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Consumer facing apparel brands are increasingly progressive in taking responsibility for their global environmental and social impacts. As a component of CSR or ESG, corporate philanthropy is not a new phenomenon, but the buy-one-give-one business model has recently emerged as an alternative strategy to give back while engaging consumers. Social enterprises, with social missions, have become commonplace as major brands in the past decade and a half, and their efforts to alleviate social issues have been equally praised and criticized. Social enterprises, with an environmental mission, are cut from the same cloth, but have yet to gain the same notoriety or market share as their counterparts. United By Blue and Tentree, with missions focused on ocean plastic pollution and deforestation respectively, have grown substantially in the outdoor apparel industry since their inception, but their philanthropic impact has yet to be adequately researched. This case study gathered publicly marketed metrics of corporate philanthropy from United By Blue and Tentree, then benchmarked those figures against metrics from Toms Shoes, Warby Parker, and Patagonia to determine if their environmental aid is effective in addressing the targeted issues. The results show that United By Blue’s strategy fits many of the criticisms that Toms Shoes has addressed recently, Tentree’s strategy fits many aspects that have garnered praise for Warby Parker, and Patagonia’s traditional strategy is still effective. Findings from this research show that the aid social enterprises provide has wide ranging implications but can be altered to be an effective component of a larger CSR/ESG strategy.
Introduction:

Corporate philanthropy is big business, with charitable giving reaching twenty billion dollars in 2018\(^1\); however, this spending is not an expense without a return. Major international brands and retailers including General Mills, Ikea, Whole Foods, and Sephora are cashing in on the marketing and consumer engagement value of the buy-one-give-one business model.\(^2\)

The simple proposition was developed by Blake Mycoskie in 2006 when Toms Shoes was founded on aspirations of alleviating poverty by donating a pair of shoes for every pair sold; “One For One” being the trademarked term by the company. Following the trend of integrating a social mission into business, Neil Blumenthal, David Gilboa, Andrew Hunt, and Jeffrey Raider (all students at UPenn’s Wharton Business school at the time) launched Warby Parker. Blumenthal, formerly a director of a nonprofit that distributed eyeglasses in developing countries, was the force behind Warby Parker’s “Buy a Pair, Give a Pair” social mission that seeks out “sustainable ways to get glasses on people’s faces”.\(^3\) Toms Shoes and Warby Parker, with hundreds of millions in revenue annually, have proven that this alternative form of business can create commercial and social capital simultaneously.

The buy-one-give-one (BOGO) model sits at the nexus of the formally researched topics of social enterprise, corporate philanthropy, cause related marketing, and cause brand alliance (Fig. 1).
Social enterprises, defined at the broadest level, are organizations with “a mission to create and sustain social value, not just private value”. The term social enterprise accurately describes ventures like Toms and Warby Parker, in that the founders are inherently entrepreneurial, relentlessly pursuing new opportunities and continuously innovating, adapting, and learning. The Social Enterprise Alliance (SEA) defines social enterprise as “organizations that address a basic unmet need or solve a social or environmental problem through a market-driven approach”. SEA notes that “social enterprise initiatives enable a company to integrate social impact into business operations and prioritize social goals alongside financial returns”. The prominence of the new structure is evident by investor, consumer, university, media, and policymaker attention.

Corporate philanthropy is used to apply humanity to the often-harsh goal of profit maximization, and in turn provides a social license to operate. Through these means, a firm garners the acceptance of stakeholders for their practices and operations.
Cause-related marketing (CRM) is the commonly used tool to tell the story of a firm’s corporate philanthropy efforts. A firm’s marketing of their BOGO model is “characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives”. Effectively, this practice is the consumer facing side of a structure where an organization commits to donating to a cause with each customer purchase.

Cause-brand alliance, somewhat of a subset of CRM, further investigates if and how each party may be affected by the partnership.

Unsurprisingly, the BOGO model has been replicated across many categories of consumer products and has been applied to environmental mission statements as well. United By Blue and tentree have BOGO business models: “For every product sold, UBB removes one pound of trash from our world’s oceans and waterways” and “you buy one, we’ll plant ten [trees]” respectively. Despite their much smaller size, they are the leading social enterprises that utilize the BOGO model in the outdoor apparel industry. These two companies need to be analyzed to determine if their business models are effective in addressing their targeted environmental issues.

**Literature Review:**

*Social Enterprise:*

There is an absence of qualitative analysis on the effectiveness of BOGO businesses, in the apparel and accessories industry, in addressing environmental dilemmas. However, a history of research into the broader topic of social enterprise has both defined the term and evaluated the structure’s overall effectiveness. The term social enterprise has become so widespread Ridley-Duff and Bull have recently concluded “social enterprise a useful umbrella term for any
(democratic) organization form or activity where ‘people are not in it for the money, but still generate a financial surplus”.\textsuperscript{13}

Alter provides further distinction of social enterprise from other organization’s structures with a typology for the wide range of firms that fall somewhere between the traditional nonprofit and traditional for profit. This work identifies four ‘hybrid practitioners’: nonprofit with income-generating activities, social enterprise, socially responsible business, and corporation practicing social responsibility. Figure 2 portrays the key differentiators in identifying social enterprise. Prioritizing social value creation over economic value creation distinguishes social enterprise as traditional nonprofit leaning, while socially responsible business trends towards traditional for-profit. This work also explains why this spectrum exists:

- “Nonprofits are founded to create social value; however, financial sustainability cannot be achieved without external or self-generated funds.
- For-profits are established to create economic value, yet often must make social contributions to survive in the marketplace.
- Both types of hybrids pursue dual value creation strategies to achieve sustainability equilibrium. Nonprofits integrate commercial methods to support their social purpose and for-profits incorporate social programs to achieve their profit-making objectives”.\textsuperscript{14}
Figure 2: Four types of Hybrid Practitioners

Alter’s typology also expands on the micro level of analyzing if or if not an enterprise and its mission are related. In relation to this study, the identification of ‘external social enterprises’ captures the essence of the companies analyzed for this case study. These are identified in that “business activities may have a social bent, add marketing or branding value...however, profit potential is the motivation for creating a social enterprise unrelated to the mission”.

**Cause-Related Marketing:**

The value of a cause related marketing and cause brand alliance is undeniable, and social enterprises are effectively maximizing both with corporate philanthropy efforts. Bronn and Vrioni concluded two decades ago, that CSR is not only a critical component of long-term success but also the communication of its initiatives to all stakeholders including customers. Koschate-Fischer, Stefan, and Hoyer confirm this finding by realizing that CRM spending growth rates exceeded 12% in the 2000’s, rendering it the fastest-growing trend marketing. Barone Miyazaki, and Taylor’s work justifies this spending in that consumers increasingly choose brands that support social causes that are perceived by the consumer as ‘appropriate causes’. Varadarajan and Menon’s 1988 prediction that “CRM has the potential to evolve into
a creditable answer the oft-repeated call for corporations to become more involved in solving some of America’s social and economic problems”\textsuperscript{20} has come to fruition. Bronn and Vrioni also conclude that a pro-social agenda doubles as a marketing tool that can:

- “Build and shape a company’s reputational status
- Make a differentiation in the market
- Give a company a competitive edge”\textsuperscript{21}

While researchers have detailed the numerous benefits, they also identify the potential for harm this form of marketing may enable. Varadarajan and Menon note that CRM may be ‘marketing’s major contribution to society’ but also identify that misuse leading to unintended consequences and resigning to cause-exploitative marketing are possibilities that must be avoided.\textsuperscript{22} Bronn and Vrioni, concur that the contribution to the designated cause must be consistent and believable to realize the benefits detailed above.\textsuperscript{23}

**Cause-Brand Alliance:**

Lafferty, Goldsmith, and Hult have shown that a relationship between a cause and brand enhances customer attitude towards both parties.\textsuperscript{24} Bigné et al. confirm this assertion in their finding that the more a brand image is associated with a social cause, the greater return on brand credibility.\textsuperscript{25} When looking at the ‘fit’ between the cause and alliance, Lafferty has found “that the fit between the cause and the brand does not affect perceptions of attitudes or purchase intentions...just the fact that the brand is aligned with a cause and that money is being given to it as a result of purchasing the product, may be sufficient to positively influence their perceptions of the company, brand, and purchase intent”.\textsuperscript{26} Her research concludes that the good feelings alone, generated by the presence of CBA, overrides the need for the cause to be related to the business itself.\textsuperscript{27} This phenomenon was analyzed in the context of the 2004 tsunami that hit
Indonesia. A logical fit in CBA was Starbucks’ two-dollar donation to CARE, a nonprofit that provided emergency shelter, water, and hygiene, for every pound of Sumatran coffee sold (Sumatran coffee being sourced from Indonesia). An illogical fit, was the donation of one hundred dollars for each RV sold by Freedom Roads, because it lacked the direct business connection to Indonesia, but the CBA still provided an increase in sales for the RV dealer.²⁸ Although the variable of fit between cause and brand is found to have little to no effect on consumers, Lafferty and Goldsmith’s subsequent research finds that brand familiarity and cause importance are variables with impact. Brand familiarity is “knowledge about a brand that has been accumulated by the consumer through either direct or indirect experience with that product”.²⁹ Lafferty found that the unfamiliar causes have the greatest upside in forming a CBA because the brand benefits either way, meaning that the increase in awareness is the greatest return alongside the positive feelings attributed to the brand.³⁰ Regarding cause importance, Lafferty found that this perceived characteristic has an effect on how the firm is viewed and purchase intentions alike.³¹ In sum, logical fit is not the determining factor for a CBA’s success. A partnership with an unfamiliar cause, that is perceived as important for the firm's customer base, is believed to have the largest upside for all parties.

**Corporate Philanthropy:**

Research on corporate philanthropy nearly unanimously supports Godfrey’s blanket statement that “rational managers should engage in corporate philanthropy because such activity benefits shareholders”.³² He argues that corporate philanthropy, when implemented strategically, can fulfill both CSR and CFP (corporate financial performance) objectives.³³ Saiia, Carroll, and Buchholtz identify the concept of strategic philanthropy as “giving that improves the firm’s strategic position (ultimately the bottom line) while it benefits the recipient of the
philanthropic act”. In an early 2000’s survey of corporate giving managers, they noted that corporate philanthropy began to evolve into a means to garner competitive advantage. This paper also likens the partnership of a corporation and nonprofit to symbiotic relationships in nature where organisms in complex environments enable each other to survive. They pose that the key component of corporate philanthropy’s success is in the corporate mindset evolving past the view that these relationships are detrimental to the bottom line but are rather long-term investments for the company and community alike. Subsequent research by Gautier and Pache, has identified that “altruistic and for-profit represent two ends of a continuum along which it is possible to sort different variations corporate philanthropy”. They pose that corporations implement corporate philanthropy for three reasons; commitment to the common good, community-oriented investment, and marketing. In their comprehensive review of the literature on corporate philanthropy, they found that firm profitability holds the focus of the majority of research at the expense of examining how the entirety of stakeholders [shareholders, consumers, employees, local communities, governments] are impacted. Although the benefits and practices have been well known since 2000, Liket and Simaens believe that while “companies struggle to define their approaches to corporate philanthropy, and managers battle to come up with strategies to optimize their management of corporate philanthropy, the research does not seem to offer many concrete contributions. This field has realized that altruistic, community, and marketing reasons are all valid aims for a corporate philanthropy program but the practice of meeting each goal is less clear in practice.

**Case Analysis of Social Enterprise:**

The BOGO business model faces substantial criticism regarding its effectiveness in alleviating global social issues targeted in mission statements. Toms Shoes, the largest recipient
of critiques, is commonly accused of only alleviating symptoms of a problem rather than addressing the systemic roots of the problem itself; poverty in their case. A 2014 study looked at households in El Salvador to determine if the aid given by Toms Shoes is effective or even necessary. Wydick, Katz, and Janet found evidence to support their hypothesis that most children already own two or three pairs of shoes, contradicting the narrative told by the brand, and that donated shoes can have a negative impact on local markets.\textsuperscript{39}

Toms use of the BOGO model matches Ponte and Richey’s definition of ‘brand aid’:

- “Commodities sold as means of achieving development for recipients and good feelings for consumers simultaneously”.\textsuperscript{40}

- Critique: Social enterprises brand global problems and the individuals plagued by them to promote products that will save them.
  - They believe “brand aid provides an easy solution to current crises by linking the global economy to international development - a development that enables corporations to brand themselves as ‘caring’ without substantially changing their normal business practices, while consumers engage in low-cost heroism without meaningfully increasing their awareness of the struggles of people they are supposed to be helping”.\textsuperscript{41}

Talpalaru’s work on the concept of ‘conspicuous giving’ further criticizes how Toms is garnering attention from the public.

- Definition: “Visible acts of donating, fundraising, and volunteering for a specific cause...conspicuous giving, in other words, refers to any charitable act performed in the public sphere to which a certain amount of public recognition is attached”.\textsuperscript{42}
• Her case study identifies that “social enterprises differ from CSR primarily because they have managed to transform what Mycoskie [Toms founder] views as corporate practices that ‘too often look like tax write-offs or public gimmicks’ into a profitable business model”.43

• The case study also identifies Toms marketing as ‘beyond cause marketing’: “By using the personal pronoun in ‘the work we’re both doing in India’, Toms changes the role of its audience by prompting its public to imagine its participation in the act of giving”.44

• Critique: Ultimately, the case study concludes that “conspicuous giving further entrenches existing class inequality and global income disparity” and “buying recast as “giving” ...leaves untouched the more structural aspects global inequities that continue to guarantee profits and to energize contemporary capitalism”.45

Despite fierce criticisms, Marquis and Villa Vella Velez have found Warby Parker to provide an instance where a social enterprise has had the impact without the unintended consequences. The direct relationship between eyeglass donations and economic productivity in a study showing that the aid “increased users’ productivity by 35% and their monthly income by 20%, within six months of obtaining reading glasses”.46 Marquis and Park believe that the BOGO model, in for-profit business, is a viable way to create commercial and social value that will increase in prevalence as trends in consumer behavior continue to change with the millennial and subsequent generations. They liken the trajectory of the BOGO model to cause related marketing, which has become commonplace over the past thirty years because shared value created through simple and direct connection between a firm’s business and donations is
undeniable.\textsuperscript{47} While Warby Parker provides an instance of social value, consumers’ willingness-to-pay (WTP) for more ethical or sustainable goods, specifically in the outdoor apparel industry, has been confirmed by an analysis of Patagonia’s switch to cotton in the mid-90’s by Casadesus-Masanell et al. This study found “that customers were willing to pay significant premiums for organic cotton garments although the organic cotton provided no demonstrable private incremental benefits” and “on average, customers were willing to pay $6.58 more...14.6\% higher than the increase in production cost”.\textsuperscript{48} The proven social and economic effectiveness of the BOGO business model, paired with a growing consumer base that is willing to pay for pro-social/environmental products, provides adequate explanation for the prevalence of the structure despite its imperfections.

Neither praise nor criticism, like noted above, has been attributed to tentree or United By Blue.

**Research Design:**

Collecting and analyzing data relevant to the effectiveness of the BOGO business model was an investigation of the social or environmental propositions marketed to the public. Analyzing data relevant to the effectiveness of social enterprise, CRM, CBA, and corporate philanthropy required a broad, and qualitative research framework because no two firms are exactly alike. Although there are groups, like B Lab, that provide quantitative metrics to compare CSR (now more commonly referred to as ESG: environment, social, governance) performance between firms, it is not an exact science thus a qualitative approach is required. Compiled, this book of data will be used to benchmark the metrics of corporate and nonprofit social and environmental aid. The data collected is focused on partnering organizations, structure of donations, and impact.
Methods:

Consumer facing, company published annual reports were the primary material utilized to compile the metrics of social and environmental impact of corporations and nonprofits. Annual reports were chosen because they are the most common, accessible, and comprehensive format for delivering such information. All firms in this study have a common baseline of internal sustainability practices, meaning they address supply chain issues, climate change impacts, recycled/preferential materials, etc. The scope of the data for BOGO firms includes partnering organizations, structure of donations, and impact. Measuring impact in this case is straightforward due to the simplicity of the business proposition (e.g. trees planted, or trash removed). The scope of data for firms with a traditional corporate philanthropy program (meaning donating funds directly to an outside group, without specific, measurable action expected), Patagonia being the benchmark company for this study, focuses on the impact that grantee’s work has on their targeted issues. Again, measuring this impact is qualitative and also less straightforward than a BOGO business model, but an attempt is made to compare the results in entirety. In any instance that relevant metrics are not available, an attempt was made to collect data from the appropriate leader at that firm.

Results:

The results below aim to determine if United By Blue and Tentree, appropriately utilize CRM, CBA, and corporate philanthropy in addressing environmental dilemmas.
Table 1. Firms analyzed for philanthropic impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Founder(s)</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Partner Organizations</th>
<th>Structure of Donations</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toms</td>
<td>Blake Mycoskie</td>
<td>“Using business to improve lives”</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42 Shoe, 11 Sight, 2 Safe Water, 2 Safe Birth, 2 Bully Prevention &amp; Response, 2 Solar Light, 15 Impact Grant</td>
<td>33% of net profits - shoe distribution and grants</td>
<td>96.5 million lives impacted&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warby Parker</td>
<td>Neil Blumenthal, Andrew Hunt, David Gilboa, Jeffrey Raider</td>
<td>“To inspire and impact the world with vision, purpose, and style”</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>VisionSpring, Pupils Project</td>
<td>Vision Spring: donate cash equivalent of a pair of glasses; Pupils Project: partnership with local nonprofits and government to administer free eye exams and distribute free glasses in classrooms</td>
<td>&gt; 7,000,000 pairs of glasses distributed&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United By Blue</td>
<td>Brian Linton</td>
<td>“For every product sold, UBB removes one pound of trash from our world’s oceans and waterways”</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50+ Annually</td>
<td>Internal Staff Collaborates with Partners</td>
<td>3,334,472 lbs. of trash collected&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentree</td>
<td>Dave Luba, Kalen Emsley</td>
<td>“Buy one, plant ten”</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Eden Reforestation Projects, Trees for the Future, One Tree Planted, Parks Canada, Monarch Butterfly Foundation, UNAM, ECOAN, Global Forest Generation, Plant with Purpose</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>43,317,146 trees planted&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patagonia

Yvon Chouinard

“We’re in business to save our home planet”

1,082 environmental groups in ’18

Grants

>$100,000,000 in grants

Toms:

Toms’ new mission of “using business to improve life”\(^5^4\) is portrayed by their wide array of grantees they now support alongside their shoe giving program. Their 2019 report states that 96.5 million lives have been impacted by the company’s philanthropic efforts, which now encompasses efforts in sight restoration, safe water access, safe births, bully prevention, and solar light access (Table 1). A statement about the original ‘One-for-One’ evolving to meet new challenges sets the tone for Toms’ 2019 report. The brand states that after delivering nearly 100 million pairs of shoes over 13 years, they can do more to address complex social issues. Their new philanthropic model now includes ‘impact grants’ alongside shoe giving; $1 for every $3 made. Toms giving team now states it will partner with a range of nonprofits, NGO’s, and social enterprises. A poll of their past shoe partners provides insight into how they expect to be of benefit to the groups they partner with: 66% gain visibility and/or credibility, 79% serve a larger volume of people, 68% build or strengthen collaborations with other organizations, 44% attract additional support, 41% increase program interest. Toms ensures they themselves will benefit from the partnership by a thorough process of applications, research, PR reviews, and interviews. The brand looks for the following qualities:

- Local Experts
  - Have deep roots in the communities they serve
- Sustainable programming
o Address local needs without compromising the community’s ability to meet its own needs in the future

● Opportunities for integration
  o Maximize the impact already being created by existing programs

● Tracking capabilities
  o Complete annual reporting to see how resources are utilized\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Warby Parker:}

Warby Parker’s 2019 report states that the eyewear brand has helped distribute over 7 million pairs of glasses on behalf of the company’s mission “to inspire and impact the world with vision, purpose, and style”\textsuperscript{56} (Table 1). The brand has found that there are 2.5 billion people that need glasses but do not have access, and 624 million of these people have a visual impairment that keeps them from learning or working. A study by VisionSpring, their main partner, found that their eyeglass distribution program will enable $1 billion in earning potential for the low-income recipients targeted in 23 countries. Communities that have no other options are the primary target for Warby Parker’s philanthropy. The brand aid promotes social entrepreneurship by providing training opportunities for community members to administer eye exams and sell glasses at affordable prices. Individuals living on less than $4 dollars a day in developing countries, are the targeted recipients for VisionSpring training. Warby Parker’s role is donating the cash equivalent of a pair of glasses, then VisionSpring procures glasses and trains people in the community. Warby Parker states their philanthropic model has a ‘multiplying effect’ because the immediate need of vision care or glasses is complemented by job creation that allows self-sustaining income for their communities and families. Although Warby Parker is a private company, the eyewear brand uses the rigorous, universal guidelines of the Global
Reporting Initiative (GRI) framework for their annual report. They state that this practice aligns with their core values of “do good, set ambitious goals, and measure results”. Warby Parker identifies GRI’s real value in its ability to help them understand, communicate, and compare impacts on material issues; material issues meaning concerns relevant to internal and external stakeholders. Warby Parker identifies itself as a stakeholder centric company, meaning every decision takes customer, employee, community, environmental, and partner perspectives into consideration. Their philosophy further reveals why such comprehensive reporting is done:

- “To be one of the most impactful brands in the world
- To inspire the next generation of entrepreneurs and consumers
- To transform eyewear and eye care industry through design and innovation
- To consider our stakeholders in everything we do
- To prove business can scale, be profitable and do good in the world, without charging a premium for it”

*United By Blue:*

United By Blue’s 2019 impact report shows that the brand has removed 3,334,472 pounds of trash from the world’s oceans and waterways. UBB has taken this action by means of an in-house cleanup model that leverages collaboration with over 50 partners (Table 1), rather than the donation model of other brands that utilize the BOGO model. United By Blue identifies that inspiring individuals to live less wasteful lives also accompanies their efforts in removing trash from oceans and waterways. In 2019, UBB mobilized nearly 3,000 volunteers to partake in 24 cleanups, in 24 states, accounting for 868,428 pounds of trash collected. The primary target of aid in 2019 was illegal dumpsites. A multi-week effort on Burlington Island, a small island on the Delaware River, accounted for 96,100 pounds of trash. This effort involved the
government agencies of the City of Burlington and the Board of Island Managers, as well as private businesses like Sea Tow Delaware, Allied Recycling, and River Services. UBB also partnered with an Environmental Crimes unit in Oklahoma to target dumpsites along tributaries and ponds throughout the state. Cleanups at these sites accounted for over half the annual volume of trash removed, coming in at 628,180lbs. Efforts to ‘inspire individuals to live less wasteful lives’, materialized on World Oceans Day when UBB extended its own pledge of single use plastic reduction to their customer base and 11,532 people committed to quitting single use plastics for 24 hours. The brand also partnered with the major retailer Recreational Equipment Inc (REI) for their first annual ‘Opt to Act’ campaign. This campaign, a combination of UBB’s four-year-old ‘Blue Friday’ and REI’s ‘Opt Outside’, sold over 2,000 cleanup kits encouraging individuals to bring gloves and a trash bag to clean up the wild places they recreate in.58

**Tentree:**

Tentree’s **2019 In Review** metrics of environmental philanthropy efforts show that the brand has planted over 43 million trees since the brand's inception in 2012 (Table 1). The report states a goal to be the most environmentally progressive apparel brand in the world, while planting 1 billion trees by 2030. With their partners, approximately 7.2 million trees were planted in 2017, 9 million in 2018, and 11 million in 2019. This was also the first year that the brand enabled individuals to make a contribution without a purchase through their ‘Double Tap To Plant’ campaign. A tree was planted in Indonesia for every ten likes on the post, and the post became Instagram’s fourth most liked post (at the time) tallying over 15.7 million likes.59

**Patagonia:**

Patagonia’s **Environmental and Social Initiatives 2018** provides that the company has donated over $100 million in grants to grassroots organizations since 1985, with nearly 1,100
groups receiving funds in 2018 (Table 1). Yvon Chouinard, founder of the company, states that Patagonia’s philanthropy model is based on the premise that there’s ‘plenty of funding for science, but science without activism is dead science”. He notes that their grants for activists is important because most companies are risk averse to funding activism because of the chance they will do something radical. Chouinard also states that the small battles these activist groups fight are the most effective way to bring environmental issues into public consciousness. The amount of annual contribution has been formalized since 1985, with 1% of net sales being granted to nonprofits. The brand also makes additional donations periodically, like 2016’s 100% for the planet - where all Black Friday sales ($10M) were given to grassroots environmental organizations and in 2018 when the company felt they received an ”irresponsible tax cut” ($10M).

Patagonia’s increasing focus on climate change is portrayed by the many groups funded through their targeted climate initiative:

- Western Organization of Resources Councils - working to defend BLM and EPA rules against natural gas pollution
- Environmental Health Coalition in San Diego - developing tools to organize and empower environmental justice leaders to defend their communities from climate impacts
- Vote Solar - promotes rooftop, community and low-income solar access, and seeks to modernize the grid for clean energy technologies

This report also provides metrics for Action Works, an online platform for Patagonia’s audience of over 2 million to form direct relationships with grantees. Since 2018, 179,000 actions have been initiated and over 10,000 hours of skill-based volunteering has been donated (worth $1.6M).
Surfers Against Sewage, a UK nonprofit is highlighted as an example of the ideal type of organization that Patagonia seeks to partner with. Their mission has evolved from fighting poor water quality, to leading the fight against any threat to the UK’s coastline. This includes plastic pollution, climate change, development, restricted access, and coastal projects. In 2018 the organization held a cleanup that mobilized 35,500 volunteers that collected 65 tons of plastic waste from over 500 beaches across the UK. On a policy level, they created the Surf Activists Toolkit which has led to improvements for water-treatment outfalls, businesses’ reduction of single use plastics, and stakeholder engagement with marine planning. On a symbolic level, Surfers Against Sewage successfully lobbied their members of Parliament to remove single use plastics from the UK Parliament, to establish the first plastic-free parliament. Ultimately their efforts are focused on empowering supporters of the cause to address issues at the local level while the organization works towards change at the national level.60

Summary:

Reports analyzed for this study provided metrics directly related to the corresponding firms social or environmental mission. Toms and Warby Parker provide an opportunity for direct comparison because of their relative size, age, and presence in the apparel and accessories industry. Their metrics are directly comparable because the item purchased by the consumer results in the donation of that same item. United By Blue and Tentree offer another opportunity for direct comparison because of relative size, age, and presence in the outdoor apparel and accessories industry. However, directly comparing metrics is not as straightforward because there is no precedent to compare the impact of trash removal to trees planted. Finally, Patagonia’s metrics provide contrast to the other four firms metrics because of its larger size, longer existence, and differing strategy in philanthropic giving. Overall, the data for these five
firms provides insight for social and environmental giving through the BOGO model as well as giving through traditional philanthropic means.

**Discussion:**

Realizing the entirety of impacts that the BOGO business model has on a wide range of stakeholders was difficult in this study. The lack of formal research, in the environmental aid application, provides little social, economic, environmental, and philanthropic conceptual foundation to build upon. As a result, the metrics and variables that were investigated had to be relatively comparable at a firm to firm level in order to maintain a targeted scope of analysis.

The nature of this type of project was to realize if a social enterprise’s environmental efforts are effective. While each firm’s annual report provides adequate benchmarking data, it is important to note they unanimously portray an overall positive picture of the social or environmental action taken. The results provide clarification into a social enterprise’s effectiveness in addressing its targeted environmental issue. Interpreting these results, in comparison to a firm with a traditional corporate philanthropy approach, provides context to the future of this newly researched business phenomena. This section discusses whether a social enterprise that provides environmental aid can simultaneously create economic value while effectively furthering their own mission.

**Toms:**

Toms Shoes is proof of Baron, Miyazaki, and Taylor’s finding that consumers are more frequently choosing brands that support social causes. The rapid growth into an international brand, provides an instance of Varadarjan and Menon assertion that CRM can be one way for corporations to address social problems. Toms’ social agenda is a powerful marketing tool that
built their reputation, created differentiation for their product and garnered competitive advantage; just as Bronn and Vrioni’s identified potential for CRM. However, the evolution of Toms shoe giving model in 2019 is an indirect acknowledgement of the unintended consequences and cause-exploitative practices. For example, a statement regarding the manufacturing of Giving Shoes in the same geographic location as their recipients seems to be a direct rebuttal to Wydick, Katz, and Janet's 2014 finding that donated shoes can have a negative impact on local markets.

"We are committed to manufacturing Giving Shoes in the same places they’re given, supporting economic development along with shoe giving. Today, at least ⅓ of our Giving Shoes are manufactured in the same countries in which they’re given."

Toms evolution of their singular One for One model also seems to counter Ponte and Richey’s allegation of their philanthropy being ‘brand aid’ (the branding of global problems and products that will solve them). Their future looking program claims to rely on local community experts and self-sustaining programming. Time will tell how they develop and utilize new practices to avoid Talpalaru’s concept of ‘conspicuous giving’. It is inevitable that Toms’ donations will be marketed to receive a certain amount of public recognition, but it also seems that they have the intention of proving that corporate philanthropy can address structural aspects of class inequality and global income disparity.

Warby Parker:

Warby Parker’s primary reason for success is the development of an industry disruptive business model. One basis of existence for the company was the founders dismay about the high cost of designer eyewear; approximately $400 at the time. The multi-billion-dollar industry was, and still largely is, controlled by Luxottica Group and Essilor International. These companies
had vertically integrated manufacturing, wholesale, and retail. For example, Luxottica licenses eyewear for Ralph Lauren, Chanel, and Prada, and owns Oakley, Ray-Ban, Oliver Peoples, and Persol. Retail wise, the industry giant owns LensCrafters, Sunglass Hut, and Pearle Vision. During the time of Warby Parker's inception, Luxottica was the largest player in retail and the second largest in wholesale. To compete in this industry, Warby Parker would not survive by adhering to a similar model as industry dominating competitors so they determined the goal would be to offer a similar product at $95 by avoiding traditional industry costs. This was done by consolidating frame (e.g. Luxottica) and lens (e.g. Essilor) companies under one brand and selling directly to consumers online. Blumenthal notes, philanthropic mission aside, that saving normal consumers billions of dollars represents socially responsible business.68

The original basis for the company's philanthropic mission was Neil Blumenthal’s search, between 2003 and 2008, for “sustainable ways to get glasses on people’s faces”.69 The business and philanthropic success of Warby Parker is portrayed in the absence of any consideration about altering the strategy for either aspect. Their path since 2010, embodies Saiia, Carroll, and Buchholtz’s ‘strategic philanthropy’ because their bottom line has benefitted alongside the recipients of VisionSpring aid.70 While all the brands in this study fit Gautier and Pache’s commitment to the common good and marketing reasons for corporate philanthropy, Warby Parker is the only firm to have fully implemented the community-oriented investment aspect.71 Liket and Simaens finding about the firm and management struggle in defining approaches and strategies to corporate philanthropy, is directly opposed by the innovative practices of Warby Parker.72 Academic literature and reported data shows that Warby Parker’s disruptive model and market-based strategic philanthropy should be the exemplary standard for the next generation of entrepreneurs and philanthropic managers alike.
**United By Blue:**

United By Blue is the only brand in this study that does not donate funds directly to an outside nonprofit organization. The company has an internal team of employees whose primary job is to foster partnerships and gather volunteers for cleanup events. A secondary aim for this team is to advocate for policy objectives like the Philly Plastic Ban Tax and reversing Clean Water Act rollbacks taken by the Trump administration. The most obvious concern about the BOGO model in UBB’s case, is that the aid is more focused on addressing the result of plastic pollution, rather than the more systematic, or structural aspects the issue. In many instances cleanup events are held at the same location year after year, sometimes in the same season, to remove a similar amount of plastic pollution. Table 4, below, portrays various non-profit organizations that would have a self-sustaining impact due to a policy objective or market-based solution.

Table 4.
Potential Non-Profit Partners for United By Blue’s Transition to a Donation Based Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Trash Collected (in lbs.; as of 7.7.20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United By Blue$^{73}$</td>
<td>&quot;For every product purchased, United by Blue removes one pound of trash from oceans and waterways.&quot;</td>
<td>3,334,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Conservancy⁷⁴</td>
<td>&quot;Ocean Conservancy is working with you to protect the ocean from today's greatest global challenges. Together we create science-based solutions for a healthy ocean and the wildlife and communities that depend on it.&quot;</td>
<td>334,046,615⁷⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Bank⁷⁶</td>
<td>&quot;Empowering the world to stop ocean plastic&quot;</td>
<td>24,915,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Mile⁷⁷</td>
<td>&quot;First Mile supports micro-economies in underdeveloped communities by collecting plastic bottles to support entrepreneurs and prevent waste from reaching landfills and oceans.&quot;</td>
<td>5,483,904⁷⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ocean Conservancy has the largest global cleanup impact, but they are also furthering the science, engaging a range of stakeholders, and promoting policies. Their Trash Free Seas Alliance is a collaboration between industry, science, and conservation leaders that aims to proactively prevent trash from entering waterways. Members ranging from the American Chemistry Council to PepsiCo contribute millions of dollars for research on ways to improve waste collection and recycling. Conservation members, like Conservation International and Keep America Beautiful, further the effort with additional research and policy
recommendations like *Stemming the Tide: Land-based strategies for a plastic-free ocean* and the Trash Free Seas Act respectively.\(^7^9\)

Nonprofit organizations like Plastic Bank and First Mile are providing market-based solutions to the issue of ocean plastic pollution. Plastic Bank builds recycling ‘ecosystems’ in coastal communities that employs ‘collectors’ to gather plastic pollution from their environment. Collectors are paid a premium for their work, and the material recycled is recreated as Social Plastic® to be used for many applications ranging from packaging to fiber. A partnership with SC Johnson for shampoo packaging has legitimized their model and its impact for people and the planet.\(^8^0\) First Mile takes a nearly identical micro-entrepreneur approach but produces recycled material specifically for the apparel industry; Ralph Lauren and Timberland being a couple of their many major brand partners.\(^8^1\)

*Tentree:*

Table 3. Tentree’s planting partner’s impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Trees Planted (as of 7.7.20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tentree(^8^2)</td>
<td>&quot;Buy one, and we’ll plant ten.&quot;</td>
<td>43,317,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Reforestation Projects(^8^3)</td>
<td>&quot;Provide fair wage employment to impoverished villagers as agents of global forest restoration.&quot;</td>
<td>345,041,465(^8^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees for the Future(^8^5)</td>
<td>&quot;Improve the livelihoods of impoverished farmers by revitalizing degraded lands.&quot;</td>
<td>187,042,083(^8^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tree Planted(^8^7)</td>
<td>&quot;One Tree Planted in a non-profit environmental charity focused on global reforestation&quot;</td>
<td>4,010,962 (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>Total Trees Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
<td>&quot;We protect and present nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage, and foster public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment in ways that ensure the ecological and commemorative integrity of these places for present and future generations.&quot;</td>
<td>461,804 (directly with Tentree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Butterfly Foundation</td>
<td>&quot;Dedicated to saving the embattled monarch butterflies.&quot;</td>
<td>83,400 (directly with Tentree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOAN</td>
<td>&quot;Conserve endangered species of flora and fauna and threatened ecosystems; through the protection of biological diversity and the sustainable use and management of natural resources.&quot;</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Forest Generation</td>
<td>&quot;Large-scale restoration of threatened forests.&quot;</td>
<td>&gt; 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant with Purpose</td>
<td>&quot;Equip farming families around the world to increase farm yields, heal damaged ecosystems, improve nutrition, and increase household savings and opportunities.&quot;</td>
<td>&gt; 32,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentree’s approach to planting 1 billion trees by 2030 is strategic partnerships that primarily focus on forest restoration. Fostering economic opportunities through tree planting is stated in many of the nonprofit organizations’ mission statements, and nearly all the groups in Table 3 have programming that is economically self-sustaining as a result. Tentree planted over
11 million trees in 2019, which means the company needs to grow rapidly and exponentially to meet its ambitions goal.97

The philanthropic act of planting trees has been legitimized by a report from the World Resources Institute and The Nature Conservancy, *The Business of Planting Trees - A Growing Investment Opportunity*. This report states that forest restoration is good for the planet while providing business opportunities. Planetary wise, restoring land can improve water quality, improve local communities’ livelihoods, and enhance biodiversity. It is also estimated that restoration, combined with land management improvements, could provide a third of the emissions reductions required to limit the global temperature rise below 2°C. Economically, it is estimated that forest restoration generated roughly $25B in direct and indirect output in 2015. Quantifying this in terms of employment, 126,000 Americans were employed through the ecological restoration industry in 2014, 59% more than jobs provided by coal mining. *The Business of Planting Trees* picked 14 companies from a survey of 140, to provide investors (with investment capability between $500,000 and $10) a case for serious consideration. The main criteria for the benchmarked companies are profitability, scalability, replicability, and environmentally and socially beneficial. The results for Tentree found the business to be profitable, scalable, and replicable, but most relevant for this study are the findings for environmental and social impact:

- “Environmentally Beneficial: Ecosystem services provided by 18 million trees (at the time of this reports creation)

- Socially Beneficial: Sponsored projects employ 500+ and provide income from fruit trees”98
An instance of their self-sustaining impact can be seen through their partnership with Trees for the Future. Tentree has worked with the nonprofit on agroforestry projects throughout Senegal to plant fruit trees in villages and farms. The brand estimates that the program, since 2014, has improved soil quality in 50 villages while providing an additional income stream for more than 200 farmers. Tentree has clearly used forest restoration to differentiate their product offerings in the very crowded apparel market, and their philanthropic strategy has proven positive economic, social, and environmental impacts.  

*Patagonia:*  

Patagonia has identified for decades that their business benefits from a healthy environment because public lands and landscapes provide recreational opportunities for their customer base. Without recreational opportunities, there is limited need for sporting apparel and equipment. An excerpt from their *Environmental and Social Initiatives 2018* about the surf break located near their headquarters in Ventura, CA portrays the firm's understanding of the complexity of philanthropic environmentalism. “They (Pacific Ocean winter storms) rain like hell, flushing the streets, storm drains and natural drainage of all the trash and other less visible waste that’s been accumulating for months. Reality hits home when the plastic bags and bottles, food containers and other disposable wash up onshore...local nonprofits sponsor cleanups to remove the trash. But we all know it’s a Band-Aid.” Since the beginning of their philanthropic giving in the mid 80’s, Patagonia has avoided the negative impacts of charity by giving to grassroots organizations that address systematic change. Partnerships with groups like Surfers Against Sewage are one of the many reasons for the company's tenure in the outdoor apparel industry.  

*Summary:*
The existence of these brands alone confirms Lafferty’s finding that CBA will positively influence attitudes towards the company, brand, and purchase intentions alike. Regarding the main question of this study, the results and discussion sections above provide evidence to support that United By Blue’s use of the BOGO model fits many of the criticisms of Toms, while Tentree’s philanthropic action fits the praise of Warby Parker. Warby Parker’s key differentiator from Toms’ BOGO model, is that Warby Parker identified that their aid had to be market-based in order to avoid dependency and unintended consequences that charity can have. Toms has now (albeit indirectly) acknowledged their shortcomings in this area and are evolving their model to adapt. United By Blue should investigate a path to do the same.

**Managerial Implications:**

This study’s literature review and results provide valuable insights for individuals responsible for the development and/or implementation of corporate philanthropy programs. Bigne, Curras Perez, and Aldas-Manzano posit that the apparel industry has to be creative with CBA because finding a functional fit is more difficult. For instance, a food company would find success in using products to fight hunger while an apparel company may find it difficult to use their own product to address social or environmental issues. Toms is moving away from shoes being the only aid provided, and UBB and Tentree provide environmental aid with no product donation involved. Lafferty and Goldsmith found that the primary factor for success in a CBA is that the brand is familiar and thought of positively. Bigne, Curras Perez, and Aldas-Manzano assert that the similar company characteristics of credibility and altruistic attribution are the crucial foundation for building image with CBA. They warn communication managers that if CSR/ESG is not integrated into the company itself, but is rather solely used for image building, the results will not only be ineffective but have the potential to negatively impact credibility.
entirely. All of the firms in this study have a solid base line for CSR/ESG within the firm itself, thus providing examples of the ‘ethical congruence’ between cause and brand.\textsuperscript{106}

This study also provides insights for marketers looking to utilize CRM for both sales and image purposes. Sales wise, Koschate-Fischer, Stefan, and Hoyer found that CRM has legitimate potential to increase customers’ WTP for products linked to philanthropic aid, given the proper implementation. More specifically they state that if a customer base has a strong and positive attitude towards helping others, WTP directly increases with the amount of donation.\textsuperscript{107} Toms, UBB, and Tentree’s existence can be attributed to this phenomenon because the only differentiating factor between their model and competitors is the ability to capitalize on their customer base’s warm glow motives (the emotional reward of giving to others). Image wise, Vanhamme et al. identify that a for-profit business must both balance the fit between the organization's image and the cause as well the fit between the consumer and the cause. They suggest research of a firm's customer base should be done to determine the most appropriate cause to support for that given population’s attitude.\textsuperscript{108} Patagonia provides an instance of excellent fit between the organization and the causes it supports, because the apparel and equipment they provide is intended for use in untrammelled landscapes they aim to protect. UBB and Tentree have followed this path because they market to an environmentally conscious younger demographic, knowing that the population tends to prioritize environmental issues.

\textit{Limitations & Future Research:}

A limitation for this study is the difficulty in compiling the entirety of literature on social enterprise, cause-related marketing, cause-brand alliance, and corporate philanthropy because the terms used for these areas of study are many and inconsistently used. For example, social
enterprise is often interchangeably used with social entrepreneurship, eco-entrepreneurship, ecopreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship, etc..

Future research should investigate the economics of the BOGO model vs. an initiative like 1% For The Planet, who requires a donation equivalent to 1% of gross sales for membership. On Dragon’s Den, BBC’s version of the entrepreneurial pitch show Shark Tank, Tentree’s founders provided that planting ten trees cost the company approximately $3 or $.30 per tree.\textsuperscript{109} For this study specifically, Maria McDonald - Director of Cleanups at UBB, provided that removing 1lb of trash costs the company between $.05 and $.50 depending on the type of cleanup event (community, illegal dumpsite, international). Their budgetary target is to flatten the average cost to $.10/lb, and once salaries of cleanup specific employees are included, the philanthropic spend comes out to roughly 2% of total revenue. While it is more difficult to quantify the systematic impact that 1% For the Planet recipients address, a better understanding of how much firms spend to pursue their philanthropic goals would be beneficial to this field of study.

The World Resources Institute and The Nature Conservancy should develop a report akin to \textit{The Business of Planting Trees} for organizations with mission statements and philanthropic models centered around the issue of ocean plastics. A deeper understanding of the economic and employment value from these burgeoning businesses, alongside social and environmental validation, will benefit all stakeholders.

Another interesting consideration for future research would be to investigate if UBB’s cleanup participants alter habits after participation. The brand seeks to “inspire individuals to live less wasteful lives”\textsuperscript{110}, and also promotes products like reusable straw kits, water bottles, and grocery totes as a solution for consumers looking to curb their use of single use plastics. There’s
potential for a ripple effect on individual behavior change for the tens of thousands of volunteers they work with. Finding evidence in this area would provide an instance where their philanthropy has an exponentially greater impact outside of their cleanup events.

**Conclusion:**

The goal for this project was to provide evidence that a for-profit business can simultaneously create environmental and social value with the BOGO model. Social enterprise is the latest development in corporate philanthropy, and best practices regarding CRM and CBA strategies seem to evolve continuously as the phenomenon becomes more common. A secondary goal was to portray the early stage of research within the field, and the potential upside to optimizing the social or environmental aid provided. Academics note both potentially positive and negative outcomes for firms that use the BOGO business model, but in sum the literature suggests that today’s consumers respond positively to any corporate philanthropy, CBA, or CRM that a company engages in as long as that company has their customer base’s trust in the first place.

Results from this project have potential to provide valuable feedback to United By Blue and Tentree regarding the effectiveness of their missions. There may also be implications for the outdoor apparel industry, or global apparel industry as a whole, by inspiring other brands to adapt or pursue their own version of the BOGO business model. For the academic fields of social enterprise, corporate philanthropy, CRM, and CBA, this study reveals that case studies of firms with BOGO business models are sparse despite the increasing commonality of the phenomenon. Investigating burgeoning firms like UBB and Tentree in other industries is a straightforward way to compare theoretical findings about social enterprise, corporate philanthropy, CRM, and CBA to real world examples. Additionally, quantitative and qualitative
metrics provided a baseline to study the similarities and differences between how and how much brands give back in the outdoor apparel industry. The framework used in this study was effective for the birds-eye view of the use of the BOGO model, but subsequent research should look into more specific aspects. One instance of this narrower view could be comparing and contrasting the economic aspects of corporate philanthropy; essentially measuring impact per resources spent.

For corporate philanthropy and marketing managers, this study provides instances of success and shortcomings with the use of the BOGO model. Therefore, these individuals have a guide of what to target and avoid in their own work. Toms announcing the evolution of their ‘One For One’ model to include grants for nonprofit organizations, is a nod to the criticism that their aid only provided a band-aid to the systematic issue of poverty. Warby Parker’s continuation of its original model is proof that providing philanthropic aid in a way that is economically self-sustaining can effectively address social issues. UBB’s current model is following Toms’ mistakes of providing singular relief without an ongoing or systematic structure to address the root causes of the targeted issue. On the other hand, Tentree seems to have avoided this trend by partnering with many organizations that promote reforestation through self-sustaining and economically beneficial models. This study also provided that simply donating money to appropriate causes is still effective. Patagonia’s social and environmental grant program has endured for over three decades, in a company that is continually adapting its practices to meet contemporary needs, nonetheless.

This case study indicates that the actual effectiveness of the buy-one-give-one model, in terms of its social or environmental effectiveness lies somewhere between the harsh criticism of academics and the shiny consumer facing marketing of a firm's CRM strategy. It is not a one
size fits all solution that can serve all stakeholders equitably in the global marketplace, but it can be an appropriate and effective component of an overarching CSR/ESG strategy.
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