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Abstract
This study focused on how and whether cause campaign affects emotional benefits as well as trust of consumers in the sustainability of organic cosmetics. It examines the relevance of emotional benefits as a mediating variable between cause campaign and trust in the sustainability of organic cosmetics. While this study found evidence of cause span effect on emotional benefits and trust, there was also evidence of the strong mediation effect of cause purview on trust. The findings also indicate that the model is valid and has good fit. The relative predictive relevance of the model has high impact on the cause span and trust. This research endeavour is significant because it has several implications for trust, with regard to sustainability of organic cosmetics which is conceptualized and operationalized at an individual level.
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Introduction
There has been paradigm shift from the last few years with regard to the concept of cause campaign as part of corporate social responsibility, which has developed as a major platform for the corporates to address (Sana & Rian, 2011). Prior research has not examined employees, suppliers, and consumers, and therefore, trust has gained the attention of research community. The literature on trust has also moved from the concept of trust vested in group and team to the trust that an individual displays. Thus, there is a perceptible shift of the idea of a team/group trust to individuals’ trust. Prior research has laid varying emphasis on cause campaign. In countries like the USA and the UK sustainability of cause related marketing induces individuals to shift their brand preferences to those products which decides to help a cause are 76 percent and 86 percent, those who are likely to invest a little bit high on those brands that supports a cause are 54 percent and 45 percent, awareness of companies supporting causes are 79 percent and 68 percent, and individuals buy cause supportive products are 78 percent and N/A in respectively (Duncan & Moriarty, 1997; O’Sullivan, 1997). Though the prior research on trust has examined the effect of cause campaign fit to the brand trust and credibility (Enrique et al., 2009), matching cause campaign (Shruti & Fulie, 2006), prospects readiness to pay higher price for the products (Brain & Linda, 2000), no prior study has investigated the effect of types of cause campaign on trust. Therefore, a researcher concentrated on various cause campaigns sustainability and its impact on individual trust for organic cosmetic products. Further, it outlines the empirical setting and testing procedure. FIMIX-PLS is mandatory when the data are not alike.

It is necessary for segmentation into groups as part of study (Sarstedt et al., 2011; Ringle et al., 2010; Ringle, Sarstedt, & Mooi, 2010; Hahn et al., 2002). When unobserved heterogeneity is suspected then applying FIMIX is necessary. If a researcher fails to employ FIMIX when it is essential it will lead to sufficient inaccurate while analysing the results. FIMIX-PLS segments investigation is established on heterogeneity in the inner path model. Application of FIMIX-PLS to assess cumulative models, like ones based on the confirmed standard plan, to assure that calculated results are not influenced by unobserved heterogeneity in the inner path model estimates.

The descriptions of the two segments are derived based on assigning each of the observations, based on the maximum membership probability, to one of the two groups. Thereafter, cross-table analysis regarding the demographic and situational customer characteristics serve to identify applicable descriptors (Ringle et al., 2010). Of all the characteristics, only gender shows a suitable and good fit with the FIMIX-PLS segmentation and multi-group analysis results. Consequently, the data-set is split into two groups.

Objectives of the study
The main objective of this paper is to explore the impact of various exogenous latent construct cause campaign and emotional benefit on endogenous latent construct trust. The secondary objective is to measure the role of mediating variable emotional benefits between cause campaign and trust.

Literature Review
Cause rubric are classified into primary cause rubric (Demetriou et al., 2010; Berger et al., 1999; Polonsky & speed, 2000) and secondary cause rubric (Kotler & Lee 2005). Prior research articulates if the corporate cause campaign concentrates on addressing basic physiological needs of human beings like providing food, cloth and shelter, eradication of poverty in the form of donations, charity or sponsorship that creates trust in individuals which is must for sustainability can happen (Demetriou et al., 2010; Berger et al., 1999; Polonsky & speed, 2000). Research endeavor has measured sustainability concept of cause rubric constructs more on primary basis. Organization campaigns in the form of charity/sponsorship/donations that fulfils construct cause consequential indicators such as, crime prevention (Engelbrecht & Du Plessis, 2004), combat communicable diseases and combat chronic diseases (De Wet, 2010; Rockey, 2005) than sudden tragedies (Ellen et al., 2000; Maon et al., 2009; Ratliff, 2007; Chocchinov, 2005; Cui et
Further, prior research proved the relationship between duration of cause span and strength of the campaign (Welsh, 1999). Cause span strengthens trust and brand loyalty and thereby the decision of purchasing of sustainability of organic cosmetics (Douwe van den Brink et al., 2006). For the sustainability of organizations’ sponsorship in cause campaign form reflects high level of physical proximity in the case of local level than national or international (Ross et al., 1990; Cui et al., 2003; Hou et al., 2008). Organizations’ sponsorship in cause campaign form reflects different level of happiness (Oatley & Johnson-Lafrid, 1987; Frijda, 1986; Wiener & Graham, 1984), desire (Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998; Andrew Ortony & Turrence Turner, 1990; Oatley & Johnson Laird, 1987; Plutchik, 1980; Izard, 1981; Ekman, 1982; Tomkins, 1984; Arnold, 1960; Frijad, 1986; James 1884; Panksepp, 1982; Watson, 1930), anxiety (Gray 1982; Oatley & Johnson Laird, 1987), contentment (De Rivera et al., 1989), and pride (Andrew Ortony & Turrence Turner, 1990). Based on the exhaustive literature review, the following conceptual framework has been framed.

Cause campaign and trust

There is a need to discuss how the relevant research discourse has situated to the sustainability concept of cause related marketing as ‘cause campaign’ is a construct that captures emotional benefits and trust at the individual level. The dimensions of definition are concentrated on cause campaign importance which create trust among individuals. Prior work on cause campaign articulated that corporates need to concentrate on cause campaign to curb the cut throat competition which exist in the economy (Polonskey & Jevons, 2000). Cause related marketing through corporate social responsibility in the form of cause campaign has two dimensions of accountability which involves legal and economic accountability (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2014), and philanthropic and ethical accountability (Ibid, 2014; Ahmed, Othman & Shamugan, 2016; Ahmed, 2017; Ampornsah & Ahmed, 2017). The concept of cause campaign has varied connotations because economic development of nation wise individuals interpret the concept of cause campaign. Advanced nations are very much concerned about cause campaign on issues like health consciousness, environmental consciousness, societal development, community advancement which is comparatively low in developing and underdeveloped nations (Visser, 2007). Prior research on cause fit motivated individuals to trust corporates (Webb & Mohr, 1998) and induced corporates to spend more on effective and efficient cause campaign (Ogrizek, 2002). Prior research on cause campaign has shown linkages between buying intention and positive attitude (Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998). Affective dimension of trust is based on the consequences experienced by previous interaction with firm as well as subject’s feelings.

Affective trust is the result of interaction of trustee with trustor. (Edell & Burke, 1987). Affective trust arises on the basis of “Gut feeling” (Kramer, 1999; Morrow et al., 2004). Emotional attachment is between people on which affective trust lies. One should feel concern and develop genuine care on which trusting relationship can be built. Emotional feeling helps in building up affective trust. Whenever people interact with one another at a very high frequency, affective trust can be created. Affective trust is possible when trustee creates favourable environment to the trustee and vice versa (McAllister, 1995). With regard to buying intention, affective factors of trust have fast and sudden effect. Cognitive dimensions are influenced by affective dimensions (Haubl, 1996). The main basis of the affective trust is vested on the main concern and level care of trustee on trustor. (Rempel et al., 1985; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982). Few researches also highlight that there is a significant relationship between affective trust and perceived industry reputation in service sector. This leads to the trustor anticipation for future actions and interactions. This way, affective trust enables healthy and strong attitude towards trustee. Feelings, care, and concern generated by trustor towards trustor is felt through affective trust (Johnson & Grayson, 2005). When the service sector renders its services perceived corporate reputation is having a strong and significant effect on consumer’s affective trust (Kambiz & Abdullah, 2012). Cognitive trust depends on the duration of relationship between trustor and trustee (Doney & Cannon, 1997). Under cognitive trust, any individual buying intention is based on his knowledge on trustor (McAllister, 1995).

Emotional benefits

This research endeavor conceptualizes emotional benefits to be a mediating variable that leads to trust. A large number of scholars had put forward many theories on emotions. As the researcher argues that emotional benefits are a precursor to trust, it is appropriate to posit it as an antecedent of trust (Cailleux et al, 2009). Desire is also posited to be an outcome of emotional benefits (Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998). Researchers used emotional model to describe and measure types of emotions which includes primary, secondary and tertiary emotions (Shaver et al., 1987; Parrot, 2001). Robert Plutchik (1980) has conceptualized emotional benefits at an individual level. The model of emotions by Robert Plutchik captures the dimensions like surprise, anger, anticipation, disgust, fear, trust, sadness, and joy. Empirical studies have investigated the impact role of emotional benefits as a strong positive feeling which is attached with purchase or use of a branded product (David Aaker, 1996). An emotional benefit passes ownership feeling to the customer when they buy branded products (Brun, 2008). Prior research on emotional benefits has shown linkages between expensive products and trust (Kapferer & Bastien, 2009) as well as brand image and trust (Cailleux et al, 2009). This research endeavor has used these research constructs to develop an emotional benefits model, in order to test the same empirically. In relation to the action tendencies many research scholars proposed a term ‘anger’ in relation to emotions. Anger is a fundamental emotion (Oatley & Johnson Laird 1987; Plutchik, 1980; Izard, 1981; Ekman, 1982; Tomkins, 1984; McDougall, 1926). One of the basic emotion factors is anger, a notion of angry human being which determines a person’s perception towards brand or product if cause does not match with cause campaign (Andrew Ortony & Turrence Turner, 1990).

Conceptual framework and hypotheses

Based on the above literature review a conceptual framework is developed as shown in figure 1 and following hypotheses were developed to be tested.

H1: There is a direct effect of cause rubric on trust
H2: There is a direct effect of cause consequential on trust
H3: There is a direct effect of cause span on trust
H4: There is a direct effect of purview on trust
H5: There is a direct effect of emotional benefits on trust
H6: There is a direct effect of cause rubric on emotional benefits
H7: There is a direct effect of cause consequential on emotional benefits
H8: There is a direct effect of cause span on emotional benefits
H9: There is a direct effect of cause purview on emotional benefits
Methodology
As earlier mentioned, this study’s focal point is on the organic cosmetics retailing setting to empirically assess the hypothesis postulated in this paper. This is mainly due to organic cosmetic industry to understand why customers differ in the emotional benefits as well as in trust matter. It also helps to understand the role played by demographic aspects in the relationships that different cause campaign and emotional benefits have with trust.

Sample, measures and testing procedures
The study is confined to Karnataka state, India. The population for the current research endeavor consists of consumers of organic cosmetic products who buy from the outlets located at Bengaluru, Mangaluru and Mysuru, in the state of Karnataka. Out of 19 retail outlets in Karnataka state only 10 outlets are selected by lottery method. The total number of sample size is 640 is selected by non-probability purposive sampling. Individuals who buy organic cosmetics from more than one year and who are aware of cause campaign and organic properties of cosmetics are included in survey.

Data analysis and interpretations

Table 1: Reflective measurement models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Elements that the indicator capture</th>
<th>Outer Loadings</th>
<th>Indicator Reliability</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause rubric</td>
<td>PRI1</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRI2</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC1</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC2</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC3</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>OG1</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential</td>
<td>OG2</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OG3</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause span</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause purview</td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLS-SEM approach recommends the measurement of reliability by using the measure of composite reliability as it measures internal consistency reliability far better than Cronbach’s Alpha. In this regard, composite reliability has two distinct advantages over Cronbach’s Alpha. First, the measure of composite reliability does not consider all indicators to be the equal contributors to the construct as does the measure of Cronbach’s Alpha. Second, composite reliability does not underestimate the internal consistency reliability by not demonstrating the tendency to increase the value of internal consistency reliability even as the number of items in the scale increases, a tendency that we find in the measure of Cronbach’s Alpha. There are varying rules of thumb that explain whether R² values are high or not (Hair et al., 2014). Prior research (Ibid, 2014) states that the cut-off values of 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 for endogenous constructs are treated to be weak, moderate and high respectively in other studies. Prior research (Chin 1998: 323; Höck et al.; Ringle, 2006) also states that the cutoff values are 0.67, 0.33 and 0.19 for endogenous constructs are treated to be “substantial”, “moderate” and “weak” respectively in other studies. The model focuses on the discriminant validity through Fornell-Lacker criteria. The measurement model assesses the loading of all manifest indicators of the measurement model. The structural model helps in testing the hypothesis empirically. The model also analyses the role of mediating variable, emotional benefits between all exogenous latent variables of cause campaign and endogenous latent variable, trust. Subsequently, there are several uncovering unobserved heterogeneity with PLS-SEM which has been analysed by using FIMIX-PLS. Finally, parametric multi-group analysis, popularly known as multi-group analysis, is applied to independent samples t-tests in order to correlate paths between groups (Kiel et al. 2000).

**Measurement model evaluation**

For confirmatory research, the threshold value of internal consistency reliability should be equal to or greater than 0.70 (Henseler et al., 2012). But it is always better to have composite reliability value equal to or greater than 0.80 (Daskalakis et al.; Mantas, 2008) and indicator reliability may be understood as the square of the outer loading. Indicator reliability threshold value is 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014) which has been established in this research work. For a reflective model, the threshold value of path loadings should be above 0.70 (Henseler et al., 2012). The threshold value of outer loadings of all indicators in this model are above 0.7. To measure the convergent validity, the average variance extracted (AVE) a strongly recommended test (Naylor et al., 2012). Convergent validity is measured with AVE threshold value should be more than 0.50 (McLure-Wasko & Faraj, 2005; Wixom & Watson, 2001). The expected threshold value of AVE is 0.50, which implies that a given construct is able to explain more than half of its indicators’ variances. In an acceptable model, threshold value of AVE should be greater than 0.5 (Chin, 1998; Höck & Ringle, 2006).
Figure 2 shows that the AVE values of all exogenous and endogenous latent variable constructs are above the threshold value of 0.50 in this model. PLS is a better way to assure the degree to which a given construct of the model is distinct from other constructs for measuring the discriminant validity (McLure Wasko & Faraj, 2005). To assess the discriminant validity, the square of the correlations among the variables has been contrast with the AVE (Chin, 1998). Discriminant validity can be assessed using Fornell-Lacker (1981) criterion which is a comparison between square root of AVE and other latent variables. The amount to which a given construct of the model is distinct from other constructs (Chin, 1998; Hair et al., 2014; Fornell-Lacker, 1981; McLure Wasko & Faraj, 2005).

**Structural model evaluation**

Path coefficients of the structural model suggests the strength and direction of structural model relationships. The bias-corrected confidence intervals return more definite values (Efron & Tibshirani, 1998). The bias correction formula is propounded by Sarstedt, Henseler, and Ringle (2011). All the 13 hypothesis are validated with bootstrapping methods shown in table 2. All estimations in the structural model relationships are significant. Cause span has strongest relationship with trust ($t=16.98$) followed by other constructs. All construct explains more than 65 percent of trust ($R^2=0.687$).
The types of cause campaigns on trust would become smaller. As a result, the proof of the significance of the indirect effect is that it will absorb a part of the direct effect. The significance of the indirect effect should also be significant after the inclusion of the mediating variable. The model of this research endeavor has predictive relevance. The model fit is examined by means of standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) (Henseler 2014; Dijkstra, et al., 2014). The SRMR value below 0.8 reflects a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1998). In this model the SRMR value are 0.71 indicates that model has valid and good fit.

Not: It may be noted that this study chose the algorithm settings of 640 cases, 5,000 samples, and the option of ‘no sign changes’ in order to check the path coefficients’ significance (Hair et al., 2014). The p-value is found out by invoking the bootstrapping procedure with 640 cases and 5,000 samples. Double bootstrap routine has been used to arrive at the bias corrected 5 percent (two-tailed) confidence interval (Chin, 1992).

Blindfolding process calculates the parameter estimates so as to assess predictive relevance i.e. Q². We also calculated the effect size f² and q² effect size, which explains the ‘relative impact of predictive relevance’ (Hair et al., 2014, p.183). Q² value above 0 reveals predictive relevance of the model (Hair et al. 2014). The Q² values of trust (0.358) and emotional benefits (0.150) which is above zero, which indicate that the model of this research endeavor has predictive relevance. In case of f² and q² effect size, cause effect on trust (0.565) and cause span on trust (0.130) respectively, which indicate that the model of this research endeavor has predictive relevance.

The model fit is examined by means of standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) (Henseler 2014; Dijkstra, et al., 2014). The SRMR value below 0.8 reflects a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1998). In this model the SRMR value are 0.71 indicates that model has valid and good fit.

### Mediation analysis

The theoretical / structural model of the present study conceptualizes the direct effect of cause campaign types on trust. Now we need to test whether the direct effect of cause campaign types on trust would be significant after the inclusion of a mediator in the model (Hair et al., 2014). However, this requires that the indirect effect should also be significant after the inclusion of the mediating variable. The proof of the significance of the indirect effect is that it will absorb a part of the direct effect. As a result, the magnitude of direct effect of types of cause campaigns on trust would become smaller. The Variance Accounted for (VAF) is calculated as follows:

\[
VAF = \frac{\text{Indirect Effect}}{\text{Indirect Effect} + \text{Direct Effect}} = \frac{p_{12} \cdot p_{23}}{(p_{12} \cdot p_{23}) + p_{13}}
\]

### Table 2: Assessment of PLS path model with direct effect of exogenous latent variables on trust and emotional benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>Bias corrected 95% confidence interval</th>
<th>f²</th>
<th>q²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause rubric and trust</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>(0.512, 0.662)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause consequential and trust</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>(0.307, 0.478)</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause span and trust</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>(0.730, 0.793)</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause purview and trust</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>(0.538, 0.670)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits and trust</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>(0.382, 0.542)</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause rubric and emotional benefits</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>(0.364, 0.512)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause consequential and emotional benefits</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>(0.228, 0.391)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause span and emotional benefits</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>(0.273, 0.464)</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause purview and emotional benefits</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>(0.318, 0.468)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Assessment of mediating effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediating effect</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits mediate between cause rubric and trust</td>
<td>(\frac{0.438 \times 0.511}{(0.438 \times 0.511) + 0.325})</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits mediate between cause consequential and trust</td>
<td>(\frac{0.294 \times 0.383}{(0.294 \times 0.383) + 0.268})</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional benefits mediate between cause span and trust</td>
<td>(\frac{0.404 \times 0.507}{(0.404 \times 0.507) + 0.312})</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all the above four cases, the VAF value is above 0.20, but below 0.80. Therefore, the construct of ‘emotional benefits’ exercises partial mediating effect in the relationship between cause rubric, consequential, cause span and cause purview 5 percent level of significance. This is further validated by the fact that the empirical t value of the mediating effect is well above the threshold value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Finite-mixture partial least square (FIMIX-PLS) segmentation analysis

Table 4: Relative segment sizes and segment retention criteria for alternative FIMIX-PLS solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative segment sizes</th>
<th>Number of pre-specified segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S=2</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S=3</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S=4</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment of the most suitable segmentation solution draws on applicable segment retention criteria which, in turn, build on 20 runs per pre-specified number of segments to avoid local optimum solutions (Sarstedt, Becker, et al., 2011). The decision is straightforward since the different criteria values suggest uniform numbers of segments. FIMIX-PLS is mandatory when the data are not alike. It is necessary for segmentation into groups as part of study (Sarstedt et al., 2011; Ringle et al., 2010; Ringle, Sarstedt, & Mooi, 2010; Hahn et al., 2002). When unobserved heterogeneity is suspected then applying FIMIX is necessary. If researcher fails to employ FIMIX when it is essential it will lead to sufficient inaccuracy while analysing the results. FIMIX-PLS segments investigation is established on heterogeneity in the inner path model. Application of FIMIX-PLS to assess cumulative models, like ones based on the confirmed standard plan, to assure that calculated results are not influenced by unobserved heterogeneity in the inner path model estimates.

FIMIX-PLS (Matthews et al., 2016; Hair et al., 2016; Hahn et al., 2002) is still the most established approach (Hair et al., 2012; Hair et al., 2017). As Ringle, Sarstedt, and Mooi (2010) recommend, and following the majority of prior marketing studies (Wilden & Gudergan, 2015; Money et al., 2012; Navarro et al., 2011; Ringle et al., 2010; Sarstedt et al., 2009), FIMIX-PLS is employed in this study. With six and more segments, FIMIX-PLS only extracts micro-segments with relative segment sizes smaller than five percent. Thus, a focus on two to five pre-specified segments is more appropriate to run FIMIX-PLS. AIC (Akaike’s Information Criterion), AIC3 (Modified Information Criterion), BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion), and CAIC (Consistent Akaike’s Information Criterion), show strong over-segmentation characteristics (Sarstedt, Becker, et al., 2011). Since AIC, AIC3, BIC and CAIC point to four segments, a three-segment solution appears feasible. The only exception is the normed entropy (EN) criterion, which clearly shows the best outcome with four segments (0.618), and increases considerably with higher segment numbers. The higher EN criterion values with a maximum value of one indicate the segments with better separability. This characteristic is important for FIMIX-PLS’ ex post analysis (Ringle et al., 2010; Sarstedt & Ringle, 2010).

In comparison with the other solutions, specifically for the four-segment solution, we obtain segment-specific distinct and significantly different PLS-SEM results. This four-segment solution is suitable in terms of substantiability, differentiability, plausibility, and accessibility (Becker et al., 2013).
The indirect relationship between cause consequential on trust through mediating variable emotional benefits has no relevance in segment 2, 3 and 4. It is significant only in segment 1 (0.426). Further, the total effect reveals that cause purview on emotional benefits has no relevance in segment 4 and 2 when compared with segment 1 (0.511) and segment 3 (0.780) which is greater at segment 3. However, Cause purview on emotional benefits has greater effect in segment 3 (1.531), segment 2 (0.771) and segment 4 (0.466) but absolutely low in segment 1 (-0.111). Finally, cause span on emotional benefits has very high relevance in segment 2 followed by segment 3, segment 4 and segment 1 respectively.

The total effect reveal that cause consequential on trust has no relevance in segment 2 when compared with segment 1, segment 3 and segment 4. Cause consequential has higher relevance in segment 4. Further, the total effect reveals that cause purview on emotional benefits has no relevance in segment 2, 3 and 4 when compared with segment 1 (0.511) and segment 3 (0.780) which is greater at segment 3. However, Cause purview on emotional benefits has greater effect in segment 3 (1.531), segment 2 (0.771) and segment 4 (0.466) but absolutely low in segment 1 (-0.111). Finally, cause span on emotional benefits has very high relevance in segment 2 followed by segment 3, segment 4 and segment 1 respectively.
segment 2, 3 and 4. It is significant only in segment 1 (0.426). Further, the total effect reveals that cause purview on emotional benefits has no relevance in segment 4 and 2 when compared with segment 1 and segment 3, which is greater at segment 3. However, cause rubric on emotional benefits has greater effect in segment 3, segment 2 and segment 4 but absolutely low in segment 1 (-0.111). Finally, cause span on emotional benefits has very high relevance in segment 2 (0.676) but has no relevance in segment 3 (-0.638). Segment 4’s results translate into considerably higher $R^2$ values for emotional benefits (0.805) and trust (0.995). The underlying model is therefore particularly useful for explaining trust in segment 4.

**PLS-MGA (Multi-group analysis)**

Parametric multi-group analysis, popularly known as multi-group analysis, is applied to independent samples t-tests in order to correlate paths between groups (Kiel et al., 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>0.148***</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.181***</td>
<td>0.165***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.256***</td>
<td>0.182***</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.479***</td>
<td>0.518***</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.080***</td>
<td>0.081**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.147***</td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.102***</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.231***</td>
<td>0.264***</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.170*</td>
<td>0.171**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Trust</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ EB</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE/Composite reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.661/0.854</td>
<td>0.694/0.871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.690/0.918</td>
<td>0.578/0.872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.592/0.878</td>
<td>0.594/0.880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.757/0.862</td>
<td>0.743/0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>0.612/0.887</td>
<td>0.603/0.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>0.562/0.939</td>
<td>0.531/0.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.126***</td>
<td>0.160***</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.189***</td>
<td>0.177***</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.274***</td>
<td>0.204***</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.492***</td>
<td>0.532***</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB $\rightarrow$ Trust</td>
<td>0.080***</td>
<td>0.081**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.147***</td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.102***</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.231***</td>
<td>0.264***</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS $\rightarrow$ EB</td>
<td>0.170*</td>
<td>0.171**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 6 shows group-specific PLS-SEM results and their differences. A double bootstrap routine determines the significance of the differences by running a PLS multi-group analysis (Sarstedt, Henseler, et al., 2011). In a final step, descriptions of the two segments are derived. This is based on assigning each of the observations, based on the maximum membership probability, to one of the two groups. Thereafter, cross-table analysis regarding the demographic and situational customer characteristics serves to identify applicable descriptors (Ringle et al., 2010). Of all the characteristics, only gender shows a suitable and good fit with the FIMIX-PLS segmentation results. Consequently, the data-set is split into two groups. Group 1 represents individuals with male gender and Group 2, those with female gender. Double bootstrap routine determines the significance

***$p < .01$; **$p < .05$; *$p < .10$. 
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of the differences by running a PLS multi-group analysis (Sarstedt, Henseler, et al., 2011).

The results show that the two segments are distinct. With regard to direct effect of cause rubric on trust, both segments are significant. But it has been observed that cause rubric primarily determining trust in male segment (0.256) than female segment (0.182). At the same time with regard to indirect effect of cause rubric on trust through emotional benefits, both segments are significant. But female segment (0.264) has strong indirect effect on trust through emotional benefits than male segment (0.231). Conversely, cause span plays significant role in the female and male segment. But it is more significant with regard to its direct effect on trust in female segment (0.518) than male segment (0.479). Though cause span has indirect effect on trust through emotional benefits it is not highly significant. In comparison with gender it is significant in female segment (0.171) than male segment (0.170). Accordingly, male segment (0.181) has strong significant direct effect of cause purview on trust than female segment (0.165). Similarly, female segment (0.102) has strong significant indirect effect of cause purview on trust through emotional benefits than female segment (0.138). Finally, cause consequential has significant direct effect in the female group on trust (0.148) than male segment (0.114). But male group (0.147) in cause consequential has strong indirect effects on trust through emotional benefits than female group (0.141).

In general, with regard to direct effect, cause span is highly significant in comparison with other cause campaigns. But with regard to indirect effect cause, rubric is highly significant in comparison with other cause campaigns on trust through emotional benefits. In both cases, female segment is more significant than male segment.

The total effects substantiate the results of the path relationships. But it has observed that indirect effect of above-mentioned all cause campaign types on trust through emotional benefits results are similar to path relations values. Based on the total effect values caused, rubric primarily determining trust in male segment (0.274) than female segment (0.204). Cause span plays significant role in the female and male segment. But it is more significant with regard to its direct effect on trust in female segment (0.532) than male segment (0.492). Male segment (0.189) has significant direct effect of cause purview on trust than female segment (0.177). Finally, cause consequential has significant direct effect in the female group on trust (0.160) than male segment (0.126). In general, with regard to direct effect, cause span is highly significant in comparison with other cause campaigns. But with regard to indirect effect cause rubric is highly significant in comparison with other cause campaigns on trust through emotional benefits. Both cases female segment is more significant than male segment.

Findings of this study is in line with suggestion of Mishra J. K. et al. 2014, that while marketers may reach compulsive buyers through emotional appeals that emphasize high prestige and assuage distrust and money worries, the interests of mental health suggest that these consumers’ money attitudes should be reversed: less emphasis on status through consumption, more trust in one’s ability to evaluate prices, more financial security, and greater prudence and planning with respect to expenditures.

Conclusion and Managerial Implications

This research has empirically shown the vital role played by demographic segment, male and female through multi-group analysis. The path coefficient of cause rubric on trust is equally significant in both male and female but comparatively significant among females. Furthermore, the path coefficient of cause consequential on trust is has proved the same results as cause span on trust. With regard to the path coefficient of mediating variable emotional benefits on trust though both are not equally significant it was found highly significant among males. The path coefficient of cause purview on emotional benefits as well as cause rubric on emotional benefits it is significant equally among male and female segment but highly significant among females. However, the path coefficient of cause span on emotional benefits as well as cause consequential on emotional benefits are not equally significant. With regard to relationship between cause span on emotional benefits it is found more significant among female segment and between causes consequential the result is opposite. Since total effects substantiate the path relationship the results of total effect of PLS-MGA is similar to that of path relationship. Therefore, this research endeavor has significant managerial implications that corporate need to pay more attention female segment without ignoring male segment since there exist relative differences in values which is essential for the sustainability of the organic cosmetics.

The VAF value is higher in case of cause purview followed by cause rubric, cause span and cause consequential. In this analysis cause purview indicators, namely, awareness regarding cause campaign in South India is higher, followed by awareness of consumers regarding cause campaign on their local area. Furthermore, the t-value of cause rubric is higher than other constructs. So, corporates cannot ignore because rubric indicators of awareness regarding cause campaign to meet safety needs. This calls for the need to pay attention to cause purview constructs and it needs to create strong awareness regarding cause campaign in South India as well as awareness of consumers regarding cause campaign conducted in their local area. At the same time, corporates need to create awareness regarding cause campaign to meet safety needs. If these issues are taken up by corporates for the sustainability of organic cosmetics, it will automatically improve individual’s affective and cognitive thinking in the parameters of trust factors like a) the trustee has much knowledge about the work b) the trustee would not knowingly do anything to hurt me and c) the trustee has a strong sense of justice.

This research has several managerial implications. It contributes to our understanding of the empirical validity of the assumptions of the impact of cause campaign on trust. Furthermore, this study has managerial implications with regard to injecting and inspiring the emotions among customers. Since cause span and cause rubric are complimentary to each other for the sustainability of organic cosmetics, it is necessary to pay attention to cause related marketing in the form of cause campaign to be more towards cause span and cause rubric by giving importance to its indicator occasional cause, awareness regarding cause campaign to meet safety needs and awareness regarding cause campaign that exhibit environmental concern. For the sustainability of organic cosmetics, corporate attention on cause span may improve individuals’ cognitive thinking in the parameters of a) the trustee is very capable of performing the trustee’s job, b) the trustee would not knowingly do anything to hurt me, and c) the trustee has a strong sense of justice. Similarly, the corporate attention on cause rubric improves positive emotion, desire which strengthens trust of an individual helps for the sustainability.

This research has limitations on data and sampling as it has covered only 10 retail outlets out of 19 of organic cosmetic products at shopping malls of Bengaluru, Mysore and Mangalore in Karnataka state of India. The result of the findings cannot be generalized for the whole country. However, the findings show the direction which needs to be verified through larger sample size covering different parts of the
country. Prior research on this issue has used cause duration as control variables, while this study hasn’t considered this as a control variable. The common source bias is another limitation of this study. This is because the data on independent and dependent variables are collected from the same source. Therefore, there exists same source bias in the research design of this study. As a result, the data on that variable which might have influenced the relationship between independent and dependent variables would be missed. This has naturally exercised an adverse impact on endogeneity.

The structural model of the future research can take up global items and develop hierarchy model of PLS-SEM. Hierarchical component models involve second order structure which consists of constructs in two layers. Accordingly, the model must possess lower order constructs and higher order constructs, wherein lower order constructs emanate from higher order constructs, while the lower order constructs are part of the measurement model, higher order constructs are part of the structural model. It may be noted that the repeated indicators approach, which is used for building the hierarchical component model in the future research endeavor, must warrants the inclusion of same number of items in every lower order construct. Moreover, though this research has analyzed the impact of cause campaigns on trust with regard to branded organic products, it opens up an opportunity to do future research, on comparative study on whether these relationships between branded and non-branded differ in strength.
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