AN EVALUATION OF CAUSE-RELATED MARKETING AND A SCALE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION
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This study was conducted to develop a consumer driven scale for factors which have an effect on the tendency to participate in cause-related marketing campaigns. After detailed analysis, a scale was developed with 10 dimensions. Scale assessment was done based on a sample (n= 451) which was retained by convenience sampling methodology. The analysis process is as follows: Data analysis and norm distribution analysis for sample, explanatory factor analysis, reliability and validity analysis for explanatory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, validity and reliability analysis for confirmatory factor analysis, and structural equation modeling.

According to the research, scale which was developed contains factors as follows: brand cause fit, masculinity / femininity, uncertainty avoidance, willingness to help others, individualism, cause familiarity, brand image, brand familiarity, and willingness to participate in campaigns. This study aims to be a base for future research related to the factors which were developed.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to develop a scale by determining the factors that are influential in terms of consumer purchasing behaviors in the participating banking sector. Cause Related Marketing (CM) is closely related to issues such as consumer behavior, social marketing, and consumer psychology. On the other hand, social marketing activities are also gaining importance for collecting such assistance and engaging the community. Social marketing activities can have an important effect in the sense of awareness of the private sector and individuals, and of promoting such aid campaigns. As mentioned by Stukas et al. (2008: 959), it also contains many benefits that follow volunteerism. The increase in volunteerism at the social level also leads to an increase in social capital. In other words, the increase of social capital contributes to the decrease of crime rates, the decrease of loneliness, the decrease of poverty, and the improvement of social problems. The increase in volunteer activities can also benefit the environmental community. In this study, a literature research was carried out to form the basis for the scale development study, and an item pool was established. Then, scale development work was carried out. Lastly, the results of the study
were evaluated in terms of managerial effects, limits of the study, and future research opportunities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Vardarajan and Menon (1988: 58), Cause Related Marketing (CM) emerged as a new form of Corporate Social Responsibility with the motivation to make profit-oriented donations at the beginning of the 1980's. It is generally known as the American Express company's initiative (Liu, 2012: 243) as the first effective example of CM, with regard to the statue of liberty in the United States and the renovation of Ellis Island. Through this program, American Express would spend 1 Agency (US) for each credit card expense transaction, and 1 dollar (US) for every credit card account opened, to repair the island of Ellis. As a result, 1.6 million US dollars were collected from this campaign. For this campaign, the company also spent $ 6 million for promotion.

2.1. Cause and Consumer Interaction Dimensions

Cause awareness, like brand awareness, has been the subject of various researches in terms of consumer involvement in CM activities. Bettman and Sujan (1987: 454) describe awareness as the result of the knowledge that accumulates in the consumer about a product or cause over a certain period of time. Zdravkovic et al. (2010: 151) state that the social problem addressed in the CM activity which has been carried out, has a positive reputation in the consumer.

2.2. Consumers Cultural Dimensions

The uncertainty avoidance variable relates to whether or not a person feels confident when faced with uncertain situations, and these uncertain situations are; original, unknown, unexpected, and different compared to normal situations and should not be confused with risk avoidance (Hofstede, 2011: 181). Individualism is used to measure the extent to which individuals are involved in the society. In societies where the concept of individualism is high, it can be said that individual interests and goals are ahead of social interests and targets. The fact that people feel themselves as either a member of a group or as an individual, constitutes the basic two extremes of the index. According to Hofstede (2011), the variables of Masculinity and Femininity are not individual but social variables. There is no difference in social roles and emotional reactions in a society where femininity is heavily repressed. Power Distance: It is about the acceptance of the less equitable distribution of power (including the family) in a power-driven organization and the extent to which it has an expectation (www.asha.org). Long-term orientation / short-term orientation focuses on whether societies focus on the future with a pragmatic focus, or with a traditional historical approach to the past (www.Asha.org). A short-term oriented society is focused on the past and the present, keeping the tradition preliminary. However, a long-term focused society is more pragmatic and evaluates its relationships according to the situation.

2.2.1. Consumers Psychographic Characteristics Dimensions

The sense of belonging is basically a matter of social psychology. The Alptekin (2011) definition about the sense of belonging is briefly as follows: "Belonging, which is a word meaning 'relationship', 'personality', 'state of belonging', is a concept that can be understood by means of association. The direction of association can be any object, human, community, ethnic group, or social categorization. The need for cognition is shown as a decisive factor in the volunteer activities of people. The need for a cognition scale is a measure developed by Cacioppo and Petty (1982) to determine the tendency of people to think about their level of satisfaction. The concept of needing to know or think can be considered as the enthusiasm and..."
motivation that one hears about conceptual information (Kerr and Das, 2013: 103; Cacioppo et al., 1982: 116). The need for security is a fundamental aspect of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory is a theory of human psychology that was developed in 1943 by the American psychologist Abraham Maslow and developed later (Koltko-Riviera, 2006: 302). According to this hierarchy, mankind tries to meet the needs of a higher level after meeting their basic needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs requirements are categorized as follows (Koltko-Riviera, 2006: 302):

1. Physiological needs (working to achieve essential life requirements),
2. Security needs (to provide security with orders and rules),
3. Need for belonging, love, compassion (to establish good relations with a group),
4. Need for prestige (recognition and achievement),
5. The need for self-fulfillment (realizing personal potential, giving an opinion).

It is an inevitable fact that the tendency to help other people has an important influence on volunteering activities. Whether or not the person's philanthropic tendency is triggered, when, where, and in what circumstances, can be important elements in terms of the tendency to participate in CM activities. In fact, this tendency, which is a topic of social psychology, can also be a decisive factor in terms of CM. According to Query (2006: 11), the more people observe a social problem, the less the people tend to help. In fact, when a person feels good he becomes more inclined to help others (Freedman et al., 1976). Thus, it can be considered as a fact that cooperation and beneficence behaviors increase happiness.

2.2.2. Product Features Dimensions

Brand awareness is an important component contributing to the increase of brand value by creating brand loyalty (Dlacic and Kezman, 2014: 121). Brand awareness can be defined as the ability of the consumer to recognize or define the brand (Taşkın and Akat 2010: 2). A brand with high brand awareness has an important place in creating a high brand image (Keller, 1998: 299), as well as having a higher probability of entering the consumer basket during the purchasing phase than low brand awareness. The brand image is basically related to the personality of the brand, and it can be predicted that this perception of personality created in the consumer in this frame, will affect the participation in the activities of the CM. Brand personality can be defined as all of the human characteristics associated with the brand (Aaker, 1997: 347). A brand is the customer experience formed by the combination of images and ideas in the consumer's mind; it is usually expressed by a symbol consisting of a logo, slogan, and design (www.AMA.org). The type of product is handled differently, depending on the purpose of the research in the various studies. Mucuk (2012: 127) describes it according to consumption purposes and easily distinguishes four categories as convenience goods, shopping goods, specialty goods, and unsought goods. While it is easy to meet the basic needs of the convenience goods, it is necessary to make comparisons according to the characteristics of the consumer products in the shopping goods.

2.2.3. Demographic Dimensions

In the study, it is desired to express how the basic demographic characteristics of the consumer, dealt with by the title of demographic characteristics, are related to consumer participation. Age, gender, marital status, income level, and education level are considered as main characteristics.
3. ITEM GENERATION

3.1. Methodology

The research was conducted with explanatory research methodology. Churchill (1979) has developed a well-recognized process in valid and reliable, multi-factorial studies (Terblanche and Boshoff, 2006: 33). This process is as follows: identifying the study area, producing a questionnaire, conducting the experimental survey, developing a scale-based scale in the validity check and reliability assessment, and creating rules.

The entire population of the research is consumers over the age of 18 who have the potential to use credit card or debit card products in banks. According to Yazicioglu and Erdogan (2004), for a sample exceeding 10 million in the 95% confidence interval, 96 samples with sampling error 0.10 and 384 samples with 0.05 sampling error are sufficient. In the study, the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were checked with a pilot study of 105 people. Later on, in the 95% confidence interval, the entire population of the survey was over one million, so a survey of 451 people was made considering a minimum of 384 people.

Data collection process was carried out by sending a questionnaire link prepared on the internet. First of all, the questionnaire concerned Kuwait Turk's campaign with KAÇUV since April 2013 on April 23rd. In this campaign, Kuveyt Türk donated a certain amount (1 TL, 0,5 TL) to KAÇUV as Kuveyt Türk for each shopping transaction made with Kuveyt Türk Bank card and credit card for one week.

The survey method was used for convenience sampling, and people who reside in İstanbul, over 18 years old, were surveyed. Survey questionnaires were asked in the 5 Likert scale, and a total of 92 survey questionnaires were targeted. In the research questions, the following scale was given with the question: "5 is very important, 1 is definitely not important", in the questions that ask: "5 completely agree, 1 absolutely disagree".
Table 3.1. Question Numbers and Dimensions

| Dimension                           | Question |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Cause Awareness                     | 5        |
| Cause Importance                    | 5        |
| Tendency to Participate             | 5        |
| Uncertainty Avoidance              | 5        |
| Individualism                       | 6        |
| Masculinity                         | 4        |
| Power Distance                      | 5        |
| Sense of Belonging                  | 4        |
| Need for Cognition                  | 4        |
| Need for Security                   | 4        |
| Self Fulfilment                     | 4        |
| Having Good Relationships with      | 4        |
| Tendency to Help Others             | 5        |
| Brand Awareness                     | 5        |
| Brand Image                         | 5        |
| Brand Cause fit                     | 5        |
| Product Type                        | 5        |
| Long Term / Short Term              | 6        |
| Demographic Characteristics         | 6        |
| Total Number                        | 92       |

4. SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Firstly, the validity of the research structure is indispensable for developing the scale. According to Terblache and Boshoff (2006), Structural Equation Modeling and Confirmatory Factor Analysis are statistical measurement tools that facilitate measurement of validity. The Structural Equation Model, or shortly, SEM, provides an objective comparison of the experimental model with a theoretical model. According to Terblache and Boshoff (2006), SEM has two basic features: the first is to express multi-relational dependencies, the second to describe the error measurement in the estimation process, and to represent the unobservable situations in the relationship.

In this research, the scale development process has been successfully carried out on the basis of generally accepted scale development indicators and processes.

4.1. Calculation

At this stage of the research, the statistical analyzes necessary for scale development was carried out with SPSS 22 and SPSS Amos applications. The data analysis and findings of
the research were submitted under two main phases. First of all, data analysis and findings of the preliminary study are shared after the data analysis and findings of the final study.

4.2. Preliminary Analysis Structure

A standard questionnaire of 102 persons remained after the removal of the items with a standard deviation of "0" and no valid response in the sample of 106 persons. The table with the demographic information of the pilot study of 102 persons is as follows.

When the sample of the pilot study was examined, 57% of the participants in the sample of 102 persons were women and 43% were male.

In the second phase of the study, the kurtosis values of the factor variables were examined. With general acceptance, it is stated that if there are small kurtosis values greater than or equal to 1 or less than -2, they are values that should not be followed by normal distribution. Therefore, the related questions are not clearly asked or are not explanatory variables for research. Although there is no value above the criterion value of 10, these records were monitored in the Exploratory Factor Analysis. After this study, Exploratory Factor Analysis was carried out. Maximum Likelihood was selected as the factor analysis method, and the filter is set to take values greater than 1 as the filter. As a rotation option, Promax has been chosen because it is considered to be a relationship between them. KMO and Bartlett sphericity were accepted as indicators for the factorability test.

The KMO and Bartlett test result is as follows when the exploratory factor analysis is run with all variables. As a result, no measurable result was obtained because the KMO statistic was well below the 0.6 value. In this case, both the kurtosis and the correlation coefficients are related to the variance of what is done by the variance looked at.

Table 4.1. KMO ve Bartlett Sphericity Test Results

| Bartlett Sphericity Test | KMO Coefficient |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Chi Square               | 7723.294        |
| Sd                       | 3655            |
| Sig                      | 0.000           |

According to Costello et al., The Communalities coefficients are between 0.40 and 0.70 (2005). A value lower than 0.3 indicates that the variable is probably not related to that factor. The value of goodness fit in the first place was not significant.

In the pilot analysis study, after the removal of many variables, the KMO and Bartlett test were found to give ultimately significant results. Factor results were obtained with 32 variables in the final case. However, under the final factors, 8 question expressions were added and re-added to provide at least 3 variable limits. Therefore, the questionnaire with 92 questions was reduced to 46 questions with 40 variables and 6 demographic information questions. As a result of the pilot study, reliability and validity values were provided. KMO and Bartlett test values are shown in the table below.
On the other hand, the variance explained in 8 factors exceeded 60%, in total 9 factors were formed. The alpha reliability values and load values for the factors are shown in the following table. No cross load was observed. There was no factor load below 0.3 for scale validity (Convergent Validity). For the discriminant validity, which is the other criterion of construct validity, the correlation matrix of factors is looked at. It was determined that all relations were below 0.5 and there was no problem. As a result of the study, the questionnaire was sent to a wider list of participants.

4.3. Factor Structure

After the removal of the items whose standard deviation was equal to “0”, the surveys of 364 people with valid responses remained. The table with the demographic information of the study is as in Table 4.3.

### Table 4.2. KMO ve Bartlett Sphericity Test Results

| Bartlett Sphericity Test | KMO Coefficient | Chi Square   | Sd  | Sig  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----|------|
|                          | .724            | 2200.020     | 528 | .000 |
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When the sample of the research was examined, 53% of the participants in the 364-person sample were male, and 47% were female.

| Table 4.3. Final Analysis Demographic Results |
|----------------------------------------------|
| **Statistics**     | **Number** | **Percentage** |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|
| **Gender**        |            |                |
| Male              | 194        | 47%            |
| Female            | 170        | 53%            |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
| **Marital Status**|            |                |
| Single            | 179        | 51%            |
| Married           | 185        | 49%            |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
| **Age**           |            |                |
| 19-24             | 93         | 25%            |
| 25-36             | 229        | 63%            |
| 37-55             | 42         | 12%            |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
| **Education**     |            |                |
| Elementary        | 4          | 1%             |
| Secondary         | 12         | 3%             |
| Undergraduate     | 228        | 63%            |
| Graduate          | 120        | 33%            |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
| **Net Personal Income** |    |                |
| 0-1000            | 59         | 16%            |
| 1001-3000         | 102        | 28%            |
| 3001-5000         | 105        | 29%            |
| 5001-10000        | 81         | 22%            |
| 10000+            | 17         | 5%             |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
| **Net Household Income** | |                |
| 0-1000            | 7          | 2%             |
| 1001-3000         | 56         | 15%            |
| 3001-5000         | 95         | 26%            |
| 5001-10000        | 123        | 34%            |
| 10000+            | 83         | 23%            |
| Grand Total       | 364        | 100%           |
In the course of future research, the income variable will be divided into two separate groups and the measurement invariance test will be performed for factor analysis. In the second phase of the study, the kurtosis values and standard deviations of the factor variables were examined. Standard deviations vary from 0 to 1. On the other hand, it is stated that the general acceptance values greater than 1 or smaller than -2 should be monitored. However, the kurtosis is accepted up to 10 (Hair et al., 2010). When if this case revealed, it means that the related questions are not clearly asked or are not explanatory variables for research.

It is seen that the variables of AO_3, AO_4, KE_1, KE_2, BK_1, BK_2, BK_3, YE_3, YE_4, YE_5, MA_5, MI_1, MI_2 and MI_3 show the kurtosis properties. Although there is no value above the criterion value of 10, these records will be followed in the Explanatory Factor Analysis.

4.4. Explanatory Factor Analysis

Maximum Likelihood was selected as a factor analysis method, and the filter was set to take eigen values larger than the value of 1 (Altunışık et al., 2012: 266). As a rotation option, Promax has been selected because the factors are considered to be interrelated. KMO and Bartlett coefficients were accepted as indicators for the factorability test. In addition, correlation coefficients less than 0.3 were filtered out in the first step due to the general acceptance.

The KMO and Bartlett test result is as follows when the Explanatory Factor Analysis is run with all variables. According to the result, the KMO was 0.898, well above 0.6. Since the Bartlett test also yielded significant results, no problems were found in terms of factorability. In this case, the results of KMO and Bartlett sphericity test are in the following table.

|                  | KMO Coefficient | Bartlett Sphericity Test |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
|                  | .898            | Chi Square 8627.940      |
|                  |                 | Sd 780                  |
|                  |                 | Sig .000                |

The Communalities coefficients are between 0.40 and 0.70, which is known as the general acceptance, but the ratio of the total variance to the common factors. For coherence, a value less than 0.3 with the general acceptance indicates that the variable is probably not related to that factor. Therefore, the Communalities Table has small values from 0.3. AB_2, AO_5, AO_2 were found to be between 0.2 – 0.3. However, they have not been removed in the first place since they are not on the list of scantlings.

On the other hand, the variance explained in 10 factors exceeded 60%. In factor analysis, the researcher chooses the number of dimensions that occur and goes to the number of factors to reach a certain level of total explained variance (Altunışık et al., 2012: 266). Thus, the variance explained in 10 factors was above the accepted threshold of 60%. Table 4.5 shows the eigenvalues for the dimensions and the total explanatory variance values. After examining the described variance values, the factor pattern matrix is looked at to see if the factor loads have significant values and whether they have cross-correlations. As seen in
Table 4.6, 10 factors were found to be well distributed apart from 3 variables. (KE_2, KE_1 and MA_2) were considered as variables to be examined.

### Table 4.5. Eigen Values and Total Variance Explained

| Factor | Initial Eigen Values | Extraction | Rotation |
|--------|----------------------|------------|----------|
|        | Total | % Variance | Cumulative% | Total | % Variance | Cumulative % | Total |
| 1      | 11,207 | 28,017 | 28,017 | 5,810 | 14,526 | 14,526 | 7,709 |
| 2      | 3,660  | 9,149  | 37,166 | 5,845 | 14,613 | 29,139 | 7,673 |
| 3      | 2,673  | 6,684  | 43,849 | 3,334 | 8,334  | 37,473 | 5,302 |
| 4      | 2,166  | 5,416  | 49,265 | 2,082 | 5,205  | 42,678 | 7,113 |
| 5      | 1,685  | 4,214  | 53,479 | 1,235 | 3,089  | 45,766 | 3,258 |
| 6      | 1,607  | 4,017  | 57,496 | 1,772 | 4,429  | 50,195 | 3,408 |
| 7      | 1,368  | 3,421  | 60,917 | 1,147 | 2,866  | 53,062 | 4,697 |
| 8      | 1,257  | 3,143  | 64,060 | 1,119 | 2,797  | 55,859 | 3,690 |
| 9      | 1,186  | 2,966  | 67,026 | 1,164 | 2,909  | 58,768 | 3,217 |
| 10     | 1,059  | 2,647  | 69,673 | .792  | 1,981  | 60,748 | 5,637 |
| 11     | .884   | 2,210  | 71,883 | .581  | 1,453  | 62,201 | 5,080 |
| 12     | .813   | 2,033  | 73,916 | .317  | .793   | 62,994 | 4,532 |

Besides, MA_2 is removed as a variable because it is left alone. When MA_2 was removed and run again for model factor analysis, all the indicators were observed to give good results. However, it was seen that the KE_2 and KE_1 variables showed a distinct pattern. For this reason, the KE_2 variable, which has a higher kurtosis and a lower value of load, was introduced in the first place. However, since the KE_1 variable was not found to have any factor, the KE_1 variable was also removed. After removal of these variables, there was improvement in communality indicators and factor loadings. The KMO coefficient was 0.890 and the Bartlett Test gave significant results. Finally, it is seen that the MA_5 variable is loaded in the MI factor group and is below 0.5, so it is removed from the variable group. Then, the alpha reliability coefficients of the remaining variable groups were examined. In the latter case, the resulting factor structure and alpha reliability coefficients are shown in Table 4.6 below.

As seen in Table 4.6, the alpha reliability values exceeded the 0.6 threshold. On the other hand, under each factor, at least 3 variable conditions were fulfilled for 9 factors. Participation tendency factor was significant with 2 variables. It has been accepted as exceptional because it has been found that the factor loadings of the Participation tendency are close to 1 value. No factor load was found below 0.3 for a total of 10 factors.
Table 4.6. Factor Pattern Matrix, Load Values and Alpha Reliabilities

| Cronbach’s Alfa | 0.841 | 0.946 | 0.780 | 0.761 | 0.775 | 0.776 | 0.915 | 0.780 | 0.834 | 0.659 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                 | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    |
| MB_2            | 0.930 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MB_3            | 0.917 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MB_5            | 0.911 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MB_1            | 0.802 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MB_4            | 0.767 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MI_1            | 0.915 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MI_4            | 0.807 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MI_2            | 0.805 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| MI_3            | 0.616 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| AB_5            | 0.905 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| AB_4            | 0.728 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| AB_3            | 0.666 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| AB_2            | 0.448 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| BH_6            |       | 0.775 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| BH_5            |       | 0.748 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| BH_2            |       | 0.645 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| BH_1            |       | 0.558 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| EK_3            |       |       | 0.827 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| EK_1            |       |       | 0.682 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| EK_2            |       |       | 0.633 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| EK_4            |       |       | 0.619 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| YE_4            |       |       |       | 0.928 |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| YE_5            |       |       |       | 0.897 |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| YE_3            |       |       |       | 0.586 |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| BK_2            |       |       |       |       | 0.891 |       |       |       |       |       |
| BK_3            |       |       |       |       |       | 0.646 |       |       |       |       |
After not having any problems with the reliability of the study, the scale validity (Convergent Validity) and the discriminant validity (Structural Validity), which are two criteria of construction validity, were examined. For the validity of the scale, factor matrix was checked for small factor load from 0.3, and no problems were found. For discriminant validity, the inter-factorial relationships were examined after it was found that there were no cross-overs. In the Factor Correlation Matrix Table (Table 4.7), factor associations can be seen.

Table 4.7: Factor Correlation Matrix

| Factor |  1  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6  |  7  |  8  |  9  | 10  |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1      | 1.00| .614| .319| .351| .289| .166| .110| .067| .478| .510|
| 2      | .614| 1.00| .196| .399| .299| .332| .142| .140| .583| .502|
| 3      | .319| .196| 1.000| .240| .075| .067| .119| .196| .161| .199|
| 4      | .351| .399| .240| 1.000| .320| .338| .253| .234| .404| .383|
| 5      | .289| .299| .075| .320| 1.000| .215| .128| .040| .281| .262|
| 6      | .166| .332| .067| .338| .215| 1.000| .385| .518| .459| .274|
| 7      | .110| .142| .119| .253| .128| .385| 1.000| .423| .259| .277|
| 8      | .067| .140| .196| .234| .040| .518| .423| 1.000| .252| .201|
| 9      | .478| .588| .161| .404| .281| .459| .259| .252| 1.000| .570|
| 10     | .510| .502| .199| .383| .262| .274| .277| .201| .570| 1.000|

When the factor correlation matrix is examined, it is seen that the majority of the relations among the factors are changed between 0.3 – 0.6. In this case, it follows the basic threshold values sought in factor analysis (Altunışık et al., 2012: 266).
4.5. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

In the final structure formed by Explanatory Factor Analysis, 10 factor groups were formed. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis in this study was conducted as a result of analyzing the 10-factor structure obtained in Explanatory Factor Analysis by SPSS AMOS application. Once the draft model has been generated, it is run in the AMOS program for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis test. After the necessary statistics for the analysis have been selected, the minimization history, standardized estimates, and modification indices are selected as output options. The modeled view of the standardized results is shown in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1. CFA Model Results

It was observed that standardized estimates were consistent with the Explanatory Factor Analysis, and that the dimension relations of the variables were at or above 0.7 in the mean.

When the covariance values for the inter-dimensional relations are examined, it is determined that they are reasonable values below 0.8.

In the next stage, model fit and other statistical model output for the indicators are discussed. In the first place, it was observed that the modification indicators did not need any change for covariance, variance, and regression coefficients. The key indicators of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis model fit are found in Table 4.8 below.
### Table 4.8. CFA Model Fit Indicators

| Model                      | NPAR | CMIN   | DF  | P   | CMIN/DF |
|----------------------------|------|--------|-----|-----|---------|
| Default Model              | 152  | 743,484| 514 | 0   | 1,446   |
| Saturated Model            | 666  | 0      | 0   | 0   | 0       |
| Independence model         | 36   | 7811,237| 630 | 0   | 12,399  |

| Model                      | RMR  | GFI    | AGFI | PGFI |
|----------------------------|------|--------|------|------|
| Default Model              | 0,043| 0,901  | 0,872| 0,696|
| Saturated Model            | 0    | 1      |      |      |
| Independence model         | 0,309| 0,272  | 0,23 | 0,257|

| Model                      | NFI  | RFI    | IFI  | TLI  | CFI    |
|----------------------------|------|--------|------|------|--------|
| Default Model              | Delta1| rho1   | Delta2| rho2 |         |
| Saturated Model            | 0,905| 0,883  | 0,969| 0,961| 0,968  |
| Independence model         | 1    | 1      | 1    |      |        |
| Model                      | 0    | 0      | 0    | 0    | 0      |

| Model                      | PRATIO| PNFI  | PCFI |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Default Model              | 0,816 | 0,738 | 0,79 |
| Saturated Model            | 0     | 0     | 0    |
| Independence model         | 1     | 0     | 0    |

| Model                      | NCP   | LO 90 | HI 90 |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Default Model              | 229,484| 160,898| 306,073|
| Saturated Model            | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| Independence model         | 7181,237| 6899,65 | 7469,281|

| Model                      | FMIN  | F0    | LO 90 | HI 90 |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Default Model              | 2,048 | 0,632 | 0,443 | 0,843 |
The CMIN / DF value is considered to be an acceptable value between 1 and 3. The realized CMIN / DF value was 1.446. This test is a method that makes the chi-square dependent on the sample size, which is obtained from the fraction of the chi-square's degree of freedom.

It can be considered that the CFI (Comparative Fit Index) value is 0.95 or more. This test compares the compatibility of the current model with the correlation of latent variables and the correspondence of the null hypothesis model, which ignores covariance. The realized CFI value was 0.956.

It can be assumed that the Root Mean Square Residual (RMSEA) value is below 0.06. As this value approaches 0, it is understood that the tested model shows better fit. The realized RMSEA value was 0.035. On the other hand, the value of pclose should not be significant. Taking a value of 1 has not become significant.

Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) can be considered to be over 0.9. The GFI shows the general amount of covariance between the observed variables calculated in the default model.
The realized GFI value was 0.901. The chi square value of the model is over 0.5, which is acceptable and meaningful as in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9. CFA Model Chi Square Results**

| Minimum Was Achieved |
|-----------------------|
| Chi Square = 743,484  |
| Df = 514              |
| PL = .000            |

On the other hand, the construct validity is looked at the Convergent Validity values. The results of the validity of the scale are seen in Table 4.10. Correlation matrix and regression weights are examined for scale validity. The importance, individualism, and masculinity factors gave a high degree of validity, while the average variance explained values (AVE) gave a moderate validity result and others over 0.5. On the other hand, the combined reliability (CR) values exceeded 0.7. The maximum shared squared Variance (MSV) and the average shared variance (ASV) values were also found to be smaller than the total variance explained. Another indicator to look at before the Structural Equation Model is the multiple linearity indicator. It is acceptable that the VIF values between dimensions in the same factor group are smaller than 3. It was observed that all of the VIF values were smaller than 3 in the study conducted.
### Table 4.10: CFA Scale Validity Results

|                             | CR  | AVE | MSV | ASV | Brand_Cause_Fit | Brand_Awareness | Brand_Imag | Cause_Awareness | Individ | Mascu | Tendency_to_Help | Uncertainty_Avoidance | Cause_Impo | Participation_Tendency |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|---------|-------|------------------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Brand_Cause_Fit            | 0.84| 0.655| 0.465| 0.215| 0.809            |                  |            |                 |         |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Brand_Awareness            | 0.94| 0.786| 0.448| 0.162| 0.565            | 0.886            |            |                 |         |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Brand_Imag                | 0.89| 0.680| 0.465| 0.186| 0.682            | 0.669            | 0.825      |                 |         |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Cause_Awareness            | 0.79| 0.503| 0.099| 0.188| 0.315            | 0.212            | 0.709      |                 |         |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Individualism              | 0.78| 0.474| 0.222| 0.124| 0.378            | 0.419            | 0.243      | 0.689           |         |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Masculinity                | 0.78| 0.476| 0.110| 0.059| 0.318            | 0.280            | 0.095      | 0.332           | 0.690   |       |                  |                        |            |                        |
| Tendency_to_Help           | 0.85| 0.671| 0.333| 0.122| 0.458            | 0.165            | 0.321      | 0.059           | 0.307   | 0.216| 0.819            |                        |            |                        |
| Uncertainty_Avoidance      | 0.77| 0.530| 0.250| 0.086| 0.313            | 0.098            | 0.151      | 0.097           | 0.273   | 0.136| 0.445            | 0.728       |            |                        |
| Cause_Imporfance           | 0.70| 0.398| 0.333| 0.106| 0.314            | 0.165            | 0.212      | 0.222           | 0.271   | 0.085| 0.577            | 0.500       | 0.631      |                        |
| Participation_Tendency     | 0.91| 0.845| 0.389| 0.167| 0.624            | 0.552            | 0.531      | 0.208           | 0.268   | 0.290| 0.301            | 0.267       | 0.919      |                        |
4.6. Structural Equation Modelling

For the Structural Equation Model, the final data set and the research model were constructed in parallel with the control variables. In the first place, variables are related due to the correlation between control variables. After running the model, we looked at the regression weights and found that gender affects the model in terms of compliance, so it was removed from the model. Later, hypotheses were formed in the framework of Structural Equation Model. The generated hypotheses are shown in Figure 4.2. The details of these hypotheses are as follows:

H1: Brand Cause Fit has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H2: The Cause Importance has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H3: Uncertainty avoidance has an effect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H4: The tendency to help others has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H5: Masculinity has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H6: Individualism has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H7: Cause awareness has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H8: The brand image has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H9: The brand awareness has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H10: The level of education has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H11: Age level has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.
H12: Marital status has an affect on the tendency to participate campaign.

Figure 4.2. SME for Participation Tendency

As a result, the resulting Structural Equation Model is as shown in Figure 4.3 below. It was seen that the fit values of the model gave the desired results again.
The correlation coefficients and significance ratings for the model are given in Table 4.11 below. As seen in this Table, 4 factors seem to have a significant regression coefficient.

**Table 4.11. SME Correlation Coefficients**

| Factor Explanation | Std. Regression Coefficient | p     | Is Significant? | Dependent Variable | Hipothesis Result |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Brand Cause Fit     | 0.621                       | 0     | Yes             | Participation Tendency | H1: Yes           |
| Cause Importance    | -0.096                      | 0.128 | No              |                    | H2: No            |
| Uncertainty         | 0.15                        | 0.004 | Yes             |                    | H3: Yes           |
| Tendency to Help    | -0.012                      | 0.841 | No              |                    | H4: No            |
| Masculinity         | 0.137                       | 0.006 | Yes             |                    | H5: Yes           |
| Individualism       | 0.052                       | 0.296 | No              |                    | H6: No            |
| Cause Awareness     | 0.04                        | 0.919 | No              |                    | H7: No            |
| Brand Image         | -0.124                      | 0.039 | Yes             |                    | H8: Yes           |
| Brand Awareness     | -0.057                      | 0.292 | No              |                    | H9: No            |
| Marital Status      | -0.063                      | 0.178 | No              |                    | H10: No           |
| Age                 | -0.013                      | 0.783 | No              |                    | H11: No           |
| Education           | 0.01                        | 0.807 | No              |                    | H12: No           |

As seen in the figure, Brand Cause Fit (0.62), Masculinity (0.14), Uncertainty Avoidance (0.15), and Brand Image (0.12) correlation coefficients are greater than 0.1 as an absolute value. In other words, it can be said that it is a moderate effect. However, as can be seen from the table, it can only be said that brand cause fit, uncertainty avoidance,
masculinity, and brand image have a direct effect on the 95% confidence interval. The Ho hypothesis was developed to show that there is no difference between the groups for the test of the measurement invariance as a result of the Structural Equation Model. For the hypothesis Ho, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the 95% confidence interval between income groups for the factors tendency to participate relationship" was developed. As a result, the Ho hypothesis was not rejected. The results of the hypothesis test are given in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12. SEM Measurement Invariance Test Results**

|                      | Low_Income | High_Income |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|
|                      | Estimation | P           | Estimation | P           | z-stat     |
| Participation_Tendency | Brand_Cause_Fit | 0.738 | 0.000 | 0.913 | 0.000 | 0.847 |
| Participation_Tendency | Cause_Importance | -0.324 | 0.077 | 0.201 | 0.556 | 1.358 |
| Participation_Tendency | Uncert_Avoidance | 0.320 | 0.000 | 0.024 | 0.863 | -1.765* |
| Participation_Tendency | Tend_to_Help | -0.008 | 0.940 | -0.249 | 0.205 | -1.082 |
| Participation_Tendency | Masculinity | 0.109 | 0.041 | 0.257 | 0.012 | 1.276 |
| Participation_Tendency | Individualism | 0.0074 | 0.307 | -0.064 | 0.688 | -0.788 |
| Participation_Tendency | Cause_Awareness | 0.020 | 0.662 | -0.036 | 0.596 | -0.685 |
| Participation_Tendency | Brand_Image | -0.240 | 0.016 | -0.124 | 0.496 | 0.552 |
| Participation_Tendency | Brand_Awareness | -0.074 | 0.205 | -0.028 | 0.774 | 0.409 |
| Participation_Tendency | Marital_Status | -0.106 | 0.221 | -0.080 | 0.575 | 0.155 |
| Participation_Tendency | Age | -0.084 | 0.279 | 0.171 | 0.131 | 1.856* |
| Participation_Tendency | Education | -0.020 | 0.761 | 0.161 | 0.164 | 1.355 |

5. DISCUSSION

In this study, a general evaluation of CM activities has been made, and a scale development study has been carried out by determining the effective factors in terms of consumer purchasing behaviors. At the end of the study, a scale factor of 10 factors was established. At the same time, a questionnaire was prepared on a 5 Likert Scale consisting of 36 questions. The factors that are the result of the research, play an important role in the success of the campaign activities. Cause Awareness has emerged as a 4 variable factor. The Cause Importance was the second factor obtained with a 4 variable structure. The Uncertainty Avoidance was realized as the third factor with a variable structure. The Individualism, which is another from the cultural dimensions, emerged as the fourth factor with 4 variable structure. This result also shows that the role that people play in society has an important place in CM campaigns. The Masculinity factor emerged as the fifth factor of study with 4 variabled structures. The Tendency to Help Others emerged as the sixth factor, with 3 variabled structure. Brand Cause Fit has been the seventh factor obtained with 3 variabled structure. Brand Awareness is the eighth factor obtained with 5 variabled structure. The Brand
Image has been the ninth factor with 4 variabled structure. The Tendency to Participate was the last factor obtained with a 2 variable structure in the study.

5.1. Research Limitations

In the CFA section of the study, only direct effects on tendency to participate were measured. As a result of this study, it has been found that Brand Cause fit, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity factors are positive and Brand Image has a negative direct effect. Since the aim of this study was mainly to improve the scale, no further studies were conducted for indirect interactions.

One of the most important limitations of the research is that a single campaign is taken up at the same time and the sector is the banking sector. Factors such as Cause Type and Cause Geographical Scope could not be handled. Another limitation of the study is that the campaign being undertaken was carried out in the field of participation banking. Similar researches to be carried out in future periods can be considered in the retail, air transportation, and technology sectors as well.

5.2. Future Research Suggestions

As a result, a scale development study that centered methodically on the consumer in this research has been completed successfully. However, above limitations encountered during the research have been elaborated; these limits for further research mean new research areas. On the other hand, the development of another consumer-centered scale to meet the company / brand is also an important research area in the future. In other words, determining what main factor the company should consider when carrying out the CM activity, might be another great research topic. In this way, an effective marketing strategy based on both consumer and brand can be created.

5.3. Managerial Impacts

A detailed literature search at the beginning of the study showed that there is no reliable and valid scale for CM. This study was carried out in order to fill this gap and serve as a basis for future work. It is also aimed to make a managerial contribution to the CM activities, which is one of the most important elements of the value-based marketing approach, also called marketing 3.0 recently. Both the company and the consumer must contribute to the transformation of the environment. One of these methods, in terms of marketing, is the CM activities. CM considers the consumer as an asset that is at the same time a heart and soul, and must be integrated with the society in which it is located. Consumers will be actively involved in social transformation and positive environmental change through communication channels such as developing technological facilities and social media, as well as choosing products and services that are reasonably suitable for their needs and wants.

With the factors brought about by this study, it was aimed to increase the attraction of CM activities by enhancing the efficiency of the CM activities carried out. Therefore, from a managerial point of view, the CM activity to be selected must take these factors into account. In particular, in order to create a synergy with the cause and brand interaction, it will be necessary to increase awareness of the cause handled and to keep up with the brand cause fit. On the other hand, the high correlation values of brand awareness and brand image attract attention. In this case, it is necessary to have knowledge about the brand of the campaign. Cause, importance factor has come to the forefront as a dimension to be considered again. It is also evident that it is important that the person does not experience any personal experience or interaction with the social problem or feel physically distant from him.
The cultural characteristics discussed in the research are also issues that should be considered to provide reliable and valid results in the ultimate analysis of the dimensions of masculinity, individualism, and uncertainty avoidance. A significant part of the cultural dimensions is of great importance in terms of the study to give valid and reliable results as a result of the research. In short, the desire to feel self-reliant, the role it plays in the society, its contribution to society, its outlook, or its anticipation can be an important consumer insight for the CM activities.

From the psychometric dimension in the survey, the tendency to help others has also become one of the dimensions that should be handled with a reliable and valid result in the research. Naturally, appealing to the sense of benevolence or triggering that emotion is an important factor. However, most of the psychometric properties did not yield valid and reliable results, and gave a contrast to what was expected.
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