

Integrating Online Marketing (eCRM) with Direct Mail Fundraising

Adding a New Communication and Donation Channel Increases Donations

A quantitative assessment prepared by
Convio and StrategicOne
Published: January 18, 2007

Authors:

Convio

Vinay Bhagat, Founder and Chief Strategy Officer
Quinn Donovan, Analytics Manager

StrategicOne

Mike Rogers, CEO
Alex Lussier, Service Operations and Special Projects Manager
John Rosen, Senior Statistical Analyst
Rebecca Johnson, Marketing Analyst



Table of Contents

Forward..... 3

Executive Summary 4

 Study Thesis and Objective 4

 Methodology 4

 Key Findings 5

 Conclusions 5

Introduction 6

 About Convio 6

 About StrategicOne..... 6

 Case Study: The SPCA of Texas 6

Methodology 7

 COMMUNICATION AND DONATION CHANNELS 7

 CAUSALITY AND ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS..... 8

 STUDY CONTEXT 9

Findings 10

 QUESTION 1: IS ONE SEGMENT MORE VALUABLE THAN THE OTHERS? 10

 Long-Term Donor Value 10

 Retention..... 11

 Lifetime Donor Value 12

 QUESTION 2: WHAT IS THE VALUE OF MULTIPLE COMMUNICATION CHANNELS? 14

Conclusions..... 16

 THE ECRM EFFECT 16

 Value, Retention and Asks 16

 Cautions..... 16

 IDENTIFYING OPPORTUNITIES 17

Forward

by Vinay Bhagat, Founder and Chief Strategy Officer, Convio, Inc. and Mike Rogers, CEO StrategicOne

Today, a vast majority of nonprofit organizations run and measure their online and direct mail programs separately. Online marketing performance is generally measured solely in terms of dollars raised online, and direct mail performance solely in terms of dollars raised versus dollars spent. The reality is that each communications channel influences the other's performance.

A key reason for this is that constituents are increasingly operating in a "multi-channel mode". For example, even if a direct mail piece asks for a response by mail, a constituent may elect to first do further research online on the organization's Web site, and also may prefer to make an online gift. In this scenario, should the gift be credited to the online channel or direct mail? Organizations savvy to this trend have started promoting specific URLs or Web page addresses to donors so that they can more easily track the source of the gift. Invariably though, many donors still go through the organization's home page, making tracking more difficult.

Conversely, online marketing can influence direct mail performance. Increasingly, donors who have traditionally given via direct mail have signed up for email communications and marketing programs. If donors continue to give via the mail but are influenced to continue or expand their support because of email updates and online engagement, how should the revenue credit be allocated?

In Convio's work with hundreds of nonprofit organizations, we observed that in mature online marketing programs, the source of the majority of online revenue (50%+) was not easily explainable. Email solicitations typically generated 15-25% of revenue. Sending direct mail and DRTV donors to specific landing pages or micro-sites generated another 5-10%. However, there was still a large unaccounted for volume. We termed this unexplained revenue "online white mail," akin to the notion of white mail or unsolicited checks in direct mail fundraising. We also heard anecdotal evidence that online marketing had a positive impact on donor loyalty, improving retention rates and gift frequency even if a donor continued to give solely through the mail. Several of our clients also had discovered that constituents who were recruited online (for example, through petitions) could be converted to donors through a combination of online marketing, mail and telephone solicitations. In other words, donors did not have to be marketed to in the channel by which they originated.

Armed with several data points, we were greatly interested in conducting a deeper study of the integrated marketing phenomenon that we were observing. We partnered with StrategicOne, an analytics company that has strong multi-channel analytical capabilities to study the issue in depth for one of our clients. We chose a regional client versus a well branded national organization to avoid the possibility that brand recognition was driving the behavior. We very much appreciate the willingness of the SPCA of Texas to work with us on this project. The following study is the first comprehensive study of this topic that we have seen, and we are proud to share it with the nonprofit sector.

Executive Summary

Study Thesis and Objective

We began this study with the thesis that Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) – communicating with donors through more than one than channel – drives stronger results than a single channel alone. We hypothesized that online marketing (online constituent relationship management, or eCRM) positively influences overall giving in a dual channel (direct mail/online) context, and wanted to quantify its impact. We believed that people who give through more than one channel are probably more valuable to an organization, and again wanted to verify that this was true and quantify how much. We also wanted to study what happens when a nonprofit organization converts single channel donors to dual channel donors.

Donors can be segmented based on their communication with an organization and by the channel(s) through which they choose to give. By observing behavior across donors segmented by channel of donation and communication, it is possible to study the influence eCRM has in an integrated channel context, and how to best optimize integrated marketing efforts.

Methodology

Convio partnered with StrategicOne to observe the effect of eCRM on donor behavior for the SPCA of Texas, a regional animal welfare organization.

Donors were classified into three cohorts according to donation channel:

1. *Online-Only* — Donors who had given only through online channels.
2. *Offline-Only* — Donors who had given only through offline channels.
3. *Dual-Channel* — Donors who had given via online and offline channels.

An additional classification coded how the SPCA had communicated with offline donors, depending on whether the donor had participated (received communications) online:

1. *Offline Only w/ eCRM* — Donors who had received the SPCA's online newsletters and engaged online.
2. *Offline Only No eCRM* — Donors who had not received online newsletters and engaged online.

Static and dynamic analyses were performed to identify differences in donor behavior by communication segment and to quantify the effect of an additional donation channel:

- Static analyses included observing long-term (12 month) donor value, active donor retention rates, and life-time value for each segment.
- Dynamic analyses compared donor behavior prior to becoming Dual-Channel donors with behavior after their first gifts to the second channel. The dynamic analyses allowed quantification of moving a donor from Online-Only to Dual-Channel and from Offline-Only to Dual-Channel donation cohorts.

Key Findings

Donors engaged through multiple communication channels have higher long-term value, retention and lifetime value. Adding a donation and solicitation channel is responsible for increased 12-month donor value. This is the case if donors start as direct mail only donors or as online only donors.

Long-Term Donor Value

Dual-Channel donors and Offline Only w/ eCRM donors demonstrated the first and second highest long-term donor value. The Online-Only and Offline Only No eCRM donors had total values barely more than half as much as the Offline Only w/ eCRM donors.

Active Donor Retention

Dual-Channel donors demonstrated the highest retention rate, followed by Offline Only w/ eCRM, Offline No eCRM, and Online-Only.

Lifetime Donor Value

Offline Only w/ eCRM donors gave more than twice as much (means of \$694 vs. \$314) as did those who did not receive electronic communication. The Dual-Channel donors had higher lifetime values still (\$877). Dual-Channel donors gave as much through offline sources as offline only donors, indicating that the online channel does not cannibalize revenue from direct mail.

Value of Multiple Communication Channels

In either case, adding online donations to an Offline-Only donor's behavior or adding Offline donations to an Online-Only donor, the second channel was associated with increased gift frequency, increased gift value and increased donor value over 12 months.

Conclusions

Quantifying the eCRM Effect

In this study, the increased value of adding an online donation and solicitation channel for donors acquired offline is \$44.71 (a 39% increase) per donor over 12 months. Additionally, donors receiving eCRM outperform those who only receive offline communications — giving twice as much or more in their lifetimes.

Identifying Opportunities to Optimize Integrated Communications

Integrated communications can be optimized by collecting email addresses through all forms of communication, including direct mail reply devices, online registration, special events and telephone contacts. Radio and telemarketing campaigns can champion the online medium by reminding constituents of the wealth of information available on an organization's Web site. Direct mail campaigns can drive donors to specific landing pages or micro-sites that coordinate with the theme of the direct-mail campaign. Donors responsive to these specialty Web sites indicate an affinity for eCRM. Web site registration is an opportunity to collect mailing addresses for online visitors by offering to deliver welcome/information packs through direct mail. Once a mailing address and email address have been acquired for a donor, a customized communication stream integrating online and offline communication should be established to convert donors to dual channel donors.

Introduction

Effective Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) delivers the appropriate message through the best channel at the right time. In the nonprofit realm, IMC involves uncovering donor segments and motives that drive giving behavior. Multi-channel communication is a key part of IMC because it allows individuals to demonstrate preferred communication streams and allows an organization to select which medium or combination is most appropriate (effective, economic) based upon the communication or solicitation goal.

Donors can be segmented based on their communication with the organization. By observing behavior across donors segmented by communication channels, it is possible to study the influence online marketing (online constituent relationship management, or eCRM) has in an integrated channel context, and how to best optimize integrated fundraising efforts. The following key questions emerge:

1. Is one segment more valuable than the others?
2. What is the value of multiple communication channels?

Convio and StrategicOne set out to quantify the influence of eCRM within an integrated marketing program and to identify opportunities to optimize integrated communications.

About Convio

Convio specializes in eCRM — the strategic use of the Internet to develop constituent relationships which drive support of fundraising and marketing programs. Convio provides nonprofits with a comprehensive software platform for eCRM and related services to realize success online. Convio was founded in 1999 and works with over 600 nonprofit clients.

About StrategicOne

Since 1997, StrategicOne has worked to increase the knowledge and intelligence with which charitable organizations raise funds through direct marketing channels. StrategicOne has particular strength in the area of predictive analytics and its strategic application in direct marketing. StrategicOne builds statistical models that use prior donation behavior (with demographic and attitudinal data) to identify the most promising donors for marketing campaigns. These predictive models have helped organizations increase return on investment. Yet, improving constituent relationships involves more than behavior-based analytics. Potential donors' gift choices depend upon their attitudes about, their interactions with, and the messages they receive from charities. Therefore, StrategicOne has been studying its clients' communications with their donors. Recent communication-oriented projects have sought to optimize the number and pattern of appeals, the content and themes of appeals, and, especially, the channels — direct mail versus online — through which appeals and donations are made.

Case Study: The SPCA of Texas

The SPCA of Texas (SPCA), a Convio client, provided the data for the following study. The SPCA is a charitable organization dedicated to animal welfare. The SPCA provides a wealth of information on its Web site. Individuals can register online to receive timely information about subjects that interest them. Registered users also can request yearly vaccination reminders for their pets. The organization adds all registered users with a valid email address to the monthly electronic newsletter mailing. The SPCA's established direct-mail program and experience in online communication allowed StrategicOne to segment donors by communication channel.

Methodology

Communication and Donation Channels

The SPCA's business rules linked its communication channel (how the SPCA sent information to donors) and donation channel (how donors sent money to the SPCA). Online-Only donors received considerable information through email that Offline-Only donors generally did not see; Offline-Only donors received a variety of "hard asks" that Online-Only donors did not. Some offline donors were engaged online via an e-newsletter and other techniques. In view of the substantial overlap between communication and donation channels, the present paper classifies donors into "cohorts" based on how they sent in donations.

Donors were classified into three cohorts according to donation channel:


1. *Online-Only* — Donors who had given only online.
2. *Offline-Only* — Donors who had given only offline.
3. *Dual-Channel* — Donors who had given via on and offline channels.

An additional classification coded how the SPCA had communicated with offline donors, depending on whether the donor was engaged online.

1. *Offline Only w/ eCRM* — Direct mail only donors engaged online
2. *Offline Only No eCRM* — Direct mail only donors not engaged online

Offline donors were far more numerous than online (Figure 1). Among offline donors, a minority were engaged online.

Figure 1: Active Donor Base



At the time of the study (Summer, 2006), the SPCA had 111,526 donors on file. The present study restricted attention to the 21,096 active donors who had given a gift within the previous 12

months. Among the active donors, 81% ($N = 16,955$) had given gifts only offline and received no e-mail from the SPCA. The remaining 19% ($N = 4,141$) had received online communications in the form of electronic newsletters or appeals.

Causality and Alternative Explanations

Identifying the cause of differences among donor segments is a challenging task that cannot solely be met by descriptive analyses of monetary value by segment. The difficulty with conclusions based on descriptive analyses is that they are vulnerable to alternative explanations. Suppose, for example, that one observed that the cohorts differed in gift amount over a 12-month period. One could not immediately conclude that communication/donation channel *caused* the differences in long-term value. Multiple alternative explanations exist for the same observation. Perhaps, for example, the cohorts had different donation patterns not because of the channels themselves but rather because one cohort has more disposable income than another. Some supporting data exist for the hypothesis that cohorts differ: It is known that Internet use in the United States varies as a function of region, income, and education¹. Accordingly, online and offline donors also may differ in generosity. Any attempt to compare communication/donation channels thus must take into account the possibility that any observed differences in donations merely reflect the pre-existing differences among the cohorts.

StrategicOne and Convio sought causal conclusions, not mere segment descriptions. The question of greatest interest is entirely about cause and effect: What are the likely financial consequences of adding a new donation and solicitation channel? StrategicOne's solution to the challenge of identifying causality in this case is time-oriented analysis. Time-oriented analyses may bridge the gap between correlation and causation. Causal influences only extend forward in time; the chicken cannot alter the egg it came from, and the egg cannot change the hen that laid it. By distinguishing what came first from what came second, sequential analyses reduce the number of alternative explanations one must attend to. However different online-only and direct mail-only donors may be, online-only donors who begin to respond by direct mail cannot be too different from online-only donors who continue to respond only online; and, however different purely online-only and purely direct mail donors may be, direct mail donors who begin to respond online cannot be too different from direct mail donors who continue to respond only via direct mail.

In the interest of understanding the consequences of different communication/donation channels, the present paper classifies SPCA donors according to cohort and compares the cohorts' donation characteristics. The most compelling analyses examine donors who, after a period of using a single channel for donations, began using a second. The associated donation increases were striking and suggest that charitable organizations should consider encouraging their donors to add a communication/donation channel.

¹ Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2003, http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Regional_Report_Aug_2003.pdf
National Center for Education Statistics, 2003, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006065.pdf>
Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, 2003, <http://www.frbsf.org/publications/economics/letter/2003/el2003-38.pdf>

Study Context

The SPCA mails 10-12 direct mail appeals each year. Each campaign features a specific theme associated with a particular fund, for example, Rescue and Investigations or Emergency Medical Fund. Some campaigns recurred annually. Direct-mail campaigns typically include “hard asks” — specific, focused appeals for an SPCA program.

The SPCA’s email communications have generally mirrored direct mail in terms of themes and frequency since 2005. Most donors on the SPCA’s online list received on the average three or four direct mail pieces per year, increasing to about 10-12 mailings per year for those who had given \$250 or more in the preceding year. Some online appeals have been area-specific. Additionally, online donors received considerable information through electronic newsletters.

Findings

The *Findings* section begins by presenting “static” analyses that describe and compare the different cohorts. These analyses are “static” because each donor was assigned to a single cohort. The section concludes with “dynamic” analyses examining those donors who added a donation channel and thereby joined the Dual-Channel cohort. These two approaches work together to quantify the influence of eCRM and to answer two key questions:

1. Is one segment more valuable than the others?
2. What is the value of multiple communication channels?

Question 1: Is one segment more valuable than the others?


Static analyses describe the donor segments (communication cohorts). The following information answers the question of the value of each segment by investigating three metrics: long-term donor value, retention and lifetime donor value.

Long-Term Donor Value

The analyses of Long-term Value excluded any donor who had given exactly one gift to the SPCA, and thus included only donors who had converted via a second gift. Individual gifts of \$10,000 or more were excluded, *but the donors were not*. A donor for whom the largest of ten gifts equaled \$10,000 would have had the other nine gifts included in the analyses.


Dual-Channel donors and Offline Only w/ eCRM donors demonstrated the first and second highest long-term donor value. The Online-Only and Offline Only No eCRM donors had total values barely more than half as much as did the Offline Only w/ eCRM donors. The overall increase over time in Long-term Value primarily occurred because of a combination of increases in average gift and frequency.

Figure 2: Long-Term Donor Value



The similarity in long-term value between the Online-Only and Offline No eCRM donors occurred because the opposite findings for gift size and for number of gifts (frequency) tended to cancel each other out. Average Gift was about \$13 (a 40% increase) larger for Offline Only No eCRM donors than for Online-Only donors; Gift Frequency was about 56% larger for Online-Only donors (mean = 3.23) than for Offline Only No eCRM donors (mean = 2.07).


Figure 3: Long-Term Average Gift and Frequency



Retention

The analyses of retention omitted all gifts received from major donors. From a long-term viewpoint, the most important measure of donor performance (after total value) is retention. In general, Retention Rate, defined as the proportion of previous-year donors who contributed during the current year, followed the same pattern as did Long-Term Donor Value: Dual-Channel highest, then Offline Only w/ eCRM, Offline No eCRM followed by Online-Only.

Figure 4: Active Donor Retention




The notable 2004 to 2005 increase in Retention Rate for Online-Only donors continued into the first half of 2006. Retention in the first six months of 2006 was 28.10%, considerably above the

corresponding value for 2005 (18.37%)². We believe this can be explained by an increase in online solicitation frequency.

Retention matters most for multi-year donors, because these are the donors that the SPCA counts on year-after-year. These are donors who had given at least one gift per year in each of the two preceding years. Restricting attention to multi-year donors in 2005 yielded the same rank ordering and similar relative sizing for Retention Rate as occurred among donors in general. The same pattern emerged again in analyses of Same Year Conversion Rate (receipt of a second gift within the same calendar year as the first; Figure 5) and in analyses of Second Year Retention Rate (receipt of a second gift within the next calendar year after the first; Figure 5). Dual channel donors are excluded from Figure 5, because conversion and retention rates are influenced by the fact that all dual channel donors have given at least two gifts in their lifetimes.

Figure 5: New Donor Conversion and Retention



Lifetime Donor Value


Lifetime value measures cumulative contributions to date since the inception of the donor on file. The analyses of *Lifetime Donor Value* excluded one-time only donors. All gifts of \$10,000 or more were excluded, but any gifts from those major donors that were less than \$10,000 were retained for analysis. Lifetime Donor Value was not computed for Online-Only donors because of the relatively short period during which online donations were possible, i.e. the SPCA of Texas has been fundraising online for much less time than in the mail.

The main contribution of the Lifetime Donor Value analyses is that they portray the cumulative magnitude of the differences among three of the cohorts. Among Offline donors, those receiving eCRM gave more than twice as much (means of \$694 vs. \$314) as did those who did not receive eCRM (Figure 6). The Dual-Channel donors had higher lifetime values (\$877) and gave

² For 2005 and 2006, the half-year values are numerically smaller than the full-year values because, on the average, only half the donors who reactivated during the full year did so within the first six months.

as much through offline sources as offline only donors — indicating that the online channel does not cannibalize revenue from direct mail.

Figure 6: Lifetime Donor Value by Donation Channel



Consistently across three measures of donor value, computed over three different time periods and three different subsets of donors, Dual-Channel donors were more involved financially and continually with the SPCA than donors contributing via a single channel, offline or online. The reported cohort-to-cohort differences in Long-Term Value, Retention Rate and Lifetime Donor Value could have either or both of two explanations:


1. *Donor differences.* The donation value differences could have come from differences among the donors who comprised the several cohorts. If wealthier or more committed donors tended to use two donation channels or engage online, while poorer or less committed donors tended to use one channel and not engage online, then (as observed) the Dual-Channel donors would have had the highest value, followed by offline only donors engaged in eCRM.
2. *Communication differences.* Alternatively, the cohort-to-cohort differences in donor value could have reflected the specific communications and asks that the several cohorts received. Dual-Channel donors received more communications and more asks than did either Online-Only or Offline (with or without eCRM) donors. If each successive communication or ask provided an additional boost to donation likelihood or amount, then (as observed) the Dual-Channel donors would have had the highest value, and the Offline donors receiving eCRM communications would have had higher value than the Offline donors without eCRM.

The two explanations have very different implications. Explanations based on *donor differences*, although interesting, do not tell marketers how to increase donations. If there exists a “type” of person who is a single-channel donor, he or she cannot be transformed into a different type of person who instead gives via two channels. Explanations based on *communication differences*, however, potentially point to communication strategies that may increase donations. The dynamic analyses that follow were performed for the purpose of choosing between explanations based on donors versus communications.

Question 2: What is the value of multiple communication channels?

In dynamic analyses, the single-channel “before” and the dual-channel “after” groups are composed of the same donors. Comparing donors to themselves reduces concern that donor-based explanations account for changes in donation behavior and empirically defines the value of multiple communication channels. Of the 109,991 donors acquired offline, 2.47% (2,721) converted to dual-channel donors by giving a gift online. Of the 1,391 donors acquired online, 29.83% (415) converted by giving to an offline appeal. As in the static analyses section, donor behavior was measured by means of the frequency of donations, average gift value and donor value. The results obtained (Figure 7) are very consistent. The second channel was associated with increased gift frequency, increased gift value and increased donor value.

Figure 7: Value of Multiple Communication Channels



Further, the triad of increases occurred for both directions of change:

- online donors adding an offline channel; and
- offline donors adding an online channel.

Offline-to-online. Before-and-after comparisons showed that mean gift size increased by 7% in the 12 months following the first online gift. Gift frequency increased by 29%, yielding a 12-month increase in donor value of 39%: from \$114.41 to \$159.12, an increase of \$44.71.

Online-to-offline. Before-and-after comparisons showed that mean gift size increased by 54% in the 12 months following the first online gift. Gift frequency increased by 30%, yielding a 12-month increase in donor value of 99%: from \$24.92 to \$49.65, an increase of \$24.73.

By comparing donor value before and after the addition of a second donation channel, the dynamic analyses reduced the plausibility of explanations based on cohort-to-cohort differences in donors' personal and financial characteristics. The dynamic analyses thus implicate communication changes as responsible for the associated increase in donations.

Conclusions

The eCRM Effect

The primary objective of this study was to quantify the influence of eCRM – online constituent relationship management in multi-channel communications context. In this case study, the increased value of adding an online donation channel for donors acquired offline is \$44.71 per donor over 12 months. Additionally, donors receiving eCRM outperform those who only receive offline communications, giving twice as much in their lifetimes. The latter observation could be due to donor differences, yet it demonstrates the importance of providing eCRM for donors who seek online communication.

Why should opening a second channel increase donations? The dynamic analyses implicate communication differences as the causal factor — the “active ingredient.” A closer look at Dual-Channel donors shows that they generally received (a) more *information* and (b) more *appeals* from the SPCA than did single channel donors.

Value, Retention and Asks

The parallel results obtained for Retention Rate and for Long-Term Donor Value suggest that the same factors influenced both measures. Dual-Channel donors, who learned the most about the SPCA and who were asked for money the most often, were most likely to give (retention), and gave the most and gave the most often (value).

Each ask, it appears, provided a new opportunity to give; each package of information provided new motivation to give. The results suggest that each separate appeal elicits a somewhat independent decision from a donor; the more appeals, the greater the number of gifts. Donor fatigue does not appear to be an issue for the SPCA, at least not in the short run.

Cautions

Taken at face value, the study would seem to suggest that organizations dependent on solicitations should increase the number of their donors’ donation and communication channels. The conclusion, although possibly correct, is premature. Campbell and Stanley’s distinction between *internal* and *external validity*³ captures the problem. Internal validity refers to whether a study’s results are valid *within the context of the study itself*. The internal validity of the present study is relatively high for a canonical design because the dynamic analyses sharply reduced the problem of alternative explanations. External validity, on the other hand, refers to how much and how widely a study’s results generalize outside the study. At present, almost nothing is known about whether the present results generalize. The study’s external validity is unknown and its results cannot be generalized.

The weak external validity reflects the fact that the present data come from one organization, with one donor pool, one cause, one style and pattern of transmitting information, one style and pattern of asks, one set of business rules and so on. It is unclear whether the same results would be obtained by other charities or, even more remote from the present context, by commercial firms. Other organizations should learn from the present study that it would be worthwhile for them to analyze gifts by communication channels as did the present study. In

³ Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

view of the importance of studying communication and donation channels for other clients, StrategicOne provides integrated channel marketing analysis such as this.

Additional study is needed to determine why adding a channel increased donations. Understanding the “why” of things lies at the heart of improving them. Learning *why* new information and appeals increased donations would go a long way toward helping organizations other than the SPCA make decisions about whether to influence their donors by adding communication channels.

Identifying Opportunities

The secondary objective of this case study was to identify opportunities for the SPCA to optimize integrated communications. This study suggests that it is important to provide the communication channels that donors prefer. It is possible to identify donors who enjoy receiving electronic communication by giving them opportunities to receive the *eJournal*, personalized emails and other benefits of registration on the SPCA’s Web site.

Currently, the SPCA automatically enrolls donors in the monthly e-newsletter program when they provide a valid email address. Donors are able to opt out of the newsletter at any time. The SPCA has opportunities to actively seek email addresses from donors by encouraging offline only donors to register on the Web site or donate online, by collecting email address through direct mail replies, at their facility, and through inbound and outbound telephone contacts.

Radio and telemarketing campaigns also are available to champion the online medium. Radio campaigns can remind pet owners of the wealth of information available on the Web site and can be used as a source for new name acquisition.

Direct mail campaigns can drive donors to special landing pages or micro-sites. These specialty pages or mini Web sites within the main site should coordinate with the theme of the direct mail campaign (same brand, same message), supplementing direct mail packages with additional details for those who are interested. Donors who seek out additional information through these micro-sites demonstrate a potential affinity for eCRM. Their email addresses should be actively sought on these sites.

In addition to adding eCRM to direct mail communications, it is also important to introduce online only donors to direct-mail communications. This study indicates that online acquired donors who eventually give through a direct mail source increase value by \$24.73 over 12 months. Currently, the SPCA collects addresses for online visitors and delivers welcome packs via postal mail. These online donors who provide mailing addresses may be receptive to a customized communication stream that integrates online and offline communication. This communication stream should be established to converted donors to dual-channel interactions.