IS IT WORTH THE COST? MARKETING TO NEGATIVELY PERCEIVED CONSUMER GROUPS

Susan Baxter, Bethune-Cookman University

ABSTRACT

Examining consumer concerns is of importance to marketers. Some concerns include the desire for businesses to be more socially responsible through products and being more inclusive in advertisements. . To stress the need for social responsibility, consumers have reverted to using civil disobedience. A civil disobedience tool, the boycott, is now being used to protest not only unethical behaviors, but to also discourage businesses from marketing to certain populations and from giving employees of that group recognition. Consumer groups that are prejudiced against other consumers are attempting to impact corporate decision making in regards to human resource policies and marketing decisions. This paper looks at the history of inclusiveness, boycotts, and the current state of affairs with consumer groups.

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice, disliking a person based on a group that they belong to, has been a part of the human condition for centuries. These attitudes have impacted societies across the world for centuries. The Inquisition, slavery, Apartheid, the Holocaust and ethnic cleansing are some of the more brutal forms that prejudice can take. Prejudice is evident in people in varying degrees. Not everyone dislikes, or hates, people of certain groups to the point of wanting to kill them, they are more subtle in their prejudice – discrimination in hiring, housing, property ownership, rights. Some people are prejudiced against people who wear fur; others have issues with different skin colors. The effects of prejudice on individuals and groups are well documented in psychological literature. But why should businesses be concerned about prejudice? Because consumer groups that don't like the policies and practices of a company or another consumer group have a tendency to protest or boycott, causing negative publicity and possibly impacting sales.

Consumer groups have a history, since the 1960s, of combining voices and money to protest against business policy, practices and products. There have been successful campaigns against unethical treatment of animals, the antifur campaign, the movement to stop dolphin killing by tuna fishermen, to name a few (McCune, 1990). One of the ways consumers express their displeasure is through a protest or boycott. A boycott is a huge weapon to persuade a business to be socially responsible. The consumer boycott, when organized well, hits the corporation in their most vulnerable area – the balance sheet (Power, 2005). Nike felt the wrath of consumers due to some of their employment practices in other countries. South African businesses felt the impact of an investment boycott. In the late 1990s, supermarkets in Britain pulled genetically modified foods off the shelves after protests and boycotts (Power, 2005).

This civil disobedience tool, the boycott, is now being used to protest not only unethical behaviors, but to also discourage businesses from marketing to certain populations and from giving employees of that group recognition. Consumer groups that are prejudiced against other consumers are attempting to impact corporate decision making in regards to human resource policies and marketing decisions.

Is it worth the potential costs to businesses to continue to market to all consumers? Should corporations listen to well-organized and well-funded consumer groups, and limit their marketing to "appropriate groups"? With more organized, funded and Internet savvy consumer groups in the mix, are boycotts a realistic threat to business success?

This paper will examine these questions, starting with a look at research on prejudice and consumer attitude to other consumers and the product based on race, on ethnicity, and then on sexual orientation. Finally, this paper will discuss a few organizations that are currently utilizing boycotts and protests to sway corporations from marketing to other consumer groups via the Internet.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Consumer versus consumer prejudice is not new. Marketing researchers and advertising professionals have been examining this topic since the 1960s when they began looking at white and black consumers and ways to effectively target them. Marketing and advertisement professionals focus their efforts on consumers' wants and needs. They keep tabs on what consumers are thinking. In the early 1960s, researchers were examining the impact of including blacks in advertisement and marketing materials for products aimed at whites. One study looked at attitudinal responses between integrated and non-integrated promotional stimuli (Barban & Cundiff, 1964). Barban and & Cundiff's (1964) results demonstrated that white's response to ads with black models was either neutral of slightly positive. Prior to this time, marketing was very segregated – products marketed to the black community used black models in black media (billboards in black neighborhoods, black magazines, black newspapers). White models were used for all commercials on television and in the advertisements in mainstream magazines and newspapers.

Other researchers used the methodology from the Barban & Cundiff study to examine the effects of different levels of social intimacy using integrated models (Barban, 1969), the level of the subject's prejudice (Cagley & Cardozo, 1970), the effect of the advertisement on the product advertised (Muse, 1971, Stafford, Birdwell & Van Tassell, 1970), and the impact on consumer brand loyalty when using integrated promotional materials (Block, 1972). These studies focused primarily on print media advertisement.

Cagley and Cardozo (1970) raise serious doubts about the use of black models in promotional materials. They identify the possibility of a "white backlash" possibly adversely affecting advertisers should reactions to blacks in ads be related to racial prejudice. Of primary importance in this study is the need for examination of levels of prejudice in a market area. The authors concluded that advertisers could unknowingly precipitate a "white backlash" by running ads with black models in more prejudiced markets and an offsetting reaction from liberal whites is unlikely (Cagley & Cardozo, 1970).

Businesses were concerned about the potential monetary loss if they offended their majority white customers – a backlash. Bush, Gwinner, and Solomon (1974) conducted some of the first research on white consumers sales response to the using of blacks in in-store promotional materials. They found that white consumers purchased equally from all experimental displays including all white models, all black models and an integrated (black and white models). This study, taking into consideration the limitations due to sample size (conducted in 3 supermarkets in predominately white markets), does provide evidence that the use of minority images in promotional materials does not adversely affect short-term sales in predominately white markets. This study has further significance when combined with the prior mentioned research as it suggests that the use of separate promotional campaigns for white and black markets may be unwarranted and the use of integrated campaigns are perceived in a positive manner by minority populations (Bush, Gwinner, & Solomon, 1974).

Civil rights organizations in the 1960s pushed for businessmen to use more minorities in promotional materials. The prevailing attitude was that increased visualization of integrated situations would help decrease racial stereotyping (Cox, 1970). These groups utilized the threat of boycotts and achieved limited immediate success but continued the push for more integrated advertising (Barban & Cundiff,

1964). Larger corporations did begin to integrate advertisements but smaller businesses were concerned about adverse sales consequences (Hair, Solomon & Bush, 1977).

Hair, Solomon and Bush (1977) conducted a factor analysis study of black models used in television commercials. They identified seventeen variables and grouped them into four categories. This study examined commercials shown in different geographic areas and noted that marketers used different advertisement strategies based on geographical strategies. Therefore, depending on the population mix of geographic area marketers will alter their promotional material to lessen the adverse impacts (Hair, Solomon & Bush, 1977).

As minority groups became more influential, business started courting them with a continuing eye on their majority clients. Marketers had a wish to design strategies that would appeal to the growing black market without alienating the dominant white market – again attempting to avoid the backlash discussed by Cagley and Cardozo (1970). "As minority groups become more influential, the threat of boycotts and lawsuits forced marketers to use more black models in promotional materials" (Bush, Hair & Solomon, 1979, p. 341). While there was still a concern about potential backlash from the predominant consumer group, the size of the minority group was bringing into question which group would have the largest negative impact on the business.

Significant research on race and prejudice as it related to business and marketing started by examining the concerns of black and white consumers and then, over time, that research took into account other ethnic groups as firms attempted to capture a larger share of the minority market (Qualls & Moore, 1990). Increased representation of ethnic groups in promotional materials has increased, again with the hope that one result of this action being an erosion of perceptual barriers between minority groups and the remainder of society (Qualls & Moore, 1990). Similarly to the early studies about black and white consumers, businesses again were concerned that using ethnic images in promotional materials would negatively impact the evaluation of the advertised product by the majority consumer. Qualls and Moore (1990) examine in-group bias theory and polarized appraisal theory to determine if one of these theories helps to explain the effect of race on consumer's evaluation of advertising. This research demonstrated that in-group bias was prevalent in advertising evaluation. An important contribution of this research is that it "provides a theoretical explanation of the impact of racial stereotyping in advertising"[in-group bias] which should give marketers a better understanding of the potential effectiveness of advertising campaigns that target minority and majority consumers (p. 150).

Forehand and Deshpande (2001) proposed that consumers' awareness of their membership in social groups (and potentially felt distinctiveness based on membership) may be brought forth by execution factors in a targeted advertisement as well as contextual primes that precede exposure to the targeted advertisement. They discussed ethnic self awareness which is defined as a temporary state during which a person is more sensitive to his or her ethnicity and this temporary state can be primed by cues in advertising and consumption situations. The authors hypothesized that ethnic primes in an advertisement would elicit ethnic self awareness and prompt more favorable attitudes toward same ethnicity actors featured in ethnically targeted advertisements (in-group bias).

Culture and gender differences are displayed in modern media outlets. The television entertainment industry has been accused of being a producer and promoter of stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes (Coltrane & Messineo, 2000). The authors noted that television producers have segmented audiences so that advertising could be created to reach each separate group. Television helped create lifestyle segmentation based on income and ethnicity. "Although segmented markets can engender a tight sense of community among people who share similar backgrounds, such differentiation can also promote suspicion of others" (p. 367). The authors noted that while television was attempting to be "inclusive during the 1990s, commercials reproduced many stereotypes of race and gender" (p. 385). Turow (1997)

blames segmentation strategies for increasing racial tensions during the latter twentieth century. Wilson & Gutierrez (1995) suggest that television once acted to bring people together, it now appears to reinforce the differences that keep them apart.

Bhat, Leigh and Wardlow (1998) took the idea of in-group bias a step further. They examined how one group (heterosexuals) reacted to the portrayal of an out-group (homosexuals) in promotional materials. They found that the emotional and attitudinal responses of heterosexuals to homosexual advertisements depended upon the heterosexual's general attitude toward homosexuals. The authors also attempted to discover if there was an impact on the attitude of the heterosexual toward the brand that utilized homosexually themed advertisement and found mixed results, which they attributed to using well-established brands (Bhat, Leigh & Wardlow, 1998).   So while there is still some concern about the level of negative response regarding an out-group representation within the promotional material, the researchers recognized the benefits from a universal campaign and noted that having an inclusive advertising campaign might shift the consumer's focus to the common situations all people have versus the fact that an out-group is represented in the commercial.

Another study looking at in-group bias was conducted by Wilkinson & Roys (2005). This study looked at different components of sexual orientation to determine the effect those components had on heterosexuals' impressions of gays and lesbians. Also included in this study was whether or not participation gender and religiosity affected this impact. As previously noted in other studies, in-group bias was a factor in the results of the study. The authors found that by placing "differential emphasis on the components of sexual orientation in representations of gay men and lesbians can affect heterosexuals' impressions of such individuals" (p. 80).

Until this point, the literature reviewed has focused on prejudice, in-group bias and the impact that has on consumers of varying group membership. The next area to consider is social responsibility. Social responsibility in business can take many forms, a few include the following: (1) towards the environment by sponsoring recycling or clean up programs, (2) towards the community by being a good corporate neighbor, (3) towards vendors by treating them fairly, paying in a timely manner, (4) towards employees by providing a safe work environment, with fair wages and benefits, and (5) towards consumers by offering a quality product at a fair price, honoring warranties, etc. Social responsibility has become a more salient means of product differentiation, and an effective instrument for developing brand equity (Macchiette & Roy, 1994). Addressing the subject of corporate social responsibility has become recognized as being vitally important to marketers (Gatten, 1991).

There has been an across- the-board erosion of brand loyalty due to the increase in available brands and a competitive marketplace. "In 1975, the average supermarket carried 9,000 items; by 1992, that number was 30,000, with more than 3,000 brands introduced each year" (Macchiette & Roy, 1994, p. 56). This increase in product availability has made it difficult to differentiate products "without using sales promotions emphasizing coupons and price reductions" (p. 56). One way to differentiate your product is through cause related marketing. Many consumers searching for self-actualization embraced the "green consumer movement" discriminated between brands of similar quality based on environmental and social concerns. (Macchiette & Roy, 1994). Environmentally friendly consumers are not the only group that marketers need to be aware of. Social responsibility in marketing includes cause related marketing and providing inclusive advertisements (as discussed earlier).

There is evidence that marketers take chances by ignoring the potential reactions caused by various interpretations of their marketing actions by concerned publics. Boycotts increased dramatically since the 1980's, but also, there are other means of collective action to deter and publicly damage incorrect or socially irresponsible marketers (Macchiette & Roy, 1994). One concern is that of a "damned brand". "This is a brand that, owing to a lack of foreseeing social response from a sensitive

group, has received such negative publicity that the product is dropped for the sake of preserving brand equity and corporate image" (p. 60). Such reactions can occur from social issues relating to questionable products and questionable marketing techniques, which are interpreted as exploitive of a particular group. Some brands that have faced this damning include Uptown and Dakota cigarettes and Power Master malt (Business and Society Review, 1992).

Another concern is the boycott. Consumers have used boycotts to protest cosmetic companies engaged in animal testing, tuna companies and their fishing practices, as well as governments for their oppressive practices (Macchiette & Roy, 1994; Power, 2005). Boycotts are expected to reach unparalleled heights from the early 1990s through the first decade of the new century (Putnam, 1993). This escalation in boycotts is tied to the increased propensity of groups to respond to notions of political correctness, environmental and ethical issues as they relate to marketing techniques.

One of the most famous consumer boycotts based on social responsibility is against the Nestle Corporation. The first boycott was in the mid 1970s and was suspended in 1984 after Nestle agreed to implement the International Code in developing countries (History, n.d.). The boycott resumed in 1988 with several countries from around the world, UNICEF, World Health Assembly, and IBFAN repeatedly calling on Nestle to stop unethical marketing practices of baby formula resulting in starving children in developing countries (History, n.d.). While there are over 31,000 websites with information on the Nestle boycott, the boycott continues (www.google.com). The interest in the topic is cyclical and various agencies involved are struggling for support (www.breastmilkaction.com).

Another example of a social responsibility reason for a boycott is the website www.Karmabanque.com call for a boycott against Coca-Cola. They lay out an agenda on what the expected results are (drop in stock price by 50%) over the next twelve months (Coca-Cola, 2004). Why are they pressing for a boycott of Coca-Cola? Environmental concerns – water supply conflicts with farmers in India, employment issues in Latin America, pursuing marketing plans to brand baby bottles with the Coke logo, to stop discrimination (2000 lawsuit by black workers in Atlanta factories), and to increase education and treatment of AIDS for workers and families in Africa (p. 14).

Proctor & Gamble (P&G), a large multinational corporation, has been the target of a boycott for 12 years by the American Family Association. The American Family Association (AFA) is a large Christian organization whose website boasts over 2.2 million members and growing (www.afa.net). AFA has been boycotting P&G's household products, not because they are a socially irresponsible corporation harming infants, the elderly or the environment. They are boycotting P&G because they are demanding that P&G stop advertising on gay-themed TV shows and web sites and end domestic partnership benefits for employees (Han, 2005; www.afa.net). AFA is claiming victory in this boycott as they state "P&G has stopped their sponsorship of TV programs promoting the homosexual lifestyle and advertising on homosexual Internet sites" (Han, 2005, p. 66).

Proctor & Gamble was not the only corporation targeted by AFA. The Walt Disney Company has faced a nine-year boycott from the AFA and the Southern Baptist Convention. Again, the AFA was not protesting a corporation that was harming the environment or vulnerable populations with their Disney boycott. The AFA was protesting the content of films distributed by MIRAMAX, a Disney subsidiary, and the "promotion of the homosexual agenda throughout the Disney corporation" (www.afa.net). The AFA has also targeted Ford Motor Corporation and Kraft Foods for similar concerns regarding employee benefits, and sponsorship of gay pride events, advertising through homosexual media, and on homosexual websites (Cohn, 2005; Han, 2005).

DISCUSSION

The United States has the largest number of Internet users in the world. Access and use of the Internet is increasing worldwide. Consumer groups are recognizing the power of websites, email lists, targeted email campaigns, and responding to social injustices en masse. Various action groups have websites, from religious affiliations, to animal rights (PETA, www.peta.org), to environmental concerns (www.greenpeace.org), to white supremacist sites (www.stormfront.org) to gay rights (www.hrc.org) and everything in between. These action groups are consumers and they have taken to the World Wide Web to spread their message of corporate and political social responsibility and activism. Previous consumer boycotts revolved around consumers versus corporations due to unfair labor practices, safety issues, or animal rights. There is little information in the literature about studies on boycotts due to companies courting negatively perceived consumer groups.

When consumer groups dislike other consumer groups and protests or boycotts ensue, it is reminiscent of the concerns marketers and businesses had in the 1960s regarding white backlash. Have these tactics been effective? There are times when boycott effectiveness is undeniable – the tuna fishing industry for one example, PepsiCo's pull out from doing business in Burma for another (Sen, et al, 2001). But are boycotts effective? Should businesses be concerned? Pruitt and Friedman (1986) found that consumer boycott announcements were followed by statistically significant decreases in stock prices for the target firms. Additionally, their study found that the overall market value of the target firms dropped by an average of more than $120 million over the two-month post announcement period. Similar results can be found more recently by reviewing the stock prices for Ford Motor Company (sales dropped 19% January 2007 compared to same time 1 year prior) and AFA reports that Ford sales have declined 8 of the 10 months they have been boycotting (Wildmon, 2007). Is that propaganda and the decline in Ford sales due more to product recalls? If so, it is effective propaganda that continues to fuel participation in the boycott.

Other times, boycott effectiveness is questionable – the AFA versus P&G as P&G states they have not pulled advertisement from gay friendly shows or websites, that, in fact, the show did not meet P&G content guidelines or there was no advertising available to purchase (Han, 2005). The Southern Baptist Convention boycotted Walt Disney Co. for several years, yet theme park attendance maintained or increased during this time, as did stock prices (Reed & Friedman, 2005).

Corporations caving in to organizations like AFA might be costly in terms of brand loyalty. When Microsoft gave in to demands from conservatives that it drop its endorsement of a gay anti-discrimination bill in the Washington state legislature, gay rights supporters protested and the company renewed its endorsement after all (Cohn, 2005). Courting the GLBT population requires ongoing visibility in the community, either through media outlets, local organization support, or national organization sponsorship. Switching sides, as Microsoft appeared to do, greatly impacts brand loyalty, for which the GLBT population is known for (DeLozier & Rodrigue 1996, Bowes, 1996).

This same reverse boycott (from the gay population) might work with the Ford issue as well. Volvo, which is owned by Ford, is a long time supporter of gays through advertising on gay themed websites, in gay print media, and having inclusive commercials (www.commercialcloset.org). The AFA first suspended the Ford boycott after meeting with Ford dealership owners. The owners requested an extension to talk to the Ford Motor Company management about the AFA's concerns. However, due to ongoing Ford support of GLBT issues, the boycott went into effect during the summer of 2006. The AFA has a separate website specifically addressing the Ford boycott (www.boycottford.com). Due to the continual support of the gay community by Volvo, Ford might be looking for ongoing support from this community to offset the negative publicity from the AFA. Several gay websites are following and attempting to counter the AFAs boycotts (www.gay365.com, www.hrc.org, www.gay.com).

CONCLUSION

Marketing and advertising strategies have focused on being sensitive to consumer issues. This ongoing concern has been documented in the research since the early 1960s with regard to race relations and the impact on sales. Throughout the past 45 years, a heightened concern about, and public awareness of, social issues has provided strong initiatives for the development of corporate social responsibility as a market driven phenomenon (Macchiette & Roy, 1994). Employees do not want to work for companies without a conscience, and consumers do not want to buy from companies that destroy the environment. A discriminating concern and awareness of social issues has provided incentives for corporate social responsibility to be fully included into an agenda within the marketing system and aggressively implemented within marketing plans (Hutton, 1992).

Businesses have been attempting to differentiate themselves through increased cause related marketing – environmentally friendly, organic, support breast cancer research, to name a few. However, consumer groups have also engaged in cause related marketing that results in more effective protest and boycott campaigns. Therefore, marketers must be aware that a given promotional campaign may elicit a variety of meanings and cognitive, emotional, and attitudinal responses arising from individual and group-related differences, yet an advertisement designed for a very narrow group may not be cost effective (www.commercialcloset.org; Hutton, 1992). Some advertising and marketing professionals are referring to "America as a New Age Fundamentalist State whereby their advertising execution must walk a fine line between radical right religious groups and politically correct police representing sensitive groups" (Marcchiette & Roy, 1994, pp. 60-61).

The desire to not offend various audiences is just one of many facing a business. They must also attempt to be socially responsible, which includes policies that reflect social responsibility towards their employees and consumers. They may use inclusive strategies (which include not only gays and lesbians, but also various ethnic backgrounds) for many reasons: (1) to be on the cutting edge, (2) to be perceived as socially responsible enough, and (3) to penetrate new markets. Advertisers and marketers seeking to employ an inclusive campaign are advised to avoid stereotypic imagery in favor of an emphasis on common human concerns, needs and benefits (www.commercialcloset.org). Businesses that want to demonstrate respect towards employees by offering domestic partnership benefits (which benefit heterosexual unmarried couples and homosexual couples) or if they opt to target the gay community through an inclusive promotional campaign, are now at risk for backlash from prejudicial consumer groups.

Is targeting negatively perceived consumer groups worth the risk of a backlash from the majority consumer group? "For every dollar spent on gay-friendly advertising in 2003 and 2004, GPTMC generated $153 in direct visitor spending. The compares favorably to our general advertising which, in 2001 when it was last analyzed, generated $92 in visitor spending for every dollar spent in advertising" (Todd Evans, Rivendale Media, personal communication August 5, 2005). Fortune 500 companies are beginning to look at same-sex couples as an emerging market and targeting them accordingly. IBM, Volvo, JP Morgan, Subaru, and Budweiser have all featured gay couples in advertisements (Donaldson-Evans, 2004). These companies are weighing the opportunity costs associated with targeting negatively perceived consumer groups. Strategic concerns include: is a boycott planned, how large a consumer group is involved in the boycott, what is the potential financial impact of the announced boycott, is the targeted consumer group large enough to offset the costs incurred from the negative publicity.

In some cases, such as tourism, it has been shown that boycotts lead to increased support from the targeted population (Evans, 2005). Several mainstream businesses, including Anheuser-Busch , Bank of America, Avis-Rent-a-Car and Aetna Insurance, that might have once thought twice about flying their

logos alongside the rainbow flag are actively courting a market they consider beneficial, if not essential, to their bottom lines (Wong, 2005).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

While backlash from conservative consumers due to increased deliberate targeting of the GLBT population is of importance to businesses, social responsibility requires inclusiveness in marketing and employment. Corporations have a fine line to walk in an attempt to avoid offending various consumer groups. Businesses have recognized the importance of inclusiveness in the past 45 years and research has demonstrated that inclusive advertisements tend to dissipate extreme negative attitudes towards out-group consumers if the promotional campaign focuses on common, or shared, concerns. This review has demonstrated that further research into the prejudicial attitudes and use of civil disobedience by consumer groups is needed. No longer are consumers protesting just environmental or health hazards. They are now targeting multinational corporations based on religious beliefs and values.

The prevalence of websites lends one to look forward to future research representing case studies of boycott attempts through the use of the Internet, targeted email lists, and direct mail campaigns. The potential power of consumers is very great (after all, it helped start the American Revolution in the 1700s due to concerns over pricing and tea). Couple this potential with computer-communication technology and the means to realize the potential seems feasible (Zuriek & Mowshowitz, 2005). Another area of concern is web logs, or blogs. These are websites can cover a myriad of topics, depending on the theme of the blog. Some topics include politics, consumer products (electronics), breaking news, or personal thoughts. Marketing analysts can do content analysis on blogs in an effort to determine consumer response to campaigns, new products, or negative publicity.

Consumers are more educated, technologically savvy, and have a desire to be heard. Business has to decide how to manage the minefield of segmented consumer groups that don't like each other. Is it worth the cost? Many mainstream businesses are saying yes. The purchasing power of the U.S. gay and lesbian population will hit an estimated $641 billion in 2006 up from $610 billion in 2005, according to a study by Witeck-Combs Communications, a Washington, D.C.-based marketing firm specializing in the gay marketplace (Ehart, 2006). Such purchasing power makes gays and lesbians an attractive target market on the same footing as Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asians.

REFERENCES

Barban, A. M. (1969) "The dilemma of integrated advertising," *Journal of Business of the University of Chicago, 42*, pp. 477-496

Barban, A. M. and Cundiff, E. W. (1964) "Negro and white response to advertising stimuli," *Journal of Marketing Research, 1*, pp. 53-56.

Block, C. E. (1972) "White backlash to Negro ads: fact or fantasy?" *Journalism Quarterly, 49*, pp. 258-262.

Bush, R. F., Hair, J. F., and Solomon, P. J. (1979) "Consumers' level of prejudice and response to black models in advertisements," *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*(3), 341-345.

Cagley, J. W. and Cardozo, R. N. (1970) "White responses to integrated advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research, 10*, pp. 29-33.

Cohn, J. (June 27, 2005) "Road rage," *New Republic, 232*(24), 9.

Coltrane, S. & Messineo, M. (2000) "The perpetuation of subtle prejudice: race and gender imagery in 1990s television advertising," *Sex Roles, 42*(5/6), 363-389.

Cox, K. K. (1970) "Social effects of integrated advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research, 10*, pp. 41-47.

Donaldson-Evans, C. (2004, May 26) "Fortune 500 companies see money in gay families," Retrieved July 23 from the World Wide Web http://www.foxnews.com/sotry/0,2933,120902,00.html

Ehart, T. (2006, February 14) "Gay buying power projected at $641 billion in 2006," Retrieved March 29, 2007 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.witeckcombs.com/news/releases/20060214_buyingpower.pdf

Forehand, M. R. & Deshpande, R. (2001) "What we see makes us who we are: priming ethnic self-awareness and advertising response," *Journal of Marketing Research, 28*, pp. 336-348.

Gatten, C. (December 9, 1991) "Social issues guide consumer buying," *Marketing News.*

Hair, J. F., Solomon, P. J., & Bush, R. F. (1977) "A factor analytic study of black models in television commercials," *The Journal of Business, 50(*2), 208-215.

Han, A. J. (August 16, 2005) "Procter won't gamble on gays?" *Advocate,* 944, p. 66.

"History of the boycott", (n.d.) Retrieved August 10, 2005 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.babymilkaction.org/pages/history.html

Hutton, B. (January 6, 1992) "Conference to examine corporate social policy," *Marketing News.*

"It's time to take down Coca-Cola" (2004/2005). *Ecologist, 34*(10), 14.

Macchiette, B. & Roy, A. (1994) "Sensitive groups and social issues: are you marketing correct?" *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 11*(4), 55-64.

"Marketing to minorities – distilling the truth about alcohol ads," (1992). *Business and Society Review*, pp. 12-17.

McCune, J. C. (1990) "Consumer activism means big business," *Management Review, 79*(12), 16-19.

Muse, W. V. (1971) "Product-related response to use of black models in adverting," *Journal of Markeitng Research, 8*, pp. 107-109.

"Power of the purse," (2005) *Canada & the World Backgrounder, 70*, p. 20.

Pruitt, S. W. & Friedman, M. (1986) "Determining the effectiveness of consumer boycotts: a stock price analysis of their impact on corporate targets," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *9*(4), 375-387.

Putnam, T. (1993) "Boycotts are busting out all over," *Business and Society Review,* pp. 47-51.

Qualls, W. J. & Moore, D. J. (1990) "Stereotyping effects on consumers' evaluation of advertising: impact of racial differences between actors and viewers," *Psychology & Marketing, 7*(2), 135-151.

Reed, L. J. & Friedman, B. A. (2005, December) "Employer recognition of same-sex relationships in the United States: Legal and economic implications," *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 17*(4), 245-260.

Sen, S., Gurhan-Canli, Z., & Morwitz, V. (2001) "Withholding consumption: A social dilemma perspective on consumer boycotts," *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*(3), 399-417.

Stafford, J. E., Birdwell, A. E., & Van Tassel, C. E. (1970) "Integrated advertising – white backlash," *Journal of Advertising Research, 10*, pp. 15-20.

Turow, J. (1997) *Breaking up America: Advertisers and the new media world.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wildmon, D. E. (2007, February 1) "Ford sales drop 19% in January," Retrieved March 29, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.afa.net/ford020107.htm

Wilkinson, W. W. & Roys, A. C. (2005) "The components of sexual orientation, religiosity, and heterosexuals' impressions of gay men and lesbians," *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(1), 65-83.

Wilson, C. C. & Gutierrez, F. (1995). *Race, multiculturalism, and the media.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wong, B. (2005, June 25) "Gay pride parade brought to you by," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer.* Retrieved March 29, 2007 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.hrc.org/Template.cfm?Section=Home&CONTENTID=27645&TEMPLATE=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm

Zuriek, E. & Mowshowitz, A. (2005, October) "Consumer power in the digital society," *Communications of the ACM, 48*(10). 46-51.

BIOGRAPHY

Susan Baxter is an Assistant Professor of Marketing at Bethune-Cookman University. She is in the dissertation phase of her doctoral degree in marketing from Argosy University-Sarasota. Her research interests include diversity in advertising, HIV/AIDS impact on business, and consumer behavior. Questions or comments can be directed to baxters@cookman.edu.