ABSTRACT

The purpose of this evaluation is to identify the ways in which Goodwill-West Texas could improve their marketing efforts in order to increase service delivery and community support. Goodwill’s career center is underperforming in comparison to other Goodwill career centers in similar communities. Two surveys were used to assess the beliefs and attitudes towards Goodwill held by members of the community who are often in contact with Goodwill-West Texas’s target market. Participants were more likely to know about Goodwill’s retail sales rather than their social service efforts. This could be contributing to Goodwill-West Texas’s service delivery, but more research is needed to confirm this conclusion.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nationally, the 2016 poverty rate was determined to be 12.7 percent (Semega, 2016). This is less than a percentage point lower than the previous year, but it is still not a statistic worth celebrating. Based on this number, there are at least 40.6 million people who are living out the struggles that accompany having little to no income. These struggles include but are not limited to: educational difficulties, mental and emotional problems, a variety of health problems, and legal problems (Couch, Reznik, Iams, & Tamborini, 2018).

Addressing the issue of poverty could help alleviate many of the issues many Americans are facing today. In order to address these problems, it must be determined what causes poverty. The literature credits many different factors as contributing to the poverty level in America. Disability, single parenthood, minority status, and unemployment are a few of the many reasons a person might find themselves living with an inadequate income (Irp.wisc.edu, 2018).

Goodwill- West Texas

Goodwill- West Texas Goodwill-West Texas is one of the many nonprofits dedicated to solving the issue of poverty in America. They do this by creating work opportunities for many disadvantaged groups and by providing goods at discounted prices to those in their community. Goodwill-West Texas also works to eliminate poverty by addressing the issue of unemployment.
In 2015, a needs assessment was done in their community to learn more about the workforce population. The needs assessment produced results that justified the opening of a career center in order to help address the poverty and unemployment issues in the community. Although the needs assessment produced evidence of a need of this service, the Career Center has remained underutilized. They have been outperformed by other Goodwill Career Centers in similar communities, and this program evaluation will seek to understand what factors may be contributing to low service delivery at this specific location.

The program being evaluated will be the marketing department at Goodwill. This department is tasked with educating the public about the mission of Goodwill and the many services and programs it has to offer. It has already been determined that the community needs this resource, so the next logical step is to figure out why they are not using it.

**Definition of Terms**

There are many terms used throughout this thesis that have been defined in a majority of ways over the years. For clarity, this next section will define the terms in the way they were used throughout the research.

- **Marketing:** Marketing is any and all efforts of an organization to exchange information about the services, mission, and purpose of the nonprofit with members of the community (Kotler & Murray, 1975). Marketing can refer to activities involving face-to-face conversation, an online presence, news appearances, radio advertisements, community events, and brochures.
• **Brand:** The brand is the result of the marketing practices. It is how the community psychologically perceives the idea of the nonprofit (Kylander & Stone, 2012). Brand is constructed through the experiences, direct or indirect, that individuals have with the organization. The concept of brand specifically refers to its use in the nonprofit sector.

• **Brand strength:** Brand strength is most commonly a comparative quality that evaluates how positively stakeholders view the organization when considering a set of variables such as familiarity, attitude, and remarkability (Wymer, 2015; Wymer, Gross, & Helming, 2016).
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Search Methods

A search of the available literature was executed using the EBSCOhost OneSearch interface accessed using the Abilene Christian University Library homepage. Journal databases were searched to gather information concerning nonprofits and the different elements of the branding process. The search terms used were “nonprofit marketing,” “nonprofit branding,” “brand strength,” “brand awareness,” and “brand remarkability.” The search criteria excluded articles that were not peer reviewed and those that were not published in English. The information was reviewed in order to inform best practices for a brand evaluation of Goodwill-West Texas.

Probable Causes Related to Low Service Delivery

There are many different reasons an organization may experience low numbers of people accessing their services. Stigma related to the service is often one of these reasons (Bersamin, Fisher, Marcell, & Finan, 2017; Kissane, 2013). Many nonprofits work to help with issues that may not be accepted by the general public such as unexpected pregnancy, poverty, homelessness, domestic violence, and mental illness. People often avoid using services that could be beneficial to them to avoid judgment about the situation they are in.

Another reason someone may utilize a service is the location of the service. The service may be in their community, but it may be in an area that is too far for
them to find the time and resources to travel to. Geographic location plays an important role in someone’s ability to access services.

Competition with similar services also contributes to reasons an organization may experience low service delivery numbers. The issue of competition arises when there is more than one organization offering a service within proximity of another organization (Santos Cruz et al., 2013). Nonprofits are in constant competition for resources, volunteers, and support, and this same idea applies to their client base. People are less likely to use a service if they are already being served by another organization in the same field.

The most prevalent reason people do not use services, according to the literature, is awareness (Bersamin et al., 2017; Kissane, 2013; Mills & White, 2015; Sayal, Mills, White, Merrel, & Tymms, 2015; Sinha & Sharma, 2017). People are less likely to utilize a service if they lack a certain level of awareness regarding the service. Factors related to awareness include not knowing the extent of the services, not knowing how to navigate the services, and not understanding their personal need for the service (Mills & White, 2015; Santos Cruz et al., 2013). When information about a program is not transferred in a thorough way, people lack the details that help connect them to the service. Other barriers mentioned in the literature include cost, confidentiality, scheduling, and administrative problems (Bersamin et al., 2017).

**Employment and Poverty**

Unemployment is one of the many contributors to the poverty level in America, and it is also the issue Goodwill-West Texas works avidly to combat. Abilene’s unemployment rate, 3.6%, is not as high as the national average, 4.1% (“Abilene, TX
Economy at a Glance”). However, there are still improvements to be made in the state of employment Abilene. Although 3.6% may sound low, the number means there are approximately 4,400 unemployed individuals in the Abilene community. This group is a part of the 6.6 million unemployed individuals in the United States as a whole.

This group is at a higher risk for many negative consequences when compared to the general population. Health complications are more prominent among this group (Elderton, 1931). This is due to a few reasons. Firstly, they cannot afford the same health care as those who can pay for an insurance plan. This often results in costly visits to the emergency room, which results in debt and contributes to the problem. This group is also prone to poor eating habits and high consumption rates of tobacco and alcohol (Couch et al., 2018; Elderton, 1931). These are factors that can cause long-term health complications when they are performed at a high frequency and over a long period of time, which is often the case for people who are of low socioeconomic status.

Unemployment also has consequences for children in families. College funds, music classes, tutors, time to play, and healthy diets are a few of the luxuries that become out of the question when income is low. These types of conditions thwart the growth of a child educationally, emotionally, and socially (Elderton, 1931).

Unemployment also causes psychological problems in those affected. Those who are unemployed are statistically more prone to experience anxiety, depression, and suicidal thoughts (Anczewski & Anczewski, 2015; Howe, Hornberger, Weihs, Moreno, & Neiderhiser, 2012; Scheve, Esche, & Schupp, 2017).

Unemployment also takes a toll on the nation as a whole (Elderton, 1931; Kemp & Mercer, 1983; Turner & Turner 2004). When people are unemployed, they become
more reliant on public assistance to get through the week. Crime is also higher among those who are unemployed.

**Populations at Risk**

This section will highlight groups that experience unemployment at higher rates because they will be the same types of individuals Goodwill should hope to reach with their marketing efforts.

**Victims of Domestic Abuse**

Domestic abuse is a very complex problem. There is no single cause or consequence that accompanies partner violence in the home; however, research has shown a link between unemployment and domestic violence (Anderberg, 2016; Audra & Shannon, 2006; Lantrip, 2015; Showalter, 2016). The first correlation found has been between unemployment and the abuser. Men were less likely to abuse their partners if they had a monetary incentive not to harm them. Men who were reliant on their partners for income were less likely to repeat or participate in abusive behaviors. The second correlation found was between employment and a woman’s likelihood to leave. Women who were in abusive relationships were less likely to leave if they did not have a means to support themselves. Financial vulnerability can lead individuals to stay with someone who will support them, even when the situation is not safe for them mentally, physically, or emotionally (Chronister, 2008; Gianakos, 1999).

**Disabled Populations**

A disability can be anything from a physical handicap, a mental illness, or learning disability. People living with disabilities are a part of those who are at an increased risk for unemployment (Fogg, Harrington, & McMahon, 2010). In America,
someone living with a disability is twice as likely to be unemployed than someone who
does not have a disability (Turner & Turner, 2004).

There are many reasons someone with a disability may have trouble keeping a
job. They may face workplace discrimination. These conditions can leave individuals
unable to work in their current environments, and it can even lead to issues with being
hired in the first place (Turner & Turner, 2004; Kemp & Mercer, 1983).

These individuals often need accommodations in the workplace to be able to
function efficiently. These might include flexible schedules, frequent breaks, sensory-
sensitive environments, high supervision, or a number of physical accommodations for
those dealing with physical barriers to work (Poposka, 2016; Sundar, 2017). These kinds
of accommodations have been recognized as so vital that researchers have spent time
assessing the feasibility of making needed accommodations mandatory throughout work
places in order to give the disabled populations the tools they need to access employment
(Poposka, 2016; Sundar, 2017).

**Mentally Ill Population**

The unemployment rate amongst the mentally ill community is alarmingly high.
Maine has the highest unemployment rate for people with mental illness at a 92.06% rate,
and Wyoming has the lowest rate at a 56.10% rate. Texas sits towards the upper half of
unemployment for people with mental illness at an 85.60% rate. These rates are high
because the mentally ill population has a number of barriers it must overcome in order to
be successful in the workplace (Harris, Matthew, Penrose-Wall, Alam, & Jaworski,
2014).
A lack of experience contributes largely to a mentally ill person’s ability to get and keep a job. This population also has issues with attention, memory, and motivation. Parents with mental illness are less likely to be employed than their non-parenting peers (Luciano, Nicholson, & Meara, 2014).

Employment in general has shown positive outcomes for individuals with mental illness, but the problem lies in securing employment in a positive environment. Those who attempt to work and find themselves in unfit environments often face discrimination, low self-esteem, and high anxiety. Positive employment opportunities have been found to increase positive behaviors and emotions in those with mental illness, which is why organizations like Goodwill-West Texas are important (Park, Chan, & Williams, 2016). This is the population they actively seek to support through employment opportunities and training.

Marketing

Marketing is not a term many would associate with nonprofit practices, but it has become an integral part of the management of a nonprofit (Lohmann, 2002). As the number of nonprofits in America has grown, the number of challenges nonprofits face has also increased as they compete for the same resources. A number of these challenges can be handled using nonprofit marketing.

Marketing has many definitions. Kotler and Murray (1975) define marketing as “applied science most concerned with managing exchanges effectively and efficiently” (p. 470). The exchanges mentioned are the ones between stakeholders and the general community. Relationships with these groups are key because they ultimately help nonprofits achieve their mission through their support. At Goodwill-West Texas, these
relationships are integral because they connect the organization with potential clients and resources for these clients (Alvarez-Gonzalez, Garcia-Rodriguez, Garcia, & Perez, 2017).

Marketing is often associated with monetary benefits, but there are several other alternative reasons for nonprofits to start marketing. Aside from the monetary benefits organizations can gain from marketing, nonprofits should consider service delivery, volunteer recruitment, and brand strength as benefits to marketing (Kotler & Murray, 1975; Lohmann, 2002).

Marketing is a tool many administrators in the social sector have had to learn to sustain themselves. Through marketing, nonprofits can make their mission known, educate the public on the services they provide, and rally support from the community in the form of recommendation, donations, and volunteers (Lohmann, 2002; Stoycheva, 2015). Marketing is what ultimately helps nonprofits create a positive image for themselves, which research has shown to be extremely important to their success.

Marketing must be done strategically in order to yield the proper results. To be strategic, nonprofits must be aware of what is going on in the community and how people perceive them (Wymer, 2015). This information is what will ultimately allow nonprofits to know how to proceed with their marketing efforts.

**Brand**

The goal of marketing is to create a brand. Brand has been defined in many ways, across sectors for years now. Kylander and Stone (2012) define brand as “a psychological construct held in the minds of all” (p. 37). Boenigk and Becker define it as a “name that symbolizes a long-term engagement that causes the organization to stand out in comparison to others” (2016, pg. 183). Groza and Gordon define the nonprofit brand as
“an engagement that may take the form of financial contributions, volunteer commitment, and recommendation to others” (2016, p. 17). One thing is clear from looking at these definitions: brand comes down to what perceptions people have about an organization and the kind of behaviors people in the community are likely to perform as a result.

Literature agrees that the perceptions people have of organizations can greatly impact the success of the organization as a whole, and they agree that the measurement is extremely beneficial to organizations seeking to improve (Groza & Gordon, 2016; Napoli, 2006). However, the literature does not agree on how to define and measure these perceptions. Throughout research, the terms that appear the most are brand strength, brand image, brand personality, and brand equity (Michaelidou, Micevski, & Cadogan, 2015). These are all different terms for measuring how the target population views the organization and the overall relationship they have with it. The variables each measurement uses is what sets them apart from one another.

The next section of this paper will focus on defining these terms, highlighting their use in the past, and critiquing them in order to explain which is best to the use for Goodwill-West Texas.

**Brand Measurement**

Researchers often conceptualize brand measurements through the use smaller sub-measures. Organizations who meet criteria for a number of different factors are said to have positive brand outcomes. Brand strength seems to be the most appropriate measure for Goodwill-West Texas. This next section will focus on the criteria included in this measure and compare it with measures from other brand constructs.
Familiarity

According to Wymer (2015), a strong brand is one that is well known, perceived favorably, and believed to be extraordinary in comparison with others. Wymer (2015) defines these characteristics as familiarity, attitude, and remarkability. Similar criteria are found throughout research. *Familiarity* is not a term that is often used, but many researchers focus on the importance of awareness in relation to brand measures (Boenigk & Becker, 2016; Napoli, 2006; Tiwari & Roy, 2012). Familiarity is the first and most important measure of brand strength. Without it, the other two measures, attitude and remarkability, are irrelevant (Boenigk & Becker, 2016; Wymer, Gross, & Helming 2016). Familiarity measures how well known the brand is among the target group. Research supports that the more well known a brand is, the higher the strength of the overall brand.

Wymer (2015) claims familiarity to be a more beneficial measure than awareness because it measures the magnitude of how aware the target audience is of the organization. Awareness is not often a measure that can allow researchers to learn how extensive a target audience’s knowledge of an organization is. Familiarity claims to capture this level of depth (Wymer, 2015).

It is important for nonprofits to know how familiar their brand is among target groups because it could explain many performance results. It could explain the nature of service delivery, donor support, and word-of-mouth behaviors among the community (Mcdougle, 2014; Wymer, 2015). People will not utilize services of, donate money to, or speak positively about organizations with which they are unfamiliar. Low familiarity can result in performance deficits in any of these areas.
Brand familiarity has been compared to variables of similar nature throughout research in brand strength. Brand awareness is a common variable used when marketers seek to learn more about how much people know about their brand. However, familiarity has proven to be the superior measure. Familiarity focuses on more than if they have heard of the brand or not; instead, it measures familiarity on a scale (Wymer, 2015). It helps researchers give participants a wider range of options when determining how familiar they are with a brand name. For example, if one were to focus solely on the awareness measure, someone who only knows the name of a company could be placed on the same level as the person who knows the company’s mission statement, daily activities, and goals. Familiarity gives participants the chance to assess their personal knowledge beyond awareness of the existence of an organization.

Throughout the research, lack of familiarity with an organization and its services has proven to be one of the main reasons services are underutilized (Bersamin, Fisher, Marcell, & Finan, 2011; Kissane, 2013). People are less likely to use a service with which they are unfamiliar, and professionals are less likely to recommend services they know little about (Wilson & Dennison, 2011). It is for this reason that familiarity must be included in the overall evaluation. Further questions cannot be asked until the issue of knowledge about the organization is resolved.

**Attitude**

The second measure in Wymer’s construct is attitude. This measure focuses on the perceptions held in the minds about the organization. This measure posits that a brand cannot be strong if people do not view it in a positive light (Wymer, Gross, & Helming, 2016). This is a measure that is supported throughout literature. Dacin and Smith (2004)
agree that favorability is important to include in the measure of a brand. The attitude measure focuses on the positive or negative perceptions people have towards an organization. It may seem straightforward, but organizations can gain a lot from being perceived in a positive manner by stakeholders. In the private sector, brand attitude can be predictive of purchasing behaviors. However, in the third sector, there are different behaviors that are predictive when positive brand attitude is high. Individuals are more likely to volunteer, recommend, and financially support organizations they view in a positive manner. Attachment to brand also seems to be positively related to brand attitude (Whan, MacInnis, Priester, Eisengerich, & Iacobucci, 2010).

Research on brand personality can be related to this construct. Brand personality is a measure of brand that assigns human characteristics to the overall brand. It is a measure that works as a symbol (Aaker, 1997). There are a number of brand personality scales. Some range from 20-300 traits. Most of the brand personality measures are theoretical in nature because personality is not a measure that is easily validated. In one study, the set of personalities determined to be measurable were sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness (Aaker, 1997). All of these traits represent a different cluster of personality traits. These traits assigned to personality measures are representative of positive beliefs. Although researchers differ in how they measure positive beliefs, they all agree that for brands to be successful, the target audience must associate them with positive thoughts, emotions, and feelings. Brand attitude is important, but a brand can still suffer if they are not perceived to be better than their competitors (Wymer, 2016).
Remarkability

The third measure in Wymer’s brand strength construct focuses on the comparative aspect (2015). Awareness can be measured alone, and attitude can be measured alone; however, remarkability must be measured in comparison with another organization within a similar service class in order to determine the target audience’s likelihood of choosing one organization over another.

Brand remarkability is the last measure of brand strength. This measure is concerned with how exceptional a target group perceives a brand to be in comparison with other brands in its class (Wymer, 2015; Wymer, Gross, & Helming, 2016). This is the measure that makes brand strength comparative in nature. It allows researchers to see how the organization being measured compares with organizations in similar product classes. Remarkability can present itself in a variety of ways. The brand that is the best, the highest quality, or the most consistent in comparison to other brands is the one that will have the higher brand strength (Aaker, 1996). Many other researchers support the claim that brands that are seen as unique when compared to other brands is beneficial. Those who have high brand remarkability are more likely to experience positive exchanges with stakeholders (Faircloth, 2005). In brand personality studies, uniqueness is cited as being an important factor when consumers are distinguishing between brands (Faircloth, 2005; Wymer, 2015). This measure can be compared to similar measures in other brand research involving brand equity and similar constructs. Attention is often given to loyalty and commitment (Aaker, 1996; Boegink & Becker, 2016; Mühlbacher, Raies, Grohs, & Koll, 2016). They are related because they focus on the assumption that the target audience has options to choose from. However, a strong brand orientation will
lead them to choose the desired organization. It is for this reasons that loyalty, commitment, and choice are often included in brand research (Aaker, 1996; Boegink & Becker, 2016; Mühlbacher, Raies, Grohs, & Koll, 2016). This is usually the desired outcome of marketing and branding activities. The goal is to be the chosen organization to provide service.

**Conceptualization**

Wymer is one of the many researchers that has conceptualized brand strength. His conceptualization involves three different aspects: brand familiarity, brand attitude, and brand remarkability (2015). The first two measures can be taken individually, but the last measure, remarkability, gives this tool a comparative nature. The entire scale is composed of nine questions, and there are three items for each measure. The item pool was selected and refined by several marketing students in a graduate program. This is one of the simpler tools, as it only uses nine measures. This study will be grounded in Wymer’s research on nonprofit brand strength (2015).

Researchers in the original study sought to develop a reliable and useful scale for measuring brand strength. The first step of this process involves conceptualizing brand strength. Marketing students at a university were then utilized to develop a pool of statements for the survey. This process yielded 18 total statements for the survey. Researchers then went through a process of purification to develop their final survey. The final survey contains nine items, and there are a total of three statements to represent each different aspect of brand strength. The researchers then tested this scale. It was determined to be useful and valid for measuring brand strength. The survey measures brand familiarity, brand remarkability, and brand attitude.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to help guide the marketing efforts of Goodwill-West Texas. By evaluating the familiarity, remarkability, and attitudes towards the organization, marketers can better learn what kinds of message need to be crafted to promote positive feelings and behaviors towards the brand name.

Research Design

This study utilizes an exploratory descriptive design to assess participants’ familiarity and beliefs about Goodwill-West Texas.

Participants

The 19 participants in this study are from local nonprofits and businesses. Local nonprofit employees are being utilized in this study because they interact directly with the clients Goodwill-West Texas often seeks to serve. They have regular access to populations at risk of unemployment, so it is important to learn more about their personal perceptions. Their beliefs could impact their willingness and desire to recommend Goodwill-West Texas to others. The second group is selected because Goodwill often places clients in jobs outside of the organization. Employers’ beliefs about Goodwill could affect their desire to hire individuals. Employers are also able to recommend people to Goodwill who they observe may need career assistance.
Measures

Two different measures are used in this evaluation. The first is a brand strength survey developed by Wymer (2015). The second is a familiarity survey that will test the validity of the familiarity measures on Wymer’s scale (2015).

Brand Strength Survey

The brand strength survey, developed by Wymer (2015), is the first instrument in this study. It is designed to measure familiarity, attitude, and remarkability within a brand construct. There are nine total measure included in the survey. Participants were asked to complete one for Goodwill-West Texas and another for Salvation Army. This survey assesses the knowledge participants have about Goodwill, their overall attitude about Goodwill, and which organization participants are likely to support more.

Familiarity Survey

The familiarity survey is a combined list of all the services offered by the organizations being compared. Participants identified which services they believe each organization offers. This tested their knowledge of what each organization does, and it also assessed their self-reported familiarity.

Data Analysis

Aggregated data were disaggregated by multiplying each of the reported percentages by 19 (the reported N) and dividing by 100. For rows that had missing data, missing scores were imputed in one of two ways. For the Salvation Army subscale “I have a positive impression about them,” missing values were replaced with a one. This allowed the row sum to equal 19 (i.e., 19 responses). For the Salvation Army “I am able to describe them to others” subscale, row means were computed and rounded to zero
decimal points to give a more accurate reading. Adding up rounded values resulted in the correct number of responses (i.e., \( n = 19 \)). On the Goodwill “I Like them” and “I have a positive impression about them” subscales, the missing values were replaced with one. This resulted in row sums that equal 19.

To reconstruct a dataset for statistical analysis, each rating for each item was replicated the number of times indicated by the value in the column by row intersection. For example, the rating of 1 was replicated 0 times for the Goodwill rating of 1 on the “I am knowledgeable about GWWT activities” subscale item. The rating of 5 was replicated 7 times on that same subscale item. This process was completed on all subscales for both agencies. The result was a data table with 10 variables (i.e., Agency, Knowledge, Describe, Understanding, Better, Exceptional, Comparison, Thoughts, Like, Impression) with 38 cases (i.e., rows of data).

Using the statistics program R, a tool for data analysis, descriptive statistics were generated, and t-tests were performed. Because the standard deviations were similar, the t-tests were performed under the assumption of equal variances. The confidence level for the t-test was set at .95 and the test performed was for a two-way hypothesis (i.e., simply looking for a significant difference without hypothesizing a direction for the difference).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Table 1 indicates that most of ratings tended to cluster toward the middle of the scale (in the middle between strongly disagreeing and strongly agreeing). However, the majority of ratings tended to be more in the direction of strongly agree (i.e., 7).

Table 1

*Percentage for Each Rating by Questionnaire Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#r</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Tot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about GWWT activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am able to describe them to others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have a good understanding of what they have done in the past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No organization is better than them at what they do</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The stand apart as being exceptional</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stands out in comparison to others</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have positive thoughts when I think about them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I like them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have a positive impression about them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 presents this information in a graphical format. On questions 1 and 2, most of the responses were 5s indicating moderately strong agreement with the statements. For questions 4, 5, and 6, the yellow line indicates that the majority of responses to those items was in the middle between strongly disagree and strongly agree.

Table 2 presents responses to the services participants believed were offered by Goodwill and Salvation Army. As indicated by the table, all participants were aware of Goodwill’s retail sales, and the majority of participants were aware of the Salvation Army’s efforts to feed the hungry and provide shelter. Very few (15.8%) were aware of the Salvation Army’s Summer Camps, and an even smaller portion were (5.3%) aware of Goodwill’s after school programs. On average, participants were more aware of the services offered by Salvation Army than those offered by Goodwill-West Texas.

Figure 1. Visual Representation of the Brand Survey
Table 2

Activities Knowledge Assessment by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Goodwill</th>
<th>Salvation Army</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly services</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camp</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career assistance</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding the hungry</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran services</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State employment services</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment training</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing shelter</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

highlighted = services actually offered by each organization

Table 3 presents percentages of responses on the questionnaire regarding the familiarity with and attitudes towards the Salvation Army. Most scores fall on the most central measures neither strongly agreeing or disagreeing. It should be noted that the three questions regarding brand remarkability did not receive any of the highest scores from participants. The only statements where the majority of participants agreed can be found in the middle of the scale.
Table 3

Salvation Army: Percentage for Each Rating by Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about SA activities</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to describe them to others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of what they have done in the past</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No organization is better than them at what they do</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They stand apart as being exceptional</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands out in comparison to others</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have positive thoughts when I think about them</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like them</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a positive impression about them</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for the brand strength subscales grouped by agency.

In general, means and medians were close together suggesting minimal skew.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Brand Strength Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>median</th>
<th>skew</th>
<th>kurtosis</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 presents the results of an independent samples t-test. The t-test results do not show any statistically differences between the agency groups on the subscales scores.

Table 5

*Independent Samples t-Test Results for Agency Subscale Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI LL</th>
<th>95% CI UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkable</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows accuracy of perception data by agency. The table shows that participants more accurately knew about four services either offered, or not offered, by Goodwill Industries. Significantly more (74% p < .02) were accurate in responding that Goodwill did not offer elderly services (i.e., correct response). In contrast, only 32% correctly responded that Salvation Army does offer elderly services. Ninety-five percent correctly responded that Goodwill offers on-the-job training, while, 36.8% incorrectly believed that Salvation Army offers on the job training (p < .01). Similarly, 89% of participants were correct in marking that Goodwill Industries does not offer summer camp, and 16% correctly indicated that Salvation Army does offer summer camp. All participants correctly marked that Goodwill Industries offers retail sales, but only 63% knew Salvation Army offers the same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N Correct</th>
<th>N Incorrect</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Percent Incorrect</th>
<th>Fishers Exact p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Elderly Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Elderly Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>On The Job Training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>On The Job Training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Career Assistance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Career Assistance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Feeding The Hungry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Feeding The Hungry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>After School Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>After School Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Veteran Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Veteran Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>State Employment Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>State Employment Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Work Adjustment Training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Work Adjustment Training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Providing Shelter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Providing Shelter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GW = Goodwill Industries; SA = Salvation Army; *p < .05, **p < .01
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Implications for Practice

As far as Goodwill-West Texas’s development, they could benefit from conducting a brand strength survey of their own before and after the end of a marketing campaign. This would help give them insight into how their outreach efforts affect the surrounding community. Goodwill already participates in a number of research endeavors regarding their sales and overall satisfaction and usage of services. It could be useful to evaluate the impact of their marketing efforts so they can begin crafting messages specific to their organizational needs.

It is also important for Goodwill-West Texas to consider how to stand out from their competition. Remarkability was mentioned as being important when determining brand strength and the likelihood of being chosen above another organization in regard to giving resources and using services. It is also the only measure that all participants felt Goodwill was not worthy of the highest score. This measure focuses on how participants view an organization in comparison to their competition, so Goodwill should focus on marketing efforts that showcase things Goodwill offers that others do not. Goodwill’s marketing efforts have been successful in branding their organization in regard to retail sales and on-the-job training. However, they need to make adjustments in their marketing technique in regard to some of their lesser known services if they expect to see improvements in the number of people who access their services.
Implications for Policy

When considering social work practice, it is important to consider the place of marketing education amongst social work professionals. In an industry already scarce in resources, it is important to equip social workers with basic skills that will benefit their future hiring capabilities and work performance. Creating curriculum that allows practitioners to gain skills in areas that will help draw people to their services as well as develop community support could allow them to be assets in areas where marketing professionals are simply not in the budget or in need of more staff in order to carry out marketing tasks.

Implications for Research

Throughout this project, it became evident that the majority of marketing research is directed at businesses. It was much harder to find research that focused on nonprofits and even more difficult to find studies on social enterprises. With the increase of social enterprises, it will only become more important for organizations to have access to research for their unique needs (Social Enterprise Alliance, 2018). Filling this gap in research could contribute to higher service delivery rates and better outcomes for social enterprises.

Limitations

There are several limitations that should be considered when taking the results of this study into account. The first is the sample size of the participants. There were difficulties in distributing the survey amongst the desired community, so the results cannot be said to be generalizable to another group, even of a similar background.

Collecting data also presented some problems throughout the research. A number of data points were lost at retrieval, so some information regarding the Salvation Army
could not be verified due to the original database being deleted and irretreivable. They were not the focus of this study, so the lack of this information is only a detriment in regard to comparison between Godwill-West Texas and Salvation Army.

The next limitation is that more organizations like Goodwill should have been included in the study to give a more precise overview on how they compare with competing organizations in their community. This study was conducted due to the low service delivery numbers of the career center specifically, so more organizations who offer this specific service should have been included in order to offer a thorough comparison.
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APPENDIX B

Brand Strength Measures

Salvation Army Brand Strength Survey

1=Completely Disagree, 2=Mostly Disagree, 3=Slightly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 5=Slightly Agree, 6=Mostly Agree, 7=Completely Agree

Familiarity
1) I am knowledgeable about SA's activities.

2) I can describe SA to others.

3) I have a good understanding of what SA has done in the past.

Remarkability
4) No other organization is better than SA at doing what it does.

5) SA really stands apart as being exceptional.

6) SA stands out in comparison to others.

Attitude
10) I have positive thoughts when I think of SA.

8) I like SA.

9) I have a positive impression about SA.
**Goodwill Brand Strength Survey**

1=Completely Disagree, 2= Mostly Disagree, 3=Slightly Disagree, 4= Neutral, 5=Slightly Agree, 6=Mostly Agree, 7=Completely Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I am knowledgeable about GWWT’s activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am able to describe GWWT to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I have a good understanding of what GWWT has done in the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarkability**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 No organization is better than GWWT at doing what it does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 GWWT really stands apart as being exceptional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 GWWT stands out in comparison to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitude**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 I have positive thoughts when I think of GWWT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I like GWWT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I have a positive impression about GWWT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salvation Army Activities Knowledge Assessment

Please mark the services you believe are offered by the Salvation Army.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding the hungry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State employment services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goodwill Activities Knowledge Assessment

Please mark the services you believe are offered by Goodwill West-Texas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding the hungry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State employment services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>