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Abstract: This study aims to examine the attitudes of American and Filipino college students and their intention to join the cause-related marketing (CRM) campaign. There were 200 Filipino and 180 American college students who joined the survey. The respondents were marketing majors. Using the theory of reasoned action (TRA), the results suggest a significant impact of religiosity, social influence, and attitude on the intention to join the CRM campaign. The results show that social influence has a positive relationship with attitude and intention to join CRM only in the U.S. Religiosity has a positive relationship with attitude and intention to join CRM in both countries. The results highlight the impact of cultural differences and exposure to CRM on consumer attitude and intention to participate in CRM across countries. This study suggests that marketers should design relevant CRM campaigns across countries.
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Cause-related marketing (CRM) is the practice of buying a good or service and donating part of the sales or profit to charity or a cause (Chun-Tuan & Liu, 2012; Hawkins, 2015). Kotler and Keller (2016) defined CRM as a form of marketing that links the firm’s contributions towards a social cause to customers who want to buy the firm’s product or service. Not only has CRM been a corporate philanthropic trend, but it has been used by many organizations to achieve their marketing communication objectives (Thomas et al., 2019). Successful CRM campaigns have strengthened the firms’ relationships with customers and have created customer loyalty (Christofi et al., 2014). CRM campaigns tend to increase future earnings depending on the firm’s short-term operational performance (Das et al., 2020).

Thomas et al. (2019) reviewed articles on CRM from 1988–2016. Their review revealed that most of the studies were conducted in the U.S. (42%), U.K., and Europe. No article about CRM was written in the Philippines (Thomas et al., 2019). CRM campaigns in developing countries, such as the Philippines, are still evolving and are mainly considered as part of corporate social responsibility (La Ferle et al., 2013; Chéron et al., 2012; Jahdi, 2014). Consumers’ attitudes towards CRM in countries where it is prevalent may differ against consumers’ attitudes towards CRM in countries where it is nascent (La Ferle et al., 2013). Hence,
comparing attitudes towards CRM of consumers in these countries may yield a deeper understanding of CRM that can be used by marketing managers for designing relevant CRM strategies.

This study compares the attitudes towards CRM of young consumers in the Philippines, where CRM is novel, against young consumers in the U.S., where CRM is prevalent. Gupta and Pirsch (2006) stated that the first CRM campaign was largely organized by American Express in the U.S. when the firm donated one cent from every purchase and one dollar for every new account to renovate the Statue of Liberty in Ellis Island. This campaign increased card usage and new card applications. Other CRM campaigns include Nabisco’s programs that linked cookie sales to donations to the World Wildlife Fund and the project Red where partner companies, such as Bank of America, Nike, Apple, Coca Cola, Starbucks, GAP, Electronics Arts, Hallmark, Beats Electronics, American Express, Johnson and Johnson, Dell Computers, and Supercell, create products with the Red logo and part of the sales are used to prevent HIV/AIDS in African countries (Robinson et al., 2012; Escareal-Go, 2013).

Working Assets, an American telecommunications service provider, donated 1% of users’ telephone charges and $0.10 per credit card purchase transaction to nonprofit organizations working for peace, human rights, economic justice, or the environment, whereas SunTrust Bank donated $100 to a cause chosen by consumers who opened a new checking account (Robinson et al., 2012). In contrast to the U.S., there is a dearth of CRM campaigns in the Philippines. Waters Philippines donated part of its sales to Operation Smile last 2012 to finance the cleft palate operations of over 80 Filipino children (Escareal-Go, 2013). Waters Philippines also donates part of its sales to Kythe Foundation, which provides programs for children with cancer and other illnesses. Watsons Philippines stores paired with Listerine, Safeguard, and Dove to donate part of their sales to Operation Smile so that free surgery can be given to 1,000 children with cleft-palate conditions.

There is a dearth of studies that provide cross-cultural data on CRM. Of the 202 published articles reviewed by Thomas et al. (2019), only six or 3.6% were comparative studies that showed CRM data from more than one country in a span of 28 years (1988–2016). These studies showed that Hofstede’s cultural dimensions of individualism/collectivism might affect the consumers’ favorable or unfavorable attitude towards CRM (Hofstede, 1983; Robinson et al., 2012; Vaidyanathan et al., 2013; Wang, 2014).

Robinson et al. (2012) showed that collectivists tend to care more about contributing to society through CRM than individualists. Vaidyanathan et al. (2013) supported the finding that collectivists (rather than individualists) are more likely to respond to CRM more positively and are willing to pay the higher product price to support a social cause. Wang (2014) also concluded that collectivist countries react favorably to CRM campaigns. However, the existing literature shows that consumers in countries where CRM is evolving have a less positive attitude towards CRM initiatives (Singh et al., 2009). Hence, there is a need for studies that explore the potential differences in reactions to CRM across countries that are collectivistic (developing) versus individualistic (developed).

In addition, although social influence is argued to play a key role in driving collectivistic behavior, values like religiosity can also predispose an individual towards prosocial behavior (Youn & Kim, 2008; Hwang & Kim, 2007). Thus, this study introduces religiosity as a factor that may influence favorable responses to CRM. Given that there are few cross-cultural studies in CRM, especially in emerging markets like the Philippines, this study aims to provide insights on the need to use relevant CRM strategies in different cultures.

Review of Related Literature

Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension of Individualism/Collectivism

Hofstede (1983) formulated a cultural framework that distinguishes one culture from another. Consumers from individualistic countries are concerned mainly with self-interests and personal needs (Flaming et al., 2010). On the other hand, consumers from collectivist countries are characterized by a concern for teamwork, mutual dependence, loyalty, and relationship-building (Bissessar, 2018). Based on the findings of Hofstede (2001), the Philippines is a collectivistic country with a score of 32 versus the U.S., which is an individualistic country, with a score of 91 on the Hofstede individualism/collectivism dimension. Thus, Filipinos tend to gravitate towards a group (their family or reference group) and, therefore, adhere to group decision-making and dependency. However,
consumers from the U.S. may tend to act independently rather than as members of the group (Flaming et al., 2010).

**Theory of Reasoned Action**

Studies show that the theory of reasoned Action (TRA) has been used as a framework to understand attitudes towards CRM (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Han & Stoel, 2017; Thomas et al., 2019). According to the TRA, social influence and attitude towards a behavior impact a person’s intention and actual behavior. The individual’s positive or negative evaluation of performing the behavior is termed attitude toward the behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Social influence entails the person’s perception of the social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior in question (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Zhang, 2018).

**Inclusions of Additional Constructs in TRA**

Ajzen (1991) stated that there could be other predictors in the TRA besides those in the framework if it can enhance the model’s predictive power. According to him, the TRA can use other predictors if these predictors possess a large proportion of the variance in behavior after the TRA’s current variables have been included.

Prior studies indicate that religion forms a basis on how consumers interact in the society and, therefore, is a key factor driving both acceptance of social norms and prosocial behavior (Arli & Pekerti, 2016; Arli & Tjiptono, 2014; Cruz et al., 2016; Cukur et al., 2004). Religiosity leads to socially desirable behaviors, such as the intention of doing good (Arli & Pekerti, 2016). Thus, this study extends the TRA model to include religiosity as an antecedent to attitude towards CRM and intention to participate in CRM. Further, this study compares the CRM intention of Americans and Filipinos. Figure 1 shows the study’s framework.

**Attitude Towards CRM**

Lavack and Kropp (2003) studied consumers’ attitudes towards CRM in Canada, Australia, Norway, and South Korea. They classified Canada and Australia as countries where CRM has received a lot of attention and Norway and South Korea as countries where CRM has received little or no attention at all. Their study showed that attitude towards CRM is more positive in Canada and Australia, whereas attitudes towards CRM are less positive in Norway and South Korea (Lavack & Kropp, 2003).

![Figure 1. Conceptual Framework](Adapted from Ajzen, 1991)
Another study found that a higher frequency of exposure to CRM campaign resulted in familiarity with the CRM campaign, which can remove skepticism towards CRM and result in higher positivity towards CRM (Singh et al., 2009). These studies show that consumers in countries where CRM is in a nascent stage will have a less positive attitude towards CRM initiatives (Hsu et al., 2017; Lavack & Kropp, 2003; Singh et al., 2009). Because CRM in the U.S. is prevalent, American consumers are exposed to CRM campaigns. In the Philippines, CRM is in the nascent stage. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H1: Attitude towards CRM will positively influence the intention to participate in CRM campaigns.

H2: The impact of attitude on the intention to participate in CRM will be higher in the U.S. than in the Philippines.

Religiosity

Religiosity is a significant part of daily life that affects the consumers’ decision-making process (Arli & Tjiptono, 2014; Cruz et al., 2016). Religiosity refers to how people use or live their religion in their daily life (Allport & Ross, 1967). According to Allport and Ross (1967), it can be viewed in terms of internal religiosity (how they live their lives) or external religiosity (how one uses religion). Whether it is internal or external religiosity, religiosity has been a strong predictor of ethical behavior, including behavior to do well, such as participating in CRM (Arli & Pekerti, 2016). Most religions promote positive values and attitudes that encourage persons to have good intentions (Cukur et al., 2004).

Religiosity positively affects social influence as religious persons reach out to groups favored in the teachings of the Church (Leak & Fish, 1989). According to Leak and Fish (1989), religious persons have a greater concern with social appearances and following the teachings of Church leaders. In other words, religious persons tend to be more influenced by the normative values of their belief system. They also have higher prosocial intentions and behavior as various religions teach the religious to find meaning and social integration (Saroglou & Cohen, 2013).

Several studies have found that religiosity is related to interdependence and collectivism (Saroglou & Cohen, 2013). A study comparing Turkish, Filipino, and American respondents observed that religiosity is associated positively with collectivism and conservative values, and individualism is associated with openness to change (Cukur et al., 2004; Saroglu & Cohen, 2013). Thus, being collectivists, Filipinos demonstrate higher religiosity (Cukur et al., 2004) than Americans, who are classified as individualists. Further, Filipinos tend to conform to group norms to preserve social order (Cukur et al., 2004). Thus, the impact of religiosity on social influence will be higher in the Philippines.

The following hypotheses are proposed:

H3: Religiosity will positively influence the intention to participate in CRM.

H4: Religiosity will have a higher impact on the intention to participate in CRM in the Philippines than in the U.S.

H5: Religiosity will positively influence social influence.

H6: The impact of religiosity on social influence will be higher in the Philippines than in the U.S.

Social Influence

The research by Eastman et al. (2019) examined the role of social media in CRM awareness among millennials. The results showed a positive correlation between social media use and CRM awareness (Eastman et al., 2019). According to Eastman et al. (2019), millennials have been using social media (Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram) for an average of two hours per day or 13.9 hours per week to keep in touch with their social networks.

Although American millennials have social networks that affirm their independence, openness, and personal goals as part of their individualistic culture, Filipino millennials have social networks that affirm their conformity to the church’s teachings, conservativeness, and tradition (Cukur et al., 2004). This implies that millennials in individualistic cultures are socialized to be independent, value their personal expression, and prioritize their personal goals versus their counterparts in collectivistic culture (Saroglou & Cohen, 2013). As American millennials tend to be more
open to change and less conservative, they tend to be more affected by social influences than their Filipino counterparts (Lee & Green, 1991). A study involving American and Chinese college students revealed that Americans are more influenced by their social networks compared to their Chinese counterparts to engage in CRM because their social peers expect them to donate to charities (Wang, 2014). Further, the study concluded that conforming to this social influence is part of the reason why CRM is prevalent in the U.S. (Wang, 2014).

This implies that the impact of social influence on attitude on CRM may be more significant in individualistic countries, such as the U.S., relative to collective countries, such as the Philippines.

The following hypotheses are proposed:

H7: Social influence will have a positive impact on attitude towards CRM.

H8: The impact of social influence on attitude towards CRM is higher in the U.S. than in the Philippines.

H9: Social influence will have a positive impact on the intention to participate in CRM.

H10: The impact of social influence on the intention to participate in CRM is higher in the U.S. than in the Philippines.

Methods

Data Collection

This study employed convenience sampling. Data were collected through self-administered surveys. The survey included items on religiosity, social influence, attitude towards CRM, and intention to participate in CRM, measured using 5-point Likert scales anchored on Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). Items for each construct were adapted from existing studies (Erdoğan et al., 2014; Hyllegard et al., 2011; Youn & Kim, 2008). Given the impact of social media and peers on the younger generation, three items reflecting social influence were utilized for the social influence construct (Williams & Page, 2011). All items for the constructs are listed in Appendix I. The questionnaire was pretested with 20 students with an age range 20–24. The questionnaire was revised for clarity after the pretest (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2002).

The data were collected using a convenience-based sampling across existing students who were marketing majors across each country. This resulted in 287 valid responses (157 from the Philippines, 130 from U.S.). The sample size was enough to meet the sample size requirements for PLS-SEM suggested by Marcoulides and Saunders (2006). Age has been found to affect attitude towards CRM (Fazli-Salehi et al., 2019). Young consumers, especially those that are under 35 years old, are observed to be more receptive to CRM rather than old consumers (Barnes, 1992; Eastman et al., 2019; Youn & Kim, 2008). Hence, the data collection efforts focused on respondents in the 18–35 age group.

There were 61.7% males and 38.2% females in the Philippines sample, and 40.7% males and 59.2% females in the U.S. sample.

Partial least squares/structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using Smart PLS 3.0 software (Ringle et al., 2015) was utilized. PLS-SEM methodology was used for several reasons like the exploratory nature of research, small data size, and the robustness of PLS against inadequacies such as multi-variate normality (Hair et al., 2014). The items in the various constructs were subjected to measurement model analysis using the factor-weighting scheme and no-sign change option.

Reliability and Validity of Research Constructs

Cronbach’s alpha was used to ensure scale reliability and internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951). The adequate Cronbach alpha value should at least be 0.70 (Peterson, 1994). Table 1 shows that constructs exhibit internal consistency because these are all higher than the set target of >0.70 (Hair et al., 2014; Ketchen, 2013). The required composite reliability (greater than or equal to 0.70) and average variance extracted (AVE; greater than or equal to 0.50) were also achieved thereby, indicating convergent validity (Hair et al., 2011), as indicated in Table 1.

No issues regarding discriminant validity were observed with either the Fornell-Larcker test (Table 2) or the HTMT test (heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations, HTMT< 0.85), as indicated in Table 3 (Hair et al., 2014).

Next, we conducted PLS-SEM structural model analysis followed by bootstrapping (Hair et al., 2014).
Table 1
Cronbach Alpha, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted for the Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Discriminant Validity using Fornell-Larcker Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Social Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Diagonal values are squared roots of AVE; off-diagonal values are the estimates of the inter-correlation between the latent constructs

The variance inflation factor of all latent variables was less than 5, indicating no multi-collinearity issue (Hair et al., 2014). Table 4 shows the results of the structural model.

The three endogenous constructs (attitude, social influence, and intention) had $R^2$ values of 0.045, 0.152, and 0.408, respectively, which were acceptable (Hair et al., 2014). We next assessed the Cohen’s (1988) Pseudo $F$ test (effect size $f^2$) of each relationship to gauge how the removal of exogenous variable impacts the $R^2$ of the endogenous variable (Ringle et al., 2015). The $f^2$ values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 present small, medium, and large effects (Cohen, 1988). In the current study, for the endogenous variable intention, the exogenous variables attitude towards CRM, religiosity, and social influence had $f^2$ values of 0.412, 0.046, and 0.048, showing large, small, and small effects, respectively. For the endogenous variable attitude, the exogenous variable social influence had $f^2$ value of 0.047, showing a small effect. For the endogenous variable social influence, the exogenous variable religiosity had $f^2$ value of 0.179, showing a medium effect.

Before conducting the partial least squares- multi-group analysis (PLS-MGA) for the moderating
impact of the two countries, measurement invariance was tested (Hair et al., 2014). The outer loadings for each item in each construct were checked (the U.S. and the Philippines). The final items for each factor showed no significant difference (PLS-MGA) across the two groups. Hence, measurement invariance was established (Hair et al., 2014).

PLS-MGA results show whether the conceptual model paths were moderated by nationality—U.S. versus Philippines (Table 5). For the non-parametric approach by Henseler’s MGA, a single tail test is used with a p-value smaller than 0.05 or larger than 0.95 significant at 5% level of significance for a difference of group-specific path coefficient (Henseler et al., 2009).

Results

The results show that attitude towards CRM has a significant positive impact on the intention to participate in CRM ($p<.001$; Table 4). Aside from supporting H1, this validates the causal relationship between attitude and intention (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Yadav & Pathak, 2016; Zhang, 2018).

Table 5 shows that the U.S. respondents have a significantly higher path coefficient mean of 0.605 versus 0.398 for the Philippines ($p<0.05$). This shows a higher impact of attitude towards CRM’s on the intention to participate in a CRM campaign in the U.S. than in the Philippines. This supports H2. This result validates existing studies that show that consumers in countries where CRM is prevalent will have a higher impact of attitude on the intention to participate in CRM than consumers in countries where it is new (Lavack & Kropp, 2003; Singh et al., 2009).

Table 4 shows a significant relationship between religiosity and intention to participate in CRM ($p=.001$). This supports H3. Table 5 shows that religiosity had a higher impact on intention to participate in CRM among Philippine respondents with a mean score of 0.274 compared to 0.145 for their U.S. counterparts; however, this difference is not significantly different, and hence, H4 is not supported.

Religiosity also has a significant positive impact on social influence, $p<0.05$ (Table 4); hence, H5 is also accepted. Table 5 shows that religiosity has a strong impact on social influence in the Philippines compared to the U.S. ($p=.047$). The path coefficient mean of the Philippines is 0.449 versus 0.254 for the U.S. (Table 5). This result supports H6. We argue that this is because collectivists tend to be more religious and hence, conservatively engage in the social cause endorsed by the religious leaders. They depend on one another to achieve goals, unlike individualists who are more open to adopting any CRM (Wang, 2014). Overall, the results show that there is a higher impact of religiosity in collective countries compared

Table 4
Summary of Structural Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Original Sample (O)</th>
<th>Sample Mean (M)</th>
<th>Std. deviation (STDEV)</th>
<th>t stat.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>$f^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Attitude -&gt; Intention</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>10.134</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Religiosity -&gt; Intention</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Religiosity -&gt; Social influence</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>8.049</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Social influence -&gt; Attitude</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Social influence -&gt; Intention</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
PLS MGA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
<th>T Values</th>
<th>p-Values</th>
<th>Path Coeff Difference</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Attitude&gt;Intention</td>
<td>0.394 (0.604)</td>
<td>0.398 (0.605)</td>
<td>0.083 (0.050)</td>
<td>4.771 (12.084)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Religiosity&gt;Intention</td>
<td>0.272 (0.148)</td>
<td>0.274 (0.145)</td>
<td>0.070 (0.073)</td>
<td>3.897 (2.025)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Religiosity&gt;Social Influence</td>
<td>0.430 (0.238)</td>
<td>0.449 (0.254)</td>
<td>0.063 (0.097)</td>
<td>6.869 (2.456)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Social Influence&gt;Attitude</td>
<td>0.130 (0.205)</td>
<td>0.143 (0.213)</td>
<td>0.074 (0.080)</td>
<td>1.754 (2.564)</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Social Influence&gt;Intention</td>
<td>0.122 (0.206)</td>
<td>0.123 (0.210)</td>
<td>0.080 (0.068)</td>
<td>1.517 (3.014)</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to individualistic countries, corroborating with prior studies (Robinson et al., 2012; Vaidyanathan, 2013; Wang, 2014).

Table 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between social influence and attitude towards CRM ($p<.001$). This supports H7. This validates existing studies that show that social factors can influence the consumer’s attitude and decision process (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Table 5 shows that the impact of social influence on attitude is significant for the U.S. respondents ($p=.010$) but is not significant for their Filipino counterparts (Table 5). Further, the difference between the two countries is not significant; hence H8 is not supported.

Table 4 shows a significant relationship between social influence and intention to participate in CRM ($p<.001$). This supports H9. The result validates studies that show that social factors can influence one’s intention to participate in CRM (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Table 5 shows that the impact of social influence on the intention to participate in CRM among U.S. respondents is significant ($p=.003$), but it is not significant for their Filipino counterparts. The difference between the two countries is not significant; hence H10 is not supported.

**Discussion**

The study’s results highlight that attitude towards CRM has a positive influence on the intention to join the CRM campaign. This validates existing studies that show that the TRA can be used as a framework to understand attitudes towards CRM (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Han & Stoel, 2017; Thomas et al., 2019). It also supports the TRA as it affirms that the individual’s positive or negative evaluation of performing the behavior can affect his intention to perform the behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

This study finds that attitude has a higher impact on the intention to participate in CRM in the U.S. than in the Philippines. Numerous studies have highlighted that collectivistic countries have a higher positivity towards CRM than individualistic countries. However, this study shows that the impact of attitude on intention can be moderated by the consumers’ exposure to CRM. CRM initiatives in the Philippines are still evolving, resulting in a lower impact of attitude on the intention to participate in CRM as compared to the U.S., where consumers have been exposed to numerous CRM campaigns (Lavack & Kropp, 2003; Singh et al., 2009). Thus, the results suggest that higher exposure to CRM can develop a better impact of attitude on the intention to participate in the CRM.
The TRA has been extended to include religiosity as an antecedent to social influence and the intention to participate in a CRM campaign. The results show that religiosity has a significant impact on social influence and the intention to join a CRM campaign, thereby corroborating existing studies that show that religiosity has been a strong predictor of ethical behavior, including behavior to do well, such as participating in CRM (Arli & Pekerti, 2016). Catholics, Protestants, and other religious groups promote positive values and attitudes that encourage persons to contribute to societal good (Cukur et al., 2004). Religiosity leads to socially desirable behaviors, such as helping others (Arli & Pekerti, 2016). As CRM campaigns are venues to contribute to society’s well-being, religiosity has a significant impact on participating in CRM campaigns (Robinson et al., 2012).

This study shows that there is a positive relationship between religiosity and social influence and religiosity and intention to join CRM among Filipino respondents. This supports studies that show that religiosity will affect social influence as religious persons reach out to groups favored in the church’s teachings (Leak & Fish, 1989). Religious persons tend to follow the church leaders’ teachings and abide by the normative values of their religion (Leak & Fish 1989). Religious persons have more prosocial intentions and behavior as various religions teach the religious to integrate harmoniously with their social groups (Saroglu & Cohen, 2013).

The results also show that religiosity has a greater impact on social influence among Filipino respondents than their American counterparts. Filipinos follow religious teachings that promote conforming to group norms and seeking a sense of security and certainty (Cukur et al., 2004). The results confirm studies that show that religious persons tend to be more influenced by the normative values of their belief system (Leak & Fish, 1989). They tend to be religious, emphasize harmonious and warm interpersonal relationships, and prefer to conform to group norms (Wang, 2014).

On the other hand, the study’s results show that Americans, who are individualists, tend to gravitate towards social influence in their attitude and intention to join CRM. The significant relationship between social influence and attitude towards CRM and social influence and intention to join CRM among American respondents support studies that show that consumers from individualistic cultures are less conservative and more independent, and thus, are strongly affected by social influence than consumers from collectivistic cultures (Lee & Green, 1991). The result validates studies that consumers from individualistic cultures are affected by social influences in their attitude and intention to join CRM campaigns (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

There are very few cross-cultural studies in CRM. This study contributes to the few cross-cultural studies on CRM. It gives insights into how young consumers from a collectivist country and an individualistic country perceive CRM. It supports existing studies that show that cultural factors can affect the consumer’s decision-making process, such as the decision to join CRM campaigns (Chan et al., 2018; Han & Stoel, 2017; Kotler & Keller, 2016; Robinson et al., 2012; Vaidyanathan et al., 2013).

Apart from culture, this study shows that exposure to CRM can have an impact on factors that drive the intention to participate in CRM. Although the Filipino respondents are more likely to be affected by religious influences such as the teachings of religious leaders, American respondents tend to be affected by their social circles of peers, bloggers, friends, and other influencers (Leak & Fish, 1989; Lee & Green, 1991). Hence, marketers can influence young Filipino consumers to respond positively to the CRM campaign by using religious themes that can include the church’s teachings, group harmony, interdependence, and societal good. On the other hand, marketers can use leaders, bloggers, peers, and friends in their social circles to influence young American consumers (Lee & Green, 1991). CRM strategies should suit the cultural orientations of target countries and consider the level of exposure to CRM in those countries.

Limitation and Suggestions for Future Research

Although this study focused on corporate-level CRM, future studies can focus on brand-level CRM. In a CRM campaign, there are several stakeholders—the consumer, the product or service, and the organization. As this study is based on consumers’ perspectives, future studies can focus on the product or service or the organization undertaking the CRM campaign.
This study’s respondents were college students. The perceptions may differ from those of ordinary consumers. Further, the perceptions of college students who major in marketing may have special results compared to ordinary college students.

Although social influence is part of the TRA’s subjective norm, religiosity is a new construct introduced as an antecedent of social influence. Although religiosity is not part of the TRA’s subjective norm, religiosity can positively affect social influence and intention to participate in CRM. Future studies comparing respondents from collectivist and individualistic cultures can examine if religiosity can positively affect social influence and intention to participate in CRM to have more robust findings. This study focused on the intention to participate in a CRM campaign. Future studies can include actual behavior.

There are differences in the age range of Filipino and American respondents. As these differences may have affected the study’s results, future studies should use respondents with the same age range. Likewise, there were more Filipino females than males and more American males than females. Future studies should have an equal number of male and female respondents.
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Appendix 1

*List of Items for Each Construct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>ATT1</td>
<td>CRM is beneficial to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>ATT2</td>
<td>CRM should be encouraged among companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X14</td>
<td>ATT3</td>
<td>I hope more companies are involved in CRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X15</td>
<td>ATT4</td>
<td>CRM is harmonious to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiosity</strong></td>
<td>X50</td>
<td>REL1</td>
<td>Religion is an important part of my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X52</td>
<td>REL2</td>
<td>It is important for me to find spiritual fulfillment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X53</td>
<td>REL3</td>
<td>I believe in God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X54</td>
<td>REL4</td>
<td>I spend time and effort to understand and reflect on my faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X55</td>
<td>REL5</td>
<td>Religious values lie behind my point of view in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X56</td>
<td>REL6</td>
<td>I donate money to institutions that reflect my religious values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention</strong></td>
<td>X31</td>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>I think participating in CRM is a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X32</td>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>I would be willing to pay more money for a product if I know a percentage of the profits from the sale were being donated to a charitable/social cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X33</td>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>I would be willing to participate in CRM campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X34</td>
<td>INT4</td>
<td>I would consider purchasing from companies engaging in CRM to provide help to the cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Influence</strong></td>
<td>X45</td>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>Participating in CRM is popular in my peers and friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X48</td>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>A lot of my social media posts show my friends campaigning for cause-related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X49</td>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>I like to engage in CRM campaigning on my social media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>