

When Politics and Cause-Related Marketing Collide: Susan G. Komen versus Planned Parenthood

Rod Carveth
Morgan State University

Abstract

This paper reviews the crisis communication strategy employed by the Susan G. Komen Foundation in the wake of the controversy caused by the Foundation's decision to discontinue funding Planned Parenthood. The analysis of the foundation's crisis communication efforts found that the organization had an inadequate communication plan with which to deal with crises, particularly one fueled by social media. In addition, the message strategy employed by Komen seemed to indicate the organization forgot what its mission was. Finally, Komen's attempt to apologize for its original decision to de-fund Planned Parenthood was inadequate.

This case study suggests that organizations that depend on cause-related marketing for their economic viability need to stick to their missions, and avoid engaging in divisive social and political issues. In addition, the rise of social media now requires organization to respond faster than ever to control the narrative during a crisis.

Introduction

Just days before Christmas 2011, the Susan G. Komen Foundation informed Planned Parenthood of America that it was discontinuing its funding for cancer screenings. Ostensibly, the reason Komen pulled the money was because the foundation had adopted a new criterion for funding awards – no organization receiving funding could be under investigation by either Congress or a federal agency. At the time of the decision, Planned Parenthood was under investigation by Congress as to whether or not they were violating abortion rules.

Komen's board of directors originally planned to keep quiet about the decision. The rationale this strategy was that a lack of publicity about the denial of funding to Planned Parenthood would avoid controversy. In retrospect, the Susan G. Komen Foundation could not have been more wrong. The controversy that ensued over the decision has continued throughout all of 2012. Komen board members have resigned, and key Komen personnel have been forced to leave the organization. Even Nancy Brinker, founder of the Susan G. Komen Foundation, stepped down from heading the organization during July 2012. Most importantly, donations to the Susan G. Komen Foundation have declined significantly, and participation the well-known Race for a Cure events have been down from 15-30%.

Cause-Related Marketing

Cause-related marketing (CRM) is a mutually beneficial collaboration between a for-profit corporation and a not-for-profit organization in which their respective assets are combined to: 1) create shareholder and social value; 2) connect with a range of stakeholders (consumers, employees, etc); and 3) communicate the shared values of both organizations

American Express first used the phrase "cause-related marketing" in 1983 to describe its campaign to raise money for the Statue of Liberty's restoration. American Express donated one cent to the restoration every time someone used its charge card. As a result, the number of new cardholders grew by 45%, and card usage increased by 28%.

Since then, CRM has taken on many forms (Daw, 2008). One form involves product sales. For example, the (Red) campaign has brought together many companies to sell specially branded products (such as a red Gap T-shirt) with a portion of the selling price going to the Global Fund for HIV/AIDS prevention.

Another type is "purchase plus" where a customer is asked at the checkout line if she or he would like to add a small donation (such as \$1) to the bill. The store processes the money and gives it to the nonprofit with which it has partnered.

An increasingly popular form of cause-related marketing is the licensing of the nonprofit's logo, brand, and assets. The licensing can apply to products that are extensions of the nonprofit's mission to using its logo on promotional items such as T-shirts, mugs, and credit cards to having the nonprofit provide a certification or commendation of particular products (such as American Heart Association providing recognition for products that meet their standards for heart health).

CRM also involves social marketing campaigns that use marketing techniques to encourage behavior change in a particular audience. An example is a social marketing campaign is the teaming up of the American Cancer Society and pharmaceutical company Novartis, on their Great American Smokeout campaign (Daw, 2008).

Finally, there are co-branded events and programs. One example is the Pan Mass Challenge, a two-day, 160-mile bike ride from central Massachusetts to the end of Cape Cod. The ride raises money for the Dana Farber Cancer Research Institute. The event draws over 5000 riders, and attracts numerous participating national and local sponsors.

The economic benefits to a non-for-profit from cause-related marketing project can be substantial, often reaching into the millions of dollars. Besides the economic benefit, not-for-profits gain the value of the publicity and advertising that usually accompanies a cause-related marketing program, which is often done by the corporation's public relations and marketing departments.

There are downsides to cause-related marketing efforts, though. For example one concern is that by linking their good names to for-profit activities a not-for-profit may weaken its trustworthiness. The public might feel the not-for-profit is "selling out," and blurring the line between business and philanthropy. Or the public might believe a good cause is being exploited for profit. For example, Microsoft Corp.'s Bing search engine created a backlash when it posted a

message on Twitter, offering to donate \$1 to Japan's relief efforts in the wake of the 2011 tsunami each time someone forwarded its message. The tactic touched off a massive number of complaints from Twitter users, who accused Bing of using the tragedy as a marketing opportunity. Bing dropped the plan within a matter of hours, providing a straight donation of \$100,000 to the relief effort instead (Steel, 2011).

Further, research from several studies on cause-related marketing (CRM) indicates that information regarding a company's support of social causes can affect choice. However, CRM's influence on product/service choice is found to depend on the perceived motivation underlying the company's CRM efforts as well as whether consumers must trade off company sponsorship of causes for lower performance or higher prices. The effects of retailer-cause fit are moderated by consumer perceptions of the retailer's motive for engaging in cause-related marketing, and by the affinity that consumers hold for the social cause component of the campaign (Barone, Norman, & Miyazakic, 2007). In other words, consumers are more likely to support companies that are making a difference in the world. But consumers are growing wary of the motives.

Finally, there is always the possibility that one of the parties involved (nonprofit or corporation) will engage in some activity that hurts its reputation. In that case, the other party may be perceived negatively as well. For that reason, corporations and nonprofits should choose their partners wisely. The recent decision by the United States Anti-Doping Agency to strip bicycle racing icon Lance Armstrong of his seven Tour de France titles because of Armstrong's alleged use of performance-enhancing drugs could affect companies such as Nike, which helps fund the Lance Armstrong Foundation.

Susan G. Komen Foundation and Cause-Related Marketing

The Susan G. Komen Foundation has been lauded as one of the most successful examples of CRM. The Susan G. Komen for the Cure initiative is "a marketing marvel" according to Jaley Cranford of the PR website Platform Magazine (Cranford, 2011). Cranford suggest that not only do events like the Race for the Cure help the organization spread awareness and raise donations benefiting breast cancer research, but they are also marketing tools that create a positive image about the organization. For example, the pink ribbon used by Komen is a marketing tool instantly recognized for breast cancer. Though October is breast cancer awareness month, hundreds of pink ribbon products can be found in stores nationwide year-round.

Since its inception in 1982, Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure has raised nearly \$1.5 billion for breast cancer research. That is not to say that Komen has been flawless in its efforts. In 2010, Komen entered into a partnership with Kentucky Fried Chicken. The partnership drew the ire of many Komen supporters for having a supporter that promoted healthy foods. Komen quietly ended its partnership with KFC. Those mishaps have been few and far between. Overall, the Susan G. Komen Foundation has been considered among the leaders in cause-related marketing ... or at least it was until 2012.

The Controversy

During the fall of 2011, the Komen board of directors discussed possible changes to policies governing the issuing of grants to various organizations provided breast cancer services to

women. By the end of December, Komen developed the following policy statement regarding grant awards:

Currently, a Komen grant may be terminated if, among other things, the grantee loses or changes its tax exempt status, is barred from receiving federal or state funds, or if we learn of any financial and/or administrative improprieties. Going forward, these same standards will now also be used in determining eligibility for Komen grants.

Further, should Komen become aware that an applicant or its affiliates are under formal investigation for financial or administrative improprieties by local, state or federal authorities, the applicant will be ineligible to receive a grant. An organization may regain its eligibility once the investigation is concluded if the organization and its related affiliates are cleared of any wrongdoing (Goldberg, 2012).

The Foundation had been feeling the heat from pro-life groups since it first made its alliance with Planned Parenthood. For example, in 2011, a Southern Baptist publisher ended sales of pink Bibles, which raised money for Komen. In addition, several Catholic dioceses around the country pulled support from the Komen Foundation and its “Race for the Cure” events.

During the spring of 2011, the anti-abortion activist group Americans United for Life released a 30-page report that accused the Planned Parenthood of misusing federal funds, failing to report child sex abuse, assisting sex traffickers, and a host of other illegal activities. The purpose of AUL's report was to convince Congress to investigate Planned Parenthood and revoke its taxpayer funds.

Around the same time, in April 2011, Karen Handel was hired as Komen’s senior vice-president of public policy. Handel, a Republican, was an unsuccessful candidate for governor of Georgia. During her gubernatorial campaign, Handel made her opposition to Planned Parenthood very clear – because she was pro-life, she promised to eliminate state grants to Planned Parenthood for breast and cervical screenings.

It is unclear how much influence Handel had in the new grant-awarding policy. Emails obtained from sources on the Komen board, however, suggest that Handel was the principal architect of the new policy. Prior to its adoption, the policy was shown to Komen's top public health official, Mollie Williams, who immediately resigned in protest (Bassett, 2012, Feb. 5).

Coincidentally (or perhaps not) at the time the new policy was announced, Planned Parenthood was the subject of a Congressional investigation launched by pro-life Republican Congressperson Cliff Stearns of Florida. Stearns started the investigation to examine whether the organization used federal funds to pay for abortions, which would be illegal. Stearns said he had been motivated to begin the investigation after reading the AUL report.

When the Komen board members asked which organization would be affected by the funding change, Elizabeth Thompson, Komen’s president, replied, “Planned Parenthood is the only one we know of. If we find others, those would be impacted, too” (Goldberg, 2012).

During the month of January 2012, Planned Parenthood tried to get Komen to reconsider its de-funding action. Komen held firm, citing the investigation by Congressman Stearns. By the end of the month, Planned Parenthood went public with the Komen funding decision.

Why did the controversy have such a negative impact on Komen? This paper proposes that Komen committed two major self-inflicted wounds. First, Komen had an inadequate communication plan with which to deal with crises, particularly one fueled by social media such as Facebook, Tumblr, and Twitter. The message strategy suggested Komen forgot what its mission was. Second, Komen's attempt to apologize for its original decision to de-fund Planned Parenthood was inadequate.

Poor Communication Plan

In any crisis, it is important to try to manage the media agenda. That means getting one's story out before the opposition gets its story out. In this case, the Komen Foundation decided it was best to handle the new policy quietly. They even believed Planned Parenthood had agreed to keep things private as well. Whether or not there was such an agreement, Planned Parenthood got its message out first, and thus was the first to control the media agenda.

In addition, in 21st century public relations, corporations need to have an *active* social media presence. Having an active social media presence is not just merely maintaining a Facebook page. It means interacting with users of that page.

The Associated Press (AP) story about Komen cancelling funding to Planned Parenthood appeared on Tuesday, January 31 (Crart, 2012). Once the AP story broke, Planned Parenthood sent out an email blast to supporters asking them for funds to replace those lost by Komen's decision. By the next day (February 1), the Komen Facebook site was overwhelmed by negative comments. A similar outburst of negative attacks against Komen also appeared on Tumblr and Twitter.

Komen's response at first was silence. Later in the day, Komen started deleting many of the negative comments on the Facebook page. No direct mention was made of the controversy. Then Komen posted an announcement that Energizer was continuing their sponsorship of Komen. Energizer's additional support had moved the company into the Million Dollar Council, a group consisting of Komen donors who had contributed at least \$1 million to support the fight for cancer research.

Within minutes, angry Planned Parenthood supporters announced on Energizer's Facebook page that it was organizing a boycott of Energizer.

Komen finally addressed the controversy on two fronts. First, a message was posted on Komen's Facebook page, seen in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1.

Susan G. Komen Facebook Message Addressing Controversy



Susan G. Komen for the Cure

At Susan G. Komen for the Cure, the women we serve are our highest priority in everything we do. Last year, we invested \$93 million in community health programs, which included 700,000 mammograms. Additionally, we began an initiative to further strengthen our grants program to be even more outcomes-driven and to allow for even greater investments in programs that directly serve women. We also implemented more stringent eligibility and performance criteria to support these strategies. While it is regrettable when changes in priorities and policies affect any of our grantees, such as a longstanding partner like Planned Parenthood, we must continue to evolve to best meet the needs of the women we serve and most fully advance our mission.

It is critical to underscore that the women we serve in communities remain our priority. We are working directly with Komen Affiliates to ensure there is no interruption or gaps in services for women who need breast health screening and services.

Grant making decisions are not about politics--our priority is and always will be the women we serve. Making this issue political or leveraging it for fundraising purposes would be a disservice to women.

Like · Comment · Share · about an hour ago · 🌐

👍 496 people like this.

💬 View all 743 comments 📄 80 shares

Write a comment...

Note. Source: Miller, K. L. (2012, Feb. 1).

Second, later that afternoon, Komen CEO Nancy Brinker issued a statement via YouTube. In the video, Brinker said the action to de-fund Planned Parenthood had been “mischaracterized” and called accusations that Komen was acting out of political motivations “scurrilous” and a “dangerous distraction” from the battle against breast cancer (Stein, 2012). Rather, Brinker stated, the decision was made as part of a broad effort to use donations more “efficiently.” Brinker, whose sister died from breast cancer, also declared, “Susan G. Komen will always fight for and serve the people who need us the most. We won't rest until every woman — rich, poor, insured or uninsured — can face a life without breast cancer” (Stein, 2012).

The next day, Brinker appeared on MSNBC's “The Andrea Mitchell” show. During the broadcast, she made the following statement:

“Many of the grants were education-oriented. We don't need to do that kind of education anymore. We've done it for 30 years. Now we need to translate this care into usable clinical care in communities. That means that if a person's screened, we need to follow. We need to follow-

up the screening. Did something happen. Once they go through the Planned Parenthood program, they also have to come to us for additional therapy and care.

We are trying to advise our community grant program. And we're doing it, and they've been a longtime partner of ours. We've notified them of this change, and frankly, we've been very private about it. And we have not said that we won't accept grants who meet our criteria ("Andrea Mitchell interviews..., 2012, Feb. 2).

The problem is that both the YouTube video and the appearance on the Mitchell broadcast contradicted the original announcement by Leslie Aun that Planned Parenthood was being defunded because of the fact that it was being investigated by Congress. The result was that the message the Komen Foundation was communicating to the public was inconsistent and contradictory.

By Friday, February 3, after thousands of angry emails, threats of withdrawing donations, and a letter signed by 26 U.S. senators asking the Foundation to reconsider its decision, Komen reversed course, saying that Planned Parenthood would be eligible to receive grant funding. By that time, however, not only had Komen lost the ability to set the media agenda, its message was so muddled, and disseminated so poorly, that it was extremely ineffective.

Inadequate Apology

Image Restoration Discourse Strategies

As noted elsewhere (Carveth, Ferraris, and Backus, 2007), reputation hinges upon the judgments that key publics make based upon an organization's -- or an individual's -- behavior. Sound reputations protect the organization or individual against existing and potential problems such as those that arise when controversial incidents occur (Baker, 2001). A previously solid reputation will not only help an organization or individual to ride out the storm, but also to successfully recover in the wake of its damage.

Image restoration becomes an issue when organizations or individuals have passed the point of anticipation and have lost the opportunity to act proactively in protecting themselves. All efforts thereafter must be made with the goal of regaining the confidence of all relevant publics, minimizing negative publicity, and returning the organization to either its previous state or one better.

Analysis of crisis communication often focuses on the content of external communications such as apologies and speeches of self-defense (Sellnow & Ulmer, 1995). Benoit's theory of image restoration comprises the typologies of self-defense to create a detailed typology of image restoration strategies for organizations (Benoit, 1995). Benoit (1997) has identified two simple components of an attack:

1. The accused is held responsible for an action.
2. That act is considered offensive.

In addition, public figures and organizations need to address a variety of stakeholder groups, each with their own set of goals and concerns. Benoit (1997) urges that in crisis situations, it is important to prioritize these groups and tailor messages to their specific concerns.

Image restoration theory focuses on the variety of message options at a crisis communicator's disposal. The theory is comprised of five broad categories of image repair strategies and three of these are divided into more specific subcategories of tactics. Denial is the first category of repair strategies. There are four variants within this category: simple denial, shifting the blame, separation, and denying that the act was harmful (Brinson & Benoit, 1999). Simple denial is a rejection of the charges. The accused party may deny that the act occurred or that they even performed the act. For example, at first, Enron denied that it had engaged in any financial wrongdoing (George & Evuleocha, 2003). Shifting of blame entails an argument that another party is actually responsible for the undesirable act. Blaney, Benoit, and Brazeal (2002) demonstrated that both Ford and Bridgestone tried to focus the blame on the other company in the wake of the incidents involving rollovers of Ford sports utility vehicles that used Firestone tires. In an analysis of Texaco's racism scandal, in which executives were taped using racial slurs against African-Americans, Brinson and Benoit (1999) also identified a previously unrecognized form of shifting of blame that they termed separation. Separation seeks to place the blame on a small portion of an organization that can be separated from the remaining and presumably good part. Finally, denying that the act was harmful is an admission by the accused that they committed the perceived wrong, however, they refute the fact that anyone was damaged by it (1999).

Evasion of responsibility is the second category. Here the offender attempts to dodge or reduce responsibility of wrongdoing. Simply put, evasion of responsibility involves the crafting of excuses (Brinson & Benoit, 1999). This general strategy has four different versions: provocation, defeasibility, accident, and good intentions. Provocation occurs when the accused party claims that the offensive act was merely a response to another's offensive act, and that the behavior should be viewed as a reasonable reaction to that provocation. Another form of evading responsibility is defeasibility. Here, the accused party alleges a lack of information about or control over key elements of the situation. Arthur Andersen tried to blame the Enron scandal not on their accounting practices, but on the downturn in the economy (George & Evuleocha, 2003). Similarly, President George W. Bush attempted to use defeasibility in defending his first term as president during an appearance on "Meet the Press" (Benoit, 2006). A third option is to claim that the offensive action was accidental. If the audience can be convinced that the negative action was a mishap, then the reasoning is that the accused will be held less accountable and the damage to image will be mitigated. Part of the image repair strategy used by the U.S. Navy in 2001 when the USS Greenville collided with a Japanese trawler, killing nine people, was that the incident was an accident (Drumheller & Benoit, 2004). A final strategy within this category entails an attempt to convince the audience that the offensive act was performed with good intentions, that although an undesirable situation occurred, the accused meant well (Benoit, 1997).

The third major category involves reducing the offensiveness of events. This category is made up of six sub-categories: bolstering, minimization, differentiation, transcendence, attack accuser, and compensation. Bolstering attempts to boost audience good will toward the accused in order to offset the negative feelings connected with the offense. Stressing the good traits of the offender or describing the offender's positive acts in the past achieves it. In the wake of the

Enron crisis, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) engaged in bolstering by stressing the positive activities and attributes of the profession (Rogers, Dillard & Yuthas, 2005). Minimization seeks to reduce the negative feelings associated with the wrongful act so that it appears less harmful than it may have initially seemed to be (Benoit, 1997). A third option is the employment of differentiation, distinguishing the present negative act from other similar, but more offensive actions in the hopes that this will reduce negative sentiment toward the act and concurrently toward the accused (Brinson & Benoit, 1999). U.S. Congressman Gary Condit attempted to employ differentiation in explaining his role in the disappearance of Chandra Levy, an intern in his office with whom he was having an affair (Len-Rios & Benoit, 2004). Transcendence attempts to place the act within a broader, more favorable context and appeals to values and group loyalties in order to improve the offender's image. In attempting to shore up his sagging approval ratings, in an April 2004 press conference, President George W. Bush employed transcendence as a strategy by claiming he was a "war president" and thus should not be judged according to the usual criteria for evaluating presidential performance (Benoit, 2006). When attacking the accuser, the offender tries to cast doubt upon the attacker's credibility to reduce the intensity of the attack. During the August 1, 2006 broadcast of his TV show, *The O'Reilly Factor*, host Bill O'Reilly responded to charges he personally attacks guests by charging his attacker, Oregonian TV critic Peter Ames Carlin, with not doing his own reporting, thus attempting to undercut his Carlin's credibility (O'Reilly, 2006). The sixth and final strategy within reducing offensiveness is compensation. In this strategy, the accused offers to reimburse the victim of the offense, which, if it is acceptable to the victim, should help reduce the negative feelings arising from a failure of some sort (Brinson & Benoit, 1999).

The fourth category of image restoration theory is corrective action. Strategies of corrective action involve the offender promising to correct the problem. The offender may promise to restore the situation to the state of affairs before the event by repairing existing damages, and/or promising to take preventive action (such as revising policies) to avoid a recurrence (Benoit, 1997).

The last category of defensive rhetoric is mortification. Apologists who use mortification confess to the wrongdoing and ask for forgiveness or express regret (Benoit, 1995, pp. 74-79). The rationale here is that the admission of guilt and a display of regret can often lead the audience to pardon the negative action (Brinson & Benoit, 1999).

Benoit (1995) argues that the more successful apologies will be those that use a combination of strategies. He also counsels the apologist to admit fault (if at fault) immediately and to report plans to correct problems and prevent recurrences. He argues that denial, shifting blame, and minimization do not typically work to preserve an apologist's image.

Komen's Use of Image Restoration Discourse Strategies

On Friday, February 3, Nancy Brinker announced that the Komen Foundation was reversing its decision and would continue to fund Planned Parenthood. Her statement is below:

We want to apologize to the American public for recent decisions that cast doubt upon our commitment to our mission of saving women's lives.

The events of this week have been deeply unsettling for our supporters, partners and friends and all of us at Susan G. Komen. We have been distressed at the presumption that the changes made to our funding criteria were done for political reasons or to specifically penalize Planned Parenthood. They were not.

Our original desire was to fulfill our fiduciary duty to our donors by not funding grant applications made by organizations under investigation. We will amend the criteria to make clear that disqualifying investigations must be criminal and conclusive in nature and not political. That is what is right and fair.

Our only goal for our granting process is to support women and families in the fight against breast cancer. Amending our criteria will ensure that politics has no place in our grant process. We will continue to fund existing grants, including those of Planned Parenthood, and preserve their eligibility to apply for future grants, while maintaining the ability of our affiliates to make funding decisions that meet the needs of their communities.

It is our hope and we believe it is time for everyone involved to pause, slow down and reflect on how grants can most effectively and directly be administered without controversies that hurt the cause of women. We urge everyone who has participated in this conversation across the country over the last few days to help us move past this issue. We do not want our mission marred or affected by politics - anyone's politics.

Starting this afternoon, we will have calls with our network and key supporters to refocus our attention on our mission and get back to doing our work. We ask for the public's understanding and patience as we gather our Komen affiliates from around the country to determine how to move forward in the best interests of the women and people we serve.

We extend our deepest thanks for the outpouring of support we have received from so many in the past few days and we sincerely hope that these changes will be welcomed by those who have expressed their concern (Bassett, 2012, Feb. 3).

On the face of it, it appears that Brinker is engaging in the image restoration strategy of mortification by apologizing for the transgression. However, the statement, "We want to apologize to the American public for recent decisions that cast doubt upon our commitment to our mission of saving women's lives" does not specify what actions the organization is apologizing for. In addition, the request for people "to help us move past this issue" makes the apology feel less than truly sincere.

In addition, the statement, "we believe it is time for everyone involved to pause, slow down and reflect on how grants can most effectively and directly be administered without controversies that hurt the cause of women" suggest a certain evasion of responsibility on the part of Komen. After all, it was the decision of the Komen board to de-fund Planned Parenthood that sparked the controversy. To suggest that everyone "pause, slow down and reflect" appears to be saying that it was other people – not the board – that created the problem.

Thus, overall, the apology by Komen could have been stronger by being more specific and more firmly taking responsibility for their actions.

Overall Impact of the Komen Controversy

At the time of this writing, it is unclear as to the long-term impact of the Planned Parenthood controversy for the Susan G. Komen Foundation. To date, a number of key members of the Komen foundation and its affiliates have resigned, including Karen Handel (senior vice-president of public policy), Leslie Aun (communications director) and Juliet Teer (vice-president of development).

In addition, fundraising has been down, as has been participation in the various races around the country. Perhaps the most symbolic example of the decline was in Washington, DC. In 2011, 37,000 runners and walkers participated in the local Susan G. Komen Global Race for the Cure. In June 2012, only 25,000 participated – a decline of 33% in one of the most visible venues in the United States (Hensley, 2012).

The Susan G. Komen Foundation was one of the best cause-related marketers around. Their pink ribbons appeared everywhere. National Football League players even wore pink shoes to support their cause. Most importantly, the organization was seen as nonpolitical. The people who supported Komen did so because of their affinity over the issue of women's health. Once Komen became perceived as acting politically, they risked the affinity the public had for their organization. Pulling funding from Planned Parenthood in what appeared to be an anti-abortion move alienated pro-choice supporters of Komen. Reversing the decision and restoring funding eligibility to Planned Parenthood angered pro-life supporters of Komen. In the end, both groups were disturbed that the Komen Foundation had become "political."

While it is clear that, at least in the short term, the Susan G. Komen Foundation lost its fight with Planned Parenthood, there is no doubt that Planned Parenthood was a winner. By February 3, Planned Parenthood had raised nearly \$3 million from 10,000 donors, many of whom had never contributed to Planned Parenthood before (included in the \$3 million was a \$250,000 donation from New York City mayor Michael Bloomberg). That more than offset the nearly \$700,000 that Komen was going to take away from Planned Parenthood – money that Komen eventually restored. Plus, Planned Parenthood stayed consistent with its mission – clearly a win-win for the organization.

References

- Baker, G. F. (2001). Race and reputation: Restoring image beyond the crisis. In R. L. Heath, & G. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 513-520). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Barone, M., Norman, A. and Miyazakic, A. (2007). Consumer response to retailer use of cause-related marketing: Is more fit better? *Journal of Retailing*, 83: 4, pp. 437–445
- Bassett, L. (2012, Feb. 3). Susan G. Komen reverses Planned Parenthood decision, does not promise to renew grants. *Huffington Post*. Available at:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/03/susan-g-komen-planned-parenthood_n_1252651.html

- Bassett, L. (2012, Feb. 5). Karen Handel, Susan G. Komen's anti-abortion VP, drove decision to defund Planned Parenthood. Huffington Post. Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/05/karen-handel-susan-g-komen-decision-defund-planned-parenthood_n_1255948.html
- Benoit, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, and apologies: A theory of image restoration strategies*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1997). Image repair discourse and crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 23(2), 177-186.
- Benoit, W. L. (2006). President Bush's Image Repair Effort on Meet the Press : The Complexities of Defeasibility. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 34: 3, 285-306.
- Benoit, W. L., & Brinson, S. L. (1994). AT&T: Apologies are not enough. *Communication Quarterly*, 42, 75-88.
- Benoit, W.L. (1997). Hugh Grant's image restoration discourse: An actor apologizes. *Communication Quarterly*, 45, 251-267.
- Blaney, J. R., Benoit, W. L., & Brazeal, L. M. (2002). Blowout! Firestone's image restoration campaign. *Public Relations Research*, 28, 379-392.
- Brinson, S. L., & Benoit, W. L. (1999). The Tarnished Star: Restoring Texaco's Damaged Public Image. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 12(4), 483-510.
- Carveth, R., Ferraris, C. & Backus, N. (2007). Fighting the Journalistic Perfect Storm: The Duke Administration's Handling of the Lacrosse Team Sex Scandal. *Proceedings of the 71st Annual Convention of the Association for Business Communication*.
- Cranford, J. (2011, Nov. 21) Cause-Related Marketing: The ribbon reigns supreme. *Platform Magazine*. Available at: <http://platformmagazine.org/2011/12/cause-related-marketing-the-ribbon-reigns-supreme-2/>
- Cratt, D. (2012, Jan. 31). Cancer charity halts grants to Planned Parenthood. *USA Today*. Available at: <http://www.usatoday.com/news/health/medical/health/medical/breastcancer/story/2012-01-31/Cancer-charity-halts-grants-to-Planned-Parenthood/52906296/1>
- Daw, J. (2008). *Cause marketing for nonprofits*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Drumheller, K. and Benoit, W. (2004). USS Greenville collides with Japan's Ehime Maru: Cultural issues in image repair discourse. *Public Relations Review* 30: 2, 177-185.

George, A. M. and Evuleocha, S, (2003). Denials, Excuses, Justifications, and Apologies: Restoring Tarnished Reputations after the Year of Corporate Malfeasance. What Worked and What Didn't. Proceedings of the 2003 Association for Business Communication Annual Convention. Available at:
<http://www.businesscommunication.org/conventions/Proceedings/2003/PDF/04ABC03.pdf>.

Goldberg, J. (2012, Feb. 2). Top Susan G. Komen official resigned over Planned Parenthood cave-in. The Atlantic. Available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2012/02/top-susan-g-komen-official-resigned-over-planned-parenthood-cave-in/252405/>

Hensley, S. (2012, June 1). Planned Parenthood controversy hangs over Komen's fundraising races. NPR. Available at:
<http://www.npr.org/blogs/health/2012/06/01/154135526/planned-parenthood-controversy-hangs-over-komens-fundraising-races>

Len-Rios, M. and Benoit, W. (2004). Gary Condit's image repair strategies: determined denial and differentiation. *Public Relations Review*, 30: (1), 95-106.

Miller, K. L. (2012, Feb. 1). The accidental re-branding of Komen for the Cure. Available at:
<http://www.nonprofitmarketingguide.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/komen-responds.jpg>

O'Reilly, B. (2006, August 1). Most ridiculous item of the day. The O'Reilly Factor. Fox News Channel.

Rogers, R., Dillard, J. and Yuthas, K. (2005). The accounting profession: Substantive change and/or image management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58: 1-3, 159-176.

Sellnow, T. & Ulmer, R. (1995). Ambiguous argument as advocacy in organizational crisis communication. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 31, 138-150.

Steel, E. (2011, March 21) Cause-tied marketing requires care. *Wall Street Journal Online*. Available at:
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703512404576209140495600916.html>

Stein, R. (2012, Feb. 2). Komen says efficiency, not politics, drove Planned Parenthood change. NPR. Available at: <http://www.npr.org/blogs/health/2012/02/02/146258585/komen-says-efficiency-not-politics-drove-planned-parenthood-change>

ROD CARVETH is an Assistant Professor of Public Relations and Advertising at Morgan State University in Baltimore, MD. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. His research examines the responses of organizations and individuals during and after crises.