involvement only on attitudes and not behaviors can be explained. In addition, the reversed relationship between the involvement level and attitude building can be attributed to the different levels of negative valence to the issues. Individuals who are involved in the student loan debt issue might exhibit a stronger involvement level along with the unpleasant emotional responses than those who are involved in the Head Start issue.
The Moderating Role of Cause Involvement in Media Richness

The role of involvement in a social cause as a possible moderator was investigated. Hypothesis 4 concerned the moderating role of cause involvement on consumers’ attitudes and behavioral intentions in relation to media richness. Specifically, based on the ELM (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), the hypothesis expected that consumers in the less-involved cause group would have more positive attitude towards the brand and intent to purchase and buzz the product in lean media than in rich media. In contrast, consumers in the highly-involved cause group would have more positive attitude towards the brand and intent to purchase and buzz the product in rich media than in lean media. However, the study found no moderating role of cause involvement in any dependent variables. The failure of the interaction of cause involvement will be discussed along with the next hypothesis testing.

The Moderating Role of Cause Involvement in Media Engagement

This study also hypothesized the moderating role of cause involvement which interacted with media engagement. That is, less-involved individuals would have more positive attitude towards the brand and intent to purchase and buzz the brand in low media engagement than high media engagement, while highly-involved individuals would have more positive attitude towards the brand and intent to purchase and buzz the brand in high media engagement than low media engagement. Nevertheless, no significant interaction was found between cause involvement and media engagement.

This study did not find a strong impact of cause involvement and its interaction with media-bound factors. However, it seems rather hasty to conclude that the impact of cause involvement is minimal given that this study investigated cause involvement only in the realm of education. Moreover, the insignificant moderating role of cause involvement might be related to the strong negative attitudes towards the student loan debt issue. Thus, other relevant causes such
as environmental or human rights issues might derive strong involvement and result in a different finding.

**Theoretical and Practical Implication**

This study provides various theoretical and practical implications to practitioners and researchers in the advertising and media industry. First, the current research extends the realm of media richness theory from the traditional media into the new media context, especially in CRM context. Since media richness theory originated in the 1980s, the main research context has been focused on tradition media (i.e., Daft & Lengel, 1984; 1986; Carlson & Zmud, 1999). In the 2000s, although some researchers have adopted media richness theory into the new media context (Huang, Yang, Baek, & Lee, 2015; Lo & Lie, 2008; Van den Hooff, 2005), those studies utilized the media richness construct concerning the adoption and use of media. In other words, new media have been investigated in terms of how individuals choose among a variety of media options and what factors affect media selection decisions. However, no studies have examined media richness as an underlying factor that influences consumers’ attitudes and behavioral intentions. The current study was the first to investigate the media-bound factors to better understand CRM consumers.

Media richness theory had been developed and discussed in 1980s mainly with traditional one-way media. With the increasing diversification in media environments, there have been a few attempts to define media richness in the context of interactive media environments (Ledford, 2012). However, the efforts to do so seem insufficient considering the recent dynamic and complex media landscape changes. Therefore, the findings from this study should be interpreted cautiously. Even though this study did not reveal significant relationships between media-bound factors and cause involvement, the relationship between these variables cannot be dismissed.
Instead, the present study contributes to propositions which assert a need for academic efforts to conceptualize and theorize media-related factors.

Moreover, of particular interest is that results of this study offer theoretical contributions that shed light on the missing link between attitudes and behavioral intentions. The findings of the present study raise an issue regarding the attitude-behavior hierarchy. It is generally agreed that attitudes serve as antecedents of behaviors. For example, drawing on the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975; 1980), Smith and McSweeney (2007) stated that behavioral decisions are “the result of a reasoned process in which behavior is influenced by attitudes, norms, and perceptions of control over the behavior” (p. 367). However, this study revealed the irrelevant relationships between the attitudes and behavioral intentions in which strong purchase and WOM intentions were found even when there were no significant positive attitudes when the message was delivered in rich media. In the same vein, another disconnection was found in the relationship with cause involvement. Even though consumers had more positive attitudes, they were not willing to buy or buzz the brand.

To explain the confounding attitude-behavior gap (Manieri et al., 1997; Tanner & Kast, 2003; Webster, 1975; Wicker, 1969), especially of socially conscious consumerism such as green consumers, some potential moderators have been suggested. For example, need for information (i.e., Carrigan & Attalla, 2001) and perceived consumer effectiveness (i.e., Ellen, Wiener, & Cobb-Walgren, 1991) have been considered to be linked to the gap. Individuals would need additional knowledge regarding the cause of student loan debts and Head Start, which requires extra investment including time and cognition (Stanley & Lasonde, 1996). Then, it might moderate the relationship between attitude and behaviors. Perceived consumer
effectiveness, an evaluation of the self to what extent a respondent believes that an individual consumer can be effective in the context of the issue (Gupta & Ogden, 2006).

The findings of this study also have practical implications for communication practitioners in terms of media planning and targeting. The results suggest that consumers’ responses to CRM messages have been influenced mainly by media-bound factors rather than consumer-related factors. Traditionally, advertising planning mainly concerns consumers’ demographic and psychographic segmentation for its media targeting. However, this study claims that media-bound factors should be considered for holistic media planning. The findings of this study suggest that highly engaged consumers exhibit positive attitudes and stronger behavioral intention to purchase and buzz.

From a management perspective, taking into account the limited advertising budget, refined media planning is needed based on the media-bound factors such that targeting consumers who are more engaged in media may be required to provide information via rich media to deliver CRM messages. Furthermore, this study sheds light on and reveals the differences not only across medium types but also between vehicles, Instagram versus Twitter in particular. Recently, a variety of social media has been introduced. Pinterest and Snapchat are two examples. Given the different levels of media richness and engagement of each vehicle, the media planners must give attention not only to medium-wide outcomes, but also to vehicle-specific variables. The delicate balance between the two categories will result in stronger media planning opportunities overall.

**Limitations and Future Research**

By employing an experimental design in the CRM context, this study has provided some unexpected findings and potentially valuable implications; however, this study has several
limitations to be acknowledged and provides several avenues for future research of media-bound factors and cause involvement.

In terms of research execution, the present research was limited in its use of established scales to measure perceived media richness and media engagement. The perceived media richness scale was adopted from the previous studies of Carlson and Zmud (1999) and Dennis and Kinney (1998). Considering that the studies were based on the traditional one-way media, updating those scales might enhance the reliability of the study. Moreover, even though the employed media engagement scale was widely used mainly for the advertising industry, it has rarely been used for the academic purposes. Thus, further research is needed to develop another scales of media engagement measure for the sake of academic uses.

In addition, this study shares common weaknesses of using an experimental design, regarding its methodological issues. First, limitations can be found in terms of artificiality. Artificiality is considered a double-edged sword; the greatest benefit of experiments resides in the fact that they are artificial, but the utmost disadvantage of experiments also comes from their artificiality. Since this study adopted experiments that manipulate the participants to be either in high or low levels of cause involvement, which was intended to examine cause-effect relationships, the indicated involvement levels did not represent the respondents’ actual levels of involvement. As discussed above, the valence of each social cause should also be taken into account to figure out the reversed relationship of the involvement level on consumers. To address the limitations, therefore, future studies are needed to investigate how consumers’ involvement levels interact with other factors, utilizing survey methods as well as measuring the valence or attitudes toward the causes.
Second, this study was conducted using Amazon M-turk and Qualtrics, online tools with self-administered questionnaires. Compared to the traditional data-collecting methods such as paper-and-pencil survey, telephone or mail survey, advanced data collecting technology allows several benefits. Online platforms provide substantially cheaper cost, greater convenience to implement, and less time to collect data (Babbie, 2007; Spizziri, 2000). Nevertheless, online tools also have their inherent weaknesses, such as limiting the respondent pool to online users who have the ability to operate a computer and have access to the Internet. Even though using online tools seems appropriate for this study since this study aims to investigate the use of social media, using limited resources such as Amazon M-Turk might be another restriction in the sampling procedure.

In addition, related to stimulus in this study, although cautious efforts were made to embrace executional formats, this study only presented screen shots of computer-mediated Twitter and Instagram to the participants in the experiment. The way in which the Twitter and Instagram postings were shown to the subjects may lack realism due to the made-up design features. According to a recent Forbes report (2014), 37.3 million Americans used Twitter and 34.6 million Americans used Instagram on their smartphones in 2013. Considering that the rapidly increasing number of social media users are on mobile devices, further research using the mobile survey application platform would be another way to improve experimental realism, or ecological validity, so that the results could likely be generalized to a more natural environment.

Third, this study was also limited in its research scope regarding the use of media vehicles and dimensions of media engagement. For the sake of manipulation, this study employed two social media vehicles (Twitter and Instagram) within the social media category and one dimension of “Interactivity/Community” among several global and local dimensions of
media engagement. In this regard, even though this study failed to find any significant differences between high and low media engagement levels, this study is still open to the possibility that using other dimensions or all dimensions as a whole might elicit significant differences. Thus, future research can provide further investigation from different perspectives by adopting structural equation modeling (SEM) to test a conceptual or theoretical model related to media engagement dimensions. In addition, with regard to the use of a media vehicle of research interest, future research can delve into examining other vehicles within the social media category or different media outlets across media types such as social media on computer versus mobile.

Fourth, the intrinsic limitation of the self-administered method might be a factor. This study relied on the assumption that people are always aware of their attitudes and that people are able and willing to express themselves when requested. In addition, because this study deals with a social cause and uses the self-reported method, it suffers from a social desirability response bias. In particular, self-reported ethical attitudes and buying behaviors might bias the responses to be more positive than they actually are (King & Bruner, 2000; La Troobe, Helen, & Acott, 2000).

Fifth, the usage of a fictitious brand of a local bank in the experiment may raise limitations for the present study. Although the fictitious brand name was used to avoid any potential effects of the subjects’ prior attitudes toward existing brands on the dependent variables, consumers might hold prior positive or negative attitudes toward the industry and use such prior attitudes for purchase decision making. Thus, the findings of this study might not be applicable to all existing brands or industry. Hence, an alternative experimental design can use a real brand name while statistically controlling for subjects’ prior attitudes toward, and
perceptions of, the specific brand. That is, future studies should prevent any of the potential confounding variables in order to increase validity of the experiment.
Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to gauge audience impressions about causes and issues promoted on social media sites. This study investigates consumers’ response to the cause-related marketing (CRM) advertisements.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

For this study, you are asked to respond to a survey about social media and individuals’ attitudes toward branded causes promoted through digital media sites. The survey will begin with a few questions that will gauge your qualification for participation. If you meet the qualifications, you will be asked to answer a series of questions.

Time required: The survey is projected to take less than 15 minutes

Risks and Benefits:

There is a minimal risk that security of any online data may be breached, but since the online host uses several layers of encryption and firewalls and your data will be downloaded from the server soon after you complete the activity, it is unlikely that a security breach of the online data will result in any adverse consequence for you. There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the study.

Compensation: You will be given 50 cents value online money. You will not be denying MTurk compensation for any reason once a Worker begins the survey.

Confidentiality:

Your identity will not be known to the researchers. Your MTurk Worker ID will be used only for the purpose of awarding compensation, and will not be shared with anyone outside the research team. It will not be linked with your survey responses, and will be removed from the data set once compensation has been made. (Note that your Worker ID can be linked to your Amazon user’s public profile page, so you may wish to restrict what information you choose to share in your public profile.)

Voluntary participation:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You can decide not to answer any questions you do not want to respond.

Right to withdraw from the study:

You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Seul Lee, Doctoral Student, College of Journalism and Communications, G044 Weimer Hall, PO Box 118400, Gainesville, FL 32611, phone 392-8271.
Cynthia Morton, Associate Professor, College of Journalism and Communications, 2082 Weimer Hall, PO Box 118400, Gainesville, FL 32611, phone 392-8841

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

Agreement:

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: ___________________________________________ Date: _________________
Principal Investigator: _______________________________ Date: _________________
1. High involvement in rich media (Student loan debts in Instagram)

**How Student Loans Can Ruin Your Life Decades After You Graduate**
By Christina Samuels on January 6, 2015

The “Calculated Choices: Examining Debt and Retirement Savings Decisions” report from the Secure Retirement Institute found that millennials - characterized as young adults between 21 and 34 years old - who enter the workforce with student debt are less likely to take full advantage of an employer-provided 401(k) match.

“Millennials without student loans are 60 percent more likely to maximize their employer match compared with those who are paying education loans,” the institute reported in a recent blog post about the findings.

The upshot is that millennials are paying off their student loans at the expense of their retirement savings, a trade-off that could cost them in a big way decades down the line.

Today’s young adults entered the job market in a lackluster economy, and many had their early career ambitions derailed by extended stints of un- or underemployment. Average student loan debts have never been higher, but the people carrying those debts aren’t landing good-paying jobs the way they might have expected.
GRADUATE FROM COLLEGE
FOOTLOOSE & DEBT FREE

63 likes
RoyalOaksBank This year, seven out of 10 new college graduates have student loan debt. The majority of borrowers are still paying the student loans into their 30s. In support of #StudentDebtFree Royal Oaks Bank can help them to find relief from financial stress.
2. Low involvement in rich media (Head Start in Instagram)

**Head Start, Child Care See Boosts Under Congressional Budget Deal**
By Christina Samuels on January 6, 2015

Head Start, the federally funded preschool program for children from low-income families, would see an increase of $570 million, to $9.2 billion, in a fiscal 2016 budget bill announced Wednesday by the House appropriations committee.

In addition, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which helps low-income families pay for child care, would see an additional $326 million for a total of $2.8 billion.

In 2014, Congress revamped the child-care block grant program to improve safety and quality. New rules are in place that are intended to reduce "churn" in the program, such as when a family's eligibility changes after a family member gets a job or a pay increase.

The bill "is an encouraging step forward in our shared commitment to ensuring every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, has the opportunity to succeed," said Yasmina Vinci, the executive director of the National Head Start Association, in a statement.
This year, Head Start has helped nearly one million children up to 5-year-old to support their school readiness. In support of #DollarPerChild Royal Oaks Bank can help Head Start to ensure children’s voices are heard.
3. High involvement in lean media (Student loan debts in Twitter)

How Student Loans Can Ruin Your Life Decades After You Graduate
By Christina Samuels on January 6, 2015

The “Calculated Choices: Examining Debt and Retirement Savings Decisions” report from the Secure Retirement Institute found that millennials - characterized as young adults between 21 and 34 years old - who enter the workforce with student debt are less likely to take full advantage of an employer-provided 401(k) match.

“Millennials without student loans are 60 percent more likely to maximize their employer match compared with those who are paying education loans,” the institute reported in a recent blog post about the findings.

The upshot is that millennials are paying off their student loans at the expense of their retirement savings, a trade-off that could cost them in a big way decades down the line.

Today’s young adults entered the job market in a lackluster economy, and many had their early career ambitions derailed by extended stints of un- or underemployment. Average student loan debts have never been higher, but the people carrying those debts aren’t landing good-paying jobs the way they might have expected.
4. Low involvement in lean media (Head Start in Twitter)

**Head Start, Child Care See Boosts Under Congressional Budget Deal**
By Christina Samuels on January 6, 2015

Head Start, the federally funded preschool program for children from low-income families, would see an increase of $570 million, to $9.2 billion, in a fiscal 2016 budget bill announced Wednesday by the House appropriations committee.

In addition, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which helps low-income families pay for child care, would see an additional $326 million for a total of $2.8 billion.

In 2014, Congress revamped the child-care block grant program to improve safety and quality. New rules are in place that are intended to reduce "churn" in the program, such as when a family's eligibility changes after a family member gets a job or a pay increase.

The bill "is an encouraging step forward in our shared commitment to ensuring every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, has the opportunity to succeed," said Yasmina Vinci, the executive director of the National Head Start Association, in a statement.
APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE

[Group1. Instagram]
Filtering Questions
1. Do you have accounts in Instagram?
   a. Yes, I have. ► Proceed
   b. No, I do not have. ► Not qualified to participate

2. In the past week, on average, how many minutes PER DAY have you spent actively using Instagram? ________ minutes

SECTION 1. Media Engagement Measures
[Media Engagement]
The following are some statements about your experiences and impressions on Instagram. Please read each of the following statements carefully and respond as honestly as possible based on your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. Instagram does a good job of getting followers/friends to contribute or provide feedback.
2. I'm as interested in input from other users as I am in the regular content on Instagram.
3. I've gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn't have because of others on Instagram.

SECTION 2. Media Richness X Cause Involvement Manipulation
Now, please take a look at the Instagram posting as below. Questions about the advertisement will follow. Please view the advertisement carefully. Once you proceed, you will not be allowed to return to this page.

Exposure to one of two stimuli
media richness (rich=Instagram) X cause involvement (high/low)

Q. Please specify what social cause is promoted in this ad. ________________
Based on the ad, please provide your opinion about the cause on the scales below that best reflects your attitudes based on your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. The cause in this ad matters to me.
2. The cause in this ad is relevant to me.
3. The cause in this ad means nothing to me.*
4. The cause in this ad is important to me.
5. The cause in this ad is of no concern to me.*
6. The cause in this ad is significant to me.

With regard to Instagram used for the ad, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements. There are no right or no answers, so select the number that most closely reflects your agreement on each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. Instagram allows me to give and receive timely feedback.
2. Instagram allows me to tailor my messages to my own personal requirements.
3. Instagram allows me to communicate a variety of different cues (such as emotional tone, attitude, or formality) in my messages.
4. Instagram allows me to use rich and varied language in my messages.
5. I could easily explain things using Instagram.
6. Instagram helps me to communicate quickly.
7. Instagram helps me to better understand others.

SECTION 3. Dependent Variables
Based on your awareness of the ad, please indicate how you feel about the ad that you just saw by indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

Attitude towards the Brand
1. I like Royal Oaks Bank.
2. I associate positive things with Royal Oaks Bank.
3. I find Royal Oaks Bank favorable.

Purchase Intentions
1. The likelihood of purchasing Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…
2. The probability that I would consider buying Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…
3. My willingness to buy Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…

Word-of-Mouth Intentions
1. I would recommend Royal Oaks Bank to someone who seeks my advice.
2. I say positive things about Royal Oaks Bank to other people.
3. I would generally recommend Royal Oaks Bank to others.
Filtering Questions

1. Do you have accounts in Twitter?
   a. Yes, I have. ► Proceed
   b. No, I do not have. ► Not qualified to participate

2. In the past week, on average, how many minutes PER DAY have you spent actively using Twitter? __________ minutes

SECTION 1. Media Engagement Measures

[Media Engagement]
The following are some statements about your experiences and impressions on Twitter. Please read each of the following statements carefully and respond as honestly as possible based on your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. Twitter does a good job of getting followers/friends to contribute or provide feedback.
2. I’m as interested in input from other users as I am in the regular content on Twitter.
3. I’ve gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn’t have because of others on Twitter.

SECTION 2. Media Richness X Cause Involvement Manipulation

Now, please take a look at the Twitter posting as below. Questions about the advertisement will follow. Please view the advertisement carefully. Once you proceed, you will not be allowed to return to this page.

Exposure to one of four stimuli
media richness (lean=Twitter) X cause involvement (high/low)

Q. Please specify what social cause is promoted in this ad. ______________

Based on the ad, please provide your opinion about the cause on the scales below that best reflects your attitudes based on your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. The cause in this ad matters to me.
2. The cause in this ad is relevant to me.
3. The cause in this ad means nothing to me.*
4. The cause in this ad is important to me.
5. The cause in this ad is of no concern to me.*
6. The cause in this ad is significant to me.
With regard to Twitter used for the ad, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements. There are no — right or — no answers, so select the number that most closely reflects your agreement on each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

1. Twitter allows me to give and receive timely feedback.
2. Twitter allows me to tailor my messages to my own personal requirements.
3. Twitter allows me to communicate a variety of different cues (such as emotional tone, attitude, or formality) in my messages.
4. Twitter allows me to use rich and varied language in my messages.
5. I could easily explain things using Twitter.
6. Twitter helps me to communicate quickly.
7. Twitter helps me to better understand others.

SECTION 3. Dependent Variables
Based on your awareness of the ad, please indicate how you feel about the ad that you just saw by indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree)

Attitude towards the Brand
4. I like Royal Oaks Bank.
5. I associate positive things with Royal Oaks Bank.
6. I find Royal Oaks Bank favorable.

Purchase Intentions
4. The likelihood of purchasing Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…
5. The probability that I would consider buying Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…
6. My willingness to buy Royal Oaks Bank’s product is…

Word-of-Mouth Intentions
4. I would recommend Royal Oaks Bank to someone who seeks my advice.
5. I say positive things about Royal Oaks Bank to other people.
6. I would generally recommend Royal Oaks Bank to others.
APPENDIX D
PRETEST RESULTS

Prior to the study execution, a series of pretests have been conducted to set up the editorial context for the study and to better simulate all independent variable manipulations and message readability. The subjects were recruited from Amazon M-Turk, an online-based paid recruiting service, in exchange for 50 cents paid to each participant. The subjects participated in the survey at their convenience. Upon consenting to participate, the subjects were asked to rate their perceived media richness of Instagram and Twitter usage. Next, they were asked to rate their involvement levels in each cause using ten items from Zaichkowski’s (1994) revised Personal Involvement Inventory (PII). Then, they were released after answering demographic questions (i.e., gender, age).

For this pretest, a total of 133 American adults between the ages of 18-49 participated in a Web-based survey. Specifically, the number of subjects in the rich (Instagram) and lean (Twitter) media conditions consisted of 37 and 37 each. Males and females comprised 63.9 percent and 36.1 percent of the sample, respectively. The age of the subjects ranged from 18 to 49 years old, and the mean age was 29.1 ($SD = 7.3$). Approximately, 63.9 percent of subjects were Caucasian, 16.5 percent Asian, 8.3 percent Hispanic, 6.8 percent African-American, and 4.6 percent other races. Subjects reported that in the past week, they spent 35.6 minutes ($SD = 48.5$) and 41.4 minutes ($SD = 58.7$) per day actively using Instagram and Twitter respectively. The Sample profile was summarized in Table D-1.

A series of t-tests were performed to find out whether there were any differences in media usage levels across experimental groups. However, no significant differences were found across conditions on subjects’ usage of Instagram/Twitter, suggesting random assignment of participants across all conditions. Additionally, another series of t-test and analyses of variances
(ANOVA) were conducted to examine any potential effects of subjects’ demographics (i.e.,
gender, education level, and ethnicity) on dependent variables (i.e., attitude toward advertising,
attitude toward product, and purchase intention). However, no significant differences among the
subject demographics were found in any of dependent variables.

Regarding manipulation checks for media richness, perceived media richness
(Cronbach’s $\alpha = .735$) was found to be significantly different, $t (37) = 2.45, p = .02$, indicating
that participants perceived Instagram as a rich vehicle ($M = 3.5, SD = 0.66$) and Twitter as a lean
vehicle ($M = 3.1, SD = 0.85$), as expected.

For the manipulation of cause involvement (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .735$), the high involvement
group with student loan debts showed significantly higher level of involvement ($M = 4.1, SD =
0.86$) than the low involvement group with Head Start ($M = 3.6, SD = 1.08$, $t (63) = 2.03, p$
$= .047$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>29.1 (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12th grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes of Instagram usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>34.6 (48.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes of Twitter usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD)</td>
<td>41.4 (58.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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