The Use of Integrated Marketing Communications by U.S. Non-profit Organizations

Amy Perkins
Margaret Algren
malgren@towson.edu
Towson University
Kristen Campbell Eichhorn
Eichhorn@oswego.edu
State University of New York at Oswego

Introduction and Review of Literature

There are approximately 1.4 million non-profit organizations in the United States (The Urban Institute, 2006). The non-profit sector currently accounts for 5.2% of gross domestic product in the United States, reporting $1.4 trillion dollars in revenue and $1.3 trillion dollars in assets and employing 9 percent of the country's workforce (The Urban Institute, 2006). The non-profit sector is extremely competitive, and organizations are constantly working to attract donors, volunteers, employees, grant funding, and media attention.

To gain an advantage, many non-profit organizations have adopted philosophies and strategies once commonly associated with for-profit corporations, Popular marketing concepts, such as market segmentation, market orientation, database marketing, and branding, have been successfully applied to the non-profit sector (Ewing & Napoli, 2005; Venable, Rose, Bush, & Gilbert, 2005). Integrated marketing communications (IMC), described as the integration of advertising, public relations, direct marketing, and sales promotion into a comprehensive plan (Caywood, 1997), has also emerged as a valuable approach for non-profit organizations. Non-profits adopting this strategy focus on building relationships with supporters and utilize communication tactics like donor appreciation, face-to-face communication, and recurring newsletters.

Integrated Marketing Communications as a Relationship-Building Strategy

Non-profit organizations benefit from creating long-term relationships with supporters (Weir & Hibbert, 2000). It has been demonstrated that a new donor does not become profitable in terms of net income to a non-profit organization for 12-18 months (Gaffney, 1996). Therefore to make its investment in recruiting a new donor worthwhile, an organization needs to extend the relationship for longer than 18 months.

For most non-profit organizations, the two largest, and arguably the most important, stakeholder groups are supporters who donate money and time and individuals who benefit from an organization's services (Venable et al., 2005). Marketing and communication strategies that focus on building relationships have been proven successful with both of these stakeholder groups (Weir & Hibbert, 2000). Bennett and Barkensjo (2005) studied five relationship-building tactics with individuals who receive services offered by human welfare charities in Great Britain: 1) relationship advertising; 2) two-way communication; 3) database marketing; 4) face-to-face contacts; and 5) listening. Their research demonstrated that higher quality relationships and

higher levels of satisfaction were reported by service recipients of organizations that used higher quality relationship-building tactics.

Social exchange theory can be used to explain the concepts of relationships, commitment, and trust with respect to organizations. Developed by John Thibaut and Harold Kelley in 1959, social exchange theory proposes that people assess relationships in terms of consequences. Each relationship has costs and rewards associated with it, and the consequences of a relationship can be viewed in terms of the rewards received and the costs incurred (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Costs are "drawbacks that are perceived as unpleasant or holding us back from a goal," while rewards are "any benefits perceived as enjoyable or helping to achieve a specific aspiration" (Dainton & Zelley, 2005, p. 64). Applying this theory to the relationship between a person and a non-profit organization, relationship costs include a person's monetary costs, time, social commitment, and emotional investment (Bussell & Forbes, 2006). Rewards vary from person to person, but include tax advantages of donations, benefits of social affiliation with the organization, and satisfaction gained from helping others (Cermak, File, & Prince, 1994).

Social exchange theory considers relationships a highly selective matter because different relationships have different consequences for different people. When a person explores entering a new relationship, he or she assesses the required investments and expected benefits. The person compares the relationship's anticipated outcome, or cost-benefit ratio, to his or her comparison level (CL), which is "the standard against which the member evaluates the 'attractiveness' of the relationship or how satisfactory it is" (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959, p. 21). If the anticipated outcome is near his or her CL, the person is likely to be satisfied with the relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959).

A person chooses whether to remain in or end an existing relationship depending on his or her comparison level of alternatives (CL_{alt}), which is "the lowest level of outcomes a member will accept in the light of available opportunities" (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959, p. 21). The height of the CL_{alt} depends on the quality of the best available alternative options for a person. If the relationship outcome drops below a person's CL_{alt}, he or she is expected to end the relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959).

As relationships meet outcome expectations for rewards and costs, trust develops between the partners. They gain confidence in each other's reliability and integrity (Dwyer, Schurr, & Oh, 1987; Venable et al., 2005). The presence of trust represents the move from an unpredictable relationship to one characterized by stability where motives and behaviors can be predicted (Kingshott, 2005). As the partners fulfill expectations in the relationship their attractiveness to each other increases. The partners are motivated to continue the relationship because as satisfaction increases, the number of available alternatives for achieving the same level of satisfaction decreases. Commitment between relationship partners occurs when satisfaction reaches a level that precludes the expected outcome of all other available alternative relationships (Dwyer et al., 2006). Achieving this commitment level, or customer loyalty, is the ultimate goal of developing relationships for most organizations.

The concepts of trust and commitment are essential for building strong relationships, and as a result, they are of central importance to non-profit organizations. As one would expect, people are more willing to choose to support organizations that demonstrate high quality services (Parsons, 2007; Weir and Hibbert, 2000). Donors and volunteers must be able to trust that a given organization will use their donations of money and time responsibly (Venable et al., 2005). As predicted by social exchange theory, supporters will only continue to donate time and money to an organization when they are satisfied with the results (Bussell & Forbes, 2006). Ensuring

that they are providing the rewards desired by supporters and that supporters' satisfaction levels are high should be a priority for non-profit organizations.

Research Questions

This research aims to expand the knowledge about United States non-profit organizations' current use of IMC to build relationships with stakeholders. The goals of the research are: (1) to determine what types of non-profit organizations currently use IMC as a relationship-building strategy, (2) to describe the content and use of IMC tactics, and (3) to examine the success of those tactics. In particular, this research examines the following questions:

RQ1: What types of non-profit organizations are more likely to focus on relationship building as an important organizational strategy?

RQ2: What communication tactics are considered successful by organizations that give a high importance to relationship building?

RQ3: Is the success of specific tactics related to the success of building and sustaining relationships with specific stakeholders?

RQ4: Is the success of specific tactics related to the benefits that the organization perceives as important to stakeholders?

RQ5: Do organizations that focus on building relationships as an important organizational strategy have longer average relationships with supporters than those organizations that do not?

Method

A quantitative online survey was distributed to a random sample of communication professionals at non-profit organizations.

Instrument

A close-ended survey was developed to collect information from communication professionals at non-profit organizations. Eight variables were assessed in this study, including: 1)the importance of relationship marketing, 2) the perception of success in building and maintaining relationships with key stake holders (board members, community leaders, corporations, donors/volunteers, etc..), 3) average length of the relationships between the organization and supporters (donor, member/volunteers), 4) perceptions of success with 12 communication tactics to build/sustain relationships (advertising, mailings, emails, face-to-face, database marketing, etc.), 5) perception of benefits to organizational supporters (personal satisfaction from helping others, public recognition of support, social affiliation with other supporters, tax advantages of donations) 6) organizational age, 7) annual revenue, and 8) number of full time employees (full survey instrument available upon request).

Sampling Procedures

A random sample of 1,000 organizations was selected from the population of 501(c) (3) public charities that filed IRS tax forms in 2005. The random sample was stratified by annual

revenue to ensure an accurate representation of the total population. The random sample was drawn from the National Center for Charitable Statistics, a data clearinghouse on the United States non-profit sector. After selection of organizations, online searches and telephone calls were used to identify email addresses for each organization in the sample. The online survey was sent to the organizations, and after approximately one week a follow-up email was sent to non-responding organizations. Due to low response rate, an additional 400 organizations were randomly selected, once again stratified for annual revenue, and added to the sample. Online surveys and follow-up emails were also sent to these 400 organizations.

   Sample Population. Two hundred and twelve completed survey responses were obtained for a response rate of 15.1%. Despite the attempt to receive responses from organizations with annual revenues that represented the population of 501(c)(3) organizations, the participating organizations were skewed toward the highest revenue classification. The mean annual revenue for the participating organizations was between $100,000 and $499,999. The mean organizational age was between 10 and 24 years, and the mean number of full-time employees was between 5 and 9 employees.

   Of the 212 surveys completed, a narrow majority (53%) were completed by chief executive officers (CEO) or executive directors. Fourteen percent of surveys were completed by communications/marketing professionals and nine percent were completed by development/ fundraising professionals.

Results

Characteristics of Organizations Focusing on Relationship Building

   The vast majority of organizations participating in the survey (90%) rated relationship building as an important organizational strategy. The importance of the strategy was significantly correlated with annual revenue, ($r^2 = .021$, $p < .05$, $n = 212$) (see Table 5.1). However, the importance was not significantly correlated with either organizational age or number of full-time employees.

Success of Communication Tactics

   The success of 12 communication tactics in building and sustaining relationships with supporters was analyzed. The success of database marketing ($r^2 = .02$, $p < .05$, $n = 205$), face-to-face communication ($r^2 = .032$, $p < .01$, $n = 212$), and listening ($r^2 = .032$, $p < .01$, $n = 209$) was significantly correlated with an organization's view of relationship building (see Table 5.2).

Success of specific communication tactics and success of building and sustaining relationships with specific stakeholders

   Like all organizations, non-profit organizations have many different stakeholders and are likely to use different communication tactics to reach each group. The success of face-to-face communication, listening, and ongoing communication was significantly correlated to the success of building relationships with all stakeholder groups (see Table 5.3).
Success of Communication Tactics and Types of Organizational Benefits

   Non-profit organizations offer supporters many types of benefits. Some benefits are intrinsic like the personal satisfaction gained from helping people while others are extrinsic like the tax advantages of donations (Cermak et al., 1994). This research found that the success of communication tactics varies depending on the importance of the benefits an organization offers

supporters. The success ratings of donor/volunteer appreciation and mailings as tactics were significantly correlated with the importance of all four identified benefits offered by organizations (see Table 5.4).

Use of Relationship Building as an Organizational Strategy and Length of Relationships with Supporters

The vast majority of organizations (91%) reported average relationships with donors/volunteers of 18 months or longer. Almost 40% of organizations reported average relationships of more than 5 years in length. However, there was no significant correlation between an organization's view of relationship building and the average length of relationship with a donor/volunteer (see Table 5.5).

Post-Hoc Analysis

Regression analysis was conducted as a post-hoc analysis to further investigate the connection between relationship building as a strategy and an organization's income, age, and staff size. Using the importance of relationship building as the dependent variable and the organizational characteristics as independent variables, a stepwise multiple regression was conducted. The three organizational characteristics explained a significant proportion of variance in an organization's view of relationship building, $R^2 = .04$, (F (3, 208) = 2.95, p < .05). Organizational age demonstrated a significant effect on an organization's view of relationship building (see Table 5.6).

Discussion

As prior research suggested, relationship-building strategies were found to be widely practiced by organizations in this sector. However, the success rate of various tactics and the success rate of building relationships with various stakeholder groups varied.

Characteristics of Organizations Focusing on Relationship Building

Overwhelmingly, the non-profit organizations that participated in this research indicated that they recognized the benefits of focusing on relationship building. In the survey results, the mean importance rating of relationship building was 4.23 (where 1 is "not at all important" to 5 "very important").

Organizations with higher annual revenue were more likely to rate relationship building as an important organizational strategy. This finding was not surprising as organizations with higher revenue and larger budgets are more likely to embrace more advanced concepts.

Although organizational age was significantly positively correlated with annual revenue, older organizations were not more likely to consider relationship building an important strategy. Only six participating organizations reported relationship building as not applicable or not at all important. These six organizations were all at least 10 years of age. The age category with the highest percentage of organizations that reported relationship building as a very important strategy was the youngest category (i.e., 0-4 years of age).

Perhaps older organizations are more set in their ways and resistant to switch to new practices. Older organizations were more likely to report success with fundraising appeals, mailings, and telemarketing, which are all fairly traditional communication approaches. Recently formed organizations may be more flexible and open to accepting newer practices. Older

organizations are also more likely to have long-standing, established relationships with supporters. Because they have methods that already have proven to be successful, these older organizations may not need to rely on relationship-building tactics in the same way as younger organizations that are still developing their supporter bases.

The research also found no significant correlation between the importance of relationship building and number of full-time employees. This research result was unexpected, partly because the number of employees was significantly positively correlated with annual revenue. It stands to reason that organizations with more employees should have increased ability to undertake relationship-building tactics, such as face-to-face communication or listening, which are often time-intensive.

The researcher suspects that the age categories provided in the survey may have influenced the results. Because information about non-profit organizations and staff size could not be located through secondary research, the researcher created the age categories based on her judgment. While the responses to the other demographic questions (i.e., age and annual revenue) were evenly distributed, 69% of participating organizations fell into the two smallest categories for number of full-time employees (i.e., 0-4 employees and 4-9 employees). If these categories had been narrowed, it is likely that fewer organizations would have been lumped together and more detail could have been obtained from the data.

The survey collected a category description of the participating non-profit organizations (e.g., education, health, human services). However, after initial review the data was not used in the analysis. Organizations of all descriptive types followed similar patterns based on age, income, and staff size. A high-income, long-established animal-related organization was more likely to act in a similar manner as a high-income, long-established arts organization than a low-income, newly formed animal-related organization.

Success of Communication Tactics

Organizations that considered building relationships with supporters an important organizational strategy were more likely to have success using database marketing, face-to-face communication, and listening (i.e., obtaining feedback) than organizations less concerned with relationships. The results of this research question concur with the results of Bennett and Barkensjo's (2005) study of relationship marketing with service recipients. Higher quality versions of these three tactics were found to result in higher quality relationships with service recipients (Bennett & Barkensjo, 2005).

Database Marketing

Database marketing involves using a computer database of stakeholder information to segment markets and create targeted communication. Obviously, personally meaningful and relevant communication helps to build a relationship between a person and a non-profit organization. When communication from an organization meets information needs and fulfills expected rewards, people are more likely to experience satisfaction. Social exchange theory predicts that this satisfaction allows the relationship to continue and eventually leads to trust and commitment (Dywer et al., 1987; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Bombarding an individual with irrelevant information or no information at all is likely to result in dissatisfaction and the probable end of the relationship. Through computer monitoring of supporter interests and responses to previous communication efforts, database marketing will help organizations ensure

that communication is relevant and meaningful to supporters, which will strengthen relationships.

Face-to-Face Communication

According to social exchange theory, individuals are assumed to enter and stay in a relationship when the benefits of the relationship outweigh the costs (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Face-to-face communication allows an individual unfamiliar with the organization to gain a more complete understanding of the non-profit entity than an impersonal fundraising letter or brochure. This communication method enables an individual to receive information about an organization and immediately have his or her questions about benefits and costs answered.

Face-to-face communication is also a means of providing individuals with expected relationship benefits, such as heartfelt appreciation for their support, an update on the organization's activities that provides supporters with a sense of accomplishment, or a free dinner. Face-to-face communication is arguably the most natural method for developing relationships so it makes sense that organizations interested in building relationships reported success with this tactic.

Listening

Trust develops when a person's outcome expectations of the relationship are continually met, and this development of trust eventually leads to commitment and loyalty (Dwyer et al., 2006; Kingshott, 2005). Listening, or receiving feedback from supporters through opportunities like surveys or open houses, allows individuals to express the relationship outcomes they desire, as well as their current satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the organization. After receiving this feedback, the organization can incorporate supporters' suggestions into future plans and make any necessary adjustments to ensure that supporters are satisfied, which will make them likely to continue the relationship and develop loyalty to the organization.

Communication tactics and building and sustaining relationships with specific stakeholders

The survey results showed that organizations' success with various communication tactics was related to their success with building and sustaining relationships with various stakeholders. The success of face-to-face communication, listening, and ongoing communication with supporters had a significant positive correlation with success with all stakeholder groups. These three tactics offer universal benefits for both internal and external stakeholders. The value of the first two tactics, face-to-face communication and listening, in building relationships was addressed in the previous section.

The third tactic, ongoing communication, is likely to appeal to all audiences. Ongoing communication creates a sense of intimacy between relationship partners, which positively influences satisfaction, trust, and commitment (Remley, 1996). Social exchange theory shows these constructs to be imperative for establishing stable relationships (Kingshott, 2005). Ongoing communication can also convey information that provides relationship benefits expected by supporters (e.g., information that demonstrates an organization's positive impact on society).

The Importance of the Target Audience

This research showed many expected significant correlations between certain audiences and certain communication tactics. For example, success with donor appreciation and

recognition was associated with success with the three groups most likely to receive recognition: donors, corporations, and funding agencies. Success with newsletters was primarily associated with success with internal audiences (e.g., employees, donors/volunteers, board members) while success with annual reports was associated with success with a much broader audience (e.g., board members, community leaders, corporations, donors/volunteers, media).

Success of Communication Tactics and Types of Organizational Benefits

The relationship-building success rates of different communication tactics were significantly correlated with the importance ratings of different stakeholder benefits provided by the organizations. Organizations that saw public recognition as an important benefit for supporters were likely to have success with tactics that could be use to publicly recognize donors and other supporters (e.g., database marketing, donor appreciation, annual reports, fundraising appeals, mailings, and newsletters). Success with communication tactics that are used to report financial information and provide financial accountability, such as advertising, fundraising appeals, mailings, and newsletters (Buckmaster, 2000), was correlated with organizations that viewed tax advantages as an important supporter benefits. The importance of personal satisfaction as a benefit for supporters was significantly correlated with the relationship-building success of only four tactics: donor appreciation, ongoing communication, fundraising appeals, and mailings. When altruism is the primary motivation for supporters, perhaps they experience satisfaction mainly from the knowledge that they are helping others.

Donor Appreciation and Recognition and Mailings

The success of donor appreciation and recognition and mailings was correlated with the importance of all organizational benefits. Even though connection between donor appreciation and recognition practices and the benefit of public recognition makes the most sense, perhaps appreciation and recognition are such powerful motivators that they work even with people who are not expecting the benefit.

Targeting Supporters' Desired Benefits

When considering the connections between importance of supporter benefits and success of communication tactics, it is important to realize that non-profit organizations frequently offer more than one benefit to supporters.

Relationship Building and Length of Relationships with Supporters

Patricia Gaffney's research (1996) illustrated that an organization needs to extend a relationship with a new donor for at least 18 months to make the investment in recruiting the donor worthwhile. Almost 91% of participating organizations reported an average length of relationships of longer than 18 months.

Grounded in social exchange theory, relationship-building tactics have been demonstrated to positively influence relationship outcomes with service recipients, donors, and volunteers (Bennett & Barkensjo, 2005; Bussell & Forbes, 2006; Weir & Hibbert, 2000). Therefore, it was expected that focusing on relationship building would be significantly positively correlated with length of relationship with supporters. However, this study did not find longer average relationships with donors and volunteers for organizations that rated relationship building as an important strategy.

Lack of Success with Communication Tactics

Participating organizations overwhelmingly recognized the benefits of relationship building. However, these organizations did not universally report success with relationship-building tactics such as database marketing, listening, face-to-face communication, and donor/volunteer appreciation. In fact between 9% and 29% of organizations did not even use the tactics. Organizations may recognize the value of relationship building but they may not have mastered how to integrate the concept into interactions with supporters. Difficulties could stem from financial, time, or technological constraints.

Impact of Organizational Age

It stands to reason that the age of an organization and average length of relationship with supporters are related to some degree. This study found a significant correlation between average relationship length and organizational age ($r^2 = .125$, $p < .01$, $n = 212$). As discussed in the analysis of RQ1, 14% of organizations with more than 50 years of age did not report building relationships as an important organizational strategy. The oldest category of organizations reported the highest mean average relationship length with supporters (mean 3.63 on a 4-point scale) and a lower reliance on building relationships as an organizational strategy than younger organizations. Many older organizations are presumed to have already established stable supporter bases and may rely on factors other than relationship-building tactics, such as prominence in a region or organizational history, to sustain supporter relationships.

Post-Hoc Analysis

A post-hoc analysis using regression revealed that the three organizational characteristics of income, age, and staff size influenced how organizations view relationship building. These factors explained 4% of the variance so while an organization's characteristics influence how the organization views relationship building, there are also other contributing factors, including the view of the organization's leadership, overall staff expertise, level of competition faced by an organization, and characteristics of an organization's supporters.

Organizational age was found to be a significant predictor of an organization's view of relationship building. As an organization increased in age, the organization's view of the importance of relationship building was likely to decrease by a corresponding amount. This result supports the research's previous conclusion that older organizations, as a whole, were less likely to rely on relationship-building tactics because they had already established stable relationships with supporters.

Implications for Non-profit Organizations

This research demonstrated that non-profit organizations, as a whole, recognized relationship building as a valuable organizational strategy. Organizations are encouraged to adopt database marketing, face-to-face communication, and listening, as these were the communication tactics considered most successful by organizations interested in building and sustaining relationships with supporters. When deciding on which tactics to adopt, organizations should consider the intended audience of the tactic. The research found that face-to-face communication, listening, and ongoing communication with supporters were likely to be

successful with all organizational stakeholders. Other communication tactics were shown to have varying rates of success depending on the target stakeholder group.

For success, organizations should also consider the relationship benefits that their supporters expect and tailor tactics to fulfill those benefits and promote relationship satisfaction. Donor/volunteer appreciation and recognition and mailings to supporters were considered successful in reaching supporters regardless of the benefits that they valued. Other communication tactics appealed to different groups of supporters at varying levels of success.

Despite this research's failure to demonstrate a connection between length of relationship with supporters and relationship building as a strategy, non-profit organizations are encouraged to consider this approach. Every non-profit supporter evaluates the cost and rewards of participating in a relationship with the organization. When benefits outweigh the costs, supporters are satisfied and likely to maintain the relationship (Dainton & Zelley, 2003). Integrated marketing communications stands to positively impact relationship satisfaction by ensuring that supporters receive the benefits they expect.

Emphasis on relationship building is thought to have more of a benefit for organizations with less established supporter relationships, such as younger organizations or organizations undergoing recent change. While the approach is beneficial for all non-profit organizations, these organizations stand to have more to gain.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study demonstrates the opportunity for further research to be conducted about non-profit organizations' use of integrated marketing communications and relationship-building tactics. This study examined the success of communication tactics from the perception of organizational leaders. A study involving the stakeholders of non-profit organizations would provide additional information, perhaps more reliable, about the success of communication tactics. A survey or a series of focus groups could be conducted with individuals on the receiving end of communication to determine which tactics they found most beneficial. By involving an organization's supporters in the research, a more accurate representation of the strength of relationships would be obtained.

Another recommendation for future research is to expand the variety of non-profit organizations examined. These research results may have been influenced by the type of organizations that participated in the survey. Participating organizations did not accurately represent the national population of 501(c)(3) public charities, as the survey received a higher response rate from organizations with annual revenues greater than $1 million dollars than organizations in other revenue categories.

Table 5.1: Importance of Relationship Building (RB) as an Organizational Strategy and Organizational Characteristics

	Importance of RB	Annual revenue	Age	Number of employees
Importance of RB		.145*	-.101	.091
Annual revenue			.246**	.720**
Age				.298**

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

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

Table 5.2: Importance of Relationship Marketing (RM) and Success of Communication Tactics

	Impor RM	Advert	Database	Donor appr	F-to-F comm	Listening	Ongoing comm
Imp.RM		.075	.140*	.114	.179*	.153*	.098
Advert			.287**	.183**	.168*	.052	.181*
Data				.216**	.199*	.252**	.294**
Donor app					.403*	.289**	.397**
F-to-F						.449**	.460**
Listening							.594**

	Ann.report	Emails	Fundraising	Mail	Newsletter	Tele
Importance of RM	.008	.096	.087	.088	.123	-.049
Advertising	.173*	.032	.180*	.097	.112	.220**
Database	.151*	.246**	.117	.255**	.179*	.136
Donor	.302**	.142*	.375*	.372**	.338**	.043
Face-to-Face communication	.283**	.204**	.335*	.256**	.359**	.014
Listening	.193**	.376**	.090	.179**	.201**	-.010
Ongoing	.276**	.344**	.279**	.324**	.419**	.007
Annual report		.073	.313**	.321**	.293**	.170*
Emails			.000	.133	.143*	.041
Fundraising				.566**	.287**	.102
Mailings					.431**	.084
Newsletters						-.026

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

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

Table 5.3: Success of Communication Tactics and Success with Stakeholder Groups

	Community	Corp	Donors/	Employee	Fundin	Govern	Media	Other
Board	.280**	.226*	.268**	.260**	.194**	.174*	.104	.133
Community leaders		357**	.207**	.177**	.285**	.482**	.425**	.186**
Corpor(s)			.318**	.214**	.286**	.314**	.355*	.161*
Donors/ volunteers				.212**	.203**	.096	.274**	.276**
Employees					.396**	.243**	.170*	.185*
Funding agencies						.397**	.302**	.357*
Govern. officials							.292**	.259**
Media								.276**

	Potential donors/ volun	Service recipients	Advert	Data market	Donor apprec	F-to-F comm	Listen	Ongoing comm
Board	.233*	.080	.164*	.125	.159*	.143*	.195*	.307**
Community leaders	.241**	.121	.215*	.085	.182*	.271**	.313**	.332*
Corporation	.355**	.230**	.124	.156*	.292**	.228**	.213*	.219**
Donors/ volunteers	.620**	.095	.098	.207**	.412**	.323**	.195**	.468**
Employees	.115	.383**	.175*	.139*	.168*	.276**	.201*	238**

Table 5.3 continued

	Potential donors/ volunteers	Service recipients	Advert	Database market	Donor app	F-to-F comm	Listen	Ongoing comm
Funding agencies	.331**	.283**	.263**	.097	.200**	.276**	.280**	.229**
Government officials	.210**	.170*	.123	.188**	.176*	.192*	.238**	.214**
Media	.311**	.071	.360**	.160*	.263**	.233**	.230**	.294**
Other non-profits	.307**	.169*	.032	.166*	.107	.162*	.262**	.271**
Potential donors/ Volunteers		.237**	.175*	.314*	.392**	.377**	.270**	.361**
Service recipients			.123	.075	.212**	.209**	.256**	193**
Advertising				.287**	.183**	.168*	.052	.181*
Database marketing					.216**	.199**	.252**	.294*
Donor appreciatio						.403	.289**	.397**
Face-to-face communica							.449**	.460**
Listening								.594**

	Annual	**Emails**	**Fundraising**	**Mailings**	**Newsletters**	**Telemarketing**
Board	.177*	.156*	.303**	.244**	.158*	.039
Community leaders	.270**	.177*	.115	.127	.104	.124
Corporations	.280**	.122	.298**	.290**	.246**	.088
Donors/ Volunteers	.192**	.144*	.477**	.426**	.387**	.051
Employees	.151*	.108	.131	.155*	.227**	.022
Funding agencies	.270**	.036	.315**	.211**	.265**	.030
Government officials	.256**	.096	.025	.112	.085	.032
Media	.288**	.126	.223*	.254**	.132	.069
Other non-	.126	.215**	.161*	.210**	.290**	.046
Potential donors/	.301**	.218**	.456*	.419**	.290**	.102
Service recipients	.068	.201**	.121	.122	.140*	.002

Advertising	.173*	.032	.180*	.097	.112	.220**
Database marketing	.151*	.246**	.117	.255**	.179*	.136
Donor appreciation	.302**	.142*	.375**	.372**	.338**	.043
Face-to-Face communication	.283**	.204**	.335**	.256**	.359**	.014
Listening	.193**	.376**	.090	.179**	.201**	-.010
Ongoing communication	.276**	.344**	.279**	.324**	.419**	.007
Annual		.073	.313**	.321**	.293**	.170*
Emails			.000	.133	.143*	.041
Fundraising appeals				.566**	.287*	.102
Mailings					.431**	.084
Newsletters						-.026

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

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

Table 5.4: Success of Communication Tactics and Importance of Supporter Benefits

	Personal sat	Public recog	Social aff	Tax advantage	Advertise	Database marketing	Donor apprec	F-to-F
Personal		.142*	.095	.210**	.041	.104	.234**	.103
Public recognitio			.576**	.314**	.132	.217**	.217**	.157*
Social				.217**	.099	.286**	.143*	.187**
Tax					.175*	.096	.160*	.221**

	Listening	Ongoing comm	Annual reports	Emails	Fundraising	Mailings	Newsletters	Telemark
Personal	.116	.176*	.113	.074	.227**	.138*	.051	.077
Public recog	.097	.130	.321**	.136	.148*	.260**	.220**	.027
Social affil	.077	.100	.227**	.104	.132	.206*	.155*	.132
Tax Advan	.002	.222**	.201**	.067	.304**	.170*	.254**	.112

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

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

Table 5.5: Importance of Relationship Building (RB) as an Organizational Strategy and Length of Relationship with Donors/Volunteers

	Importance of RB	Length of relationship
Importance of RB		.035

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

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

Table 5.6: Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting an Organization's View of Relationship Building

Variable	B	SE B	β
Annual Revenue	.173	.264	.173
Age	-.142	.098	-.147*
Number of Employees	9.230E-03	.086	.011

* $p < .05$

References

Bennett, R., & Barkensjo, A. (2005). Relationship quality, relationship marketing, and client perceptions of the levels of service quality of charitable organizations. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 16,* 1, 81-106.

Buckmaster, N. (2002). Captured within masculine accounting: Accountability of non- profit organizations. In Lehman, C.R. (Ed.), *Mirror and prisms: Interrogating accounting* (Vol. 9, pp. 31-44). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2006). Developing relationship marketing in the voluntary sector. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *15*, 1/2, 151-174.

Caywood, C.L. (1997). *The handbook of strategic public relations and integrated communications.* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Cermak, D.S.P., File, K.M., & Prince, R.A. (1994). A benefit segmentation of the major donor market. *Journal of Business Research, 29*, 2, 121-130.

Dainton, M., & Zelley, E.D. (2005). *Applying communication theory for professional life:A practical introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dwyer, F.R., Schurr, P.H., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing, 51, 2,* 11-27.

Ewing, M.T., & Napoli, J. (2005). Developing and validating a multidimensional nonprofit brand orientation scale. *Journal of Business Research, 58*, 6, 841-853.

Gaffney, T. (1996). Advanced techniques of donor recognition. *Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing, 1,* 1, 41-49.

Kingshott, R.P.J. (2005). The impact of psychological contracts upon trust and commitment within supplier-buyer relationships: A social exchange view. *Industrial Marketing Management, 35*, 6, 24-739.

Parsons, L.M. (2007). The impact of financial information and voluntary disclosures on contributions to not-for-profit organizations. *Behavioral Research in Accounting, 19,* 1, 179-196.

Remley, D. (1996, September/October). Relationship marketing: Guaranteeing the future. *Nonprofit World, 14*, 5, 13-16.

Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

The Urban Institute. (2006). *The nonprofit sector in brief: Facts and figures from the Nonprofit Almanac 2007*. Retrieved March 15, 2007 from http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/FAQ/index.php?category=31

Venable, B.T., Rose, G.M., Bush, V.D., and Gilbert, F.W. (2005). The role of brand personality in charitable giving: An assessment and validation. *Academy of Marketing Science, 33*, 3, 295-312.

Weir, L., & Hibbert, S. (2000, April). Building donor relationships: An investigation into the use of relationship and database marketing by charity fundraisers. *The Service Industries Journal, 20*, 2, 114-132.