Conspicuous Donation Behavior:

Scale Development and Validation

ABSTRACT

This article builds on the concept of conspicuous donation behavior through further conceptualization and operationalisation of this construct. The article reports on developing the conspicuous donation behavior (CDB) scale via a 3-stage process, which includes 5 data collections using a total of 1311 respondents. The data analysis indicates that the resulting 8-item (two factor) CDB scale has face, content, convergent, discriminant and predictive validity and the CDB scale is reliable across samples. The CDB scale has the potential for significant usage in the development and testing of theory, as well as in practical applications.

BACKGROUND

The UK voluntary sector produces an annual income of 26.3 billion pounds and employs approximately 608,000 individuals. Overall the sector is experiencing continued growth with most recent figures showing an increase of 28,000 non-for-profit organizations between 2000 and 2004. Much of this growth is represented by small charities with 56% of the sector reporting annual incomes of less than 10,000 pounds (Wilding, Clark, Griffith, Jochum and Wainwright, 2006). The current trends in the UK voluntary sector are comparable to that of the United States where the number of nonprofit organizations has doubled over the past 10 years and where a large proportion (approx. 66%) of charitable organizations are small (Alvarado, 2006). While these sectors continue to report significant increases in income, this is largely due to an increase in the *number* of charities rather than an increase in revenue *per* charity. In fact, average income for individual nonprofit organizations in the UK is static or has fallen. This trend is expected to continue for the remainder of the decade due to heightened competition, the UK government seeking more value for money, the withdrawal of key income streams (e.g. EU structural funds) and fragile consumer confidence (Wilding *et al* 2006).

INTRODUCTION

As the fight for the donor dollar continues to intensify, the proficient use of marketing knowledge is vitally important in the development and implementation of appropriate revenue-raising strategies of nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit organizations need to strategically select their marketing techniques on the basis of

target market knowledge. Therefore, research interest focussing on motivations and behavior of individuals in relation to donating to charities is increasing. Research findings indicate that individuals donate because of intrinsic reasons such as to enhance self-esteem, reap public gratification and gain satisfaction and fulfilment through meeting one's obligation (Dawson, 1988; Guy and Patton, 1989; Bruce, 1994; Hibbert and Horne, 1996). According to Sherry (1983:p. 160) donating to charities may be viewed as another form of gift giving, which extends from "*altruistic*, where the donor attempts to maximise the pleasure for the recipient, to *agonistic*, where the donor attempts to maximise personal satisfaction". On this latter point, the notion that some individuals donation behaviour is based more on an agonistic approach, links to West's (2004:p. 1) view that modern compassion is "all about feeling good, not doing good, and illustrates not how altruistic we have become, but how selfish". Such behavior, West (2004) argues resides under the umbrella term "conspicuous compassion". Expanding on this concept, Grace and Griffin (2006) propose the notion of conspicuous donation behavior (CDB), which they define as "an individual's show of support to charitable causes through the purchase of merchandise that is overtly displayed on the individual's person or possessions (e.g. the wearing of empathy ribbons) (Grace and Griffin, 2006: p. 149). This article builds on the concept of CDB and operationalizes this construct through the development and validation of the Conspicuous Donation Behavior (CDB) Scale. A valid and reliable measurement mechanism, that has significant uses in the context of donor behavior, is the result.

CONSPICUOUS DONATION BEHAVIOR

West's (2004) notion of conspicuous compassion builds from Veblen's (1912) theory of conspicuous consumption which promotes the visible consumption of goods as a mechanism to enhance one's social standing. The visible display of compassion is also seen as a way in which one's image can be enhanced in the eyes of others (West, 2004). The term "conspicuous compassion" encompasses a number of different behaviors such as public weeping for deceased celebrities, demonstrations, apologies for historical misdemeanours, and, in terms of donation behavior, the wearing of empathy ribbons or the like (e.g. plastic red noses). Grace and Griffin's (2006:p. 148) coining of the phrase *conspicuous donation behavior (CDB)* is formulated on the argument that "given that visibility is the key to conspicuousness and that empathy ribbons provide visibility in terms of donation-related behavior, it may be that conspicuous compassion is truly manifested through the purchase and, more particularly, the wearing of empathy ribbons or similar". The value of investigating this concept further lies in the possibility of behavioral prediction in relation to donation behavior. For example, as is the case with conspicuous (or status) consumption (e.g. Wong and Ahuvia, 1998; Chung and Fischer, 2001; Prendergast and Wong, 2003; Piancentini and Mailer, 2004), some individuals may lean towards this type of conspicuous behavior when donating (Grace and Griffin, 2006). Donating to a charity in a conspicuous manner via the purchase and wearing of 'empathy ribbons and the like' overcomes, to some extent, the problem highlighted by Rothschild (1979) that it is more difficult to sell intangible 'brotherhood' as opposed to tangible 'soap'. It would appear that many charities have overcome this factor by promoting the sale of tangible merchandise as a means of donating to charities. In determining the profiles of those who prefer conspicuous donation means as opposed to those who do not, nonprofit organizations can achieve more efficiency in the

targeting of their donation appeals. However, in order to do this, a valid and reliable measure of this construct is needed.

Firstly, the development of a sound definition of the construct being measured is required. Grace and Griffin (2006:p. 149) provide a definition of CDB as "an individual's show of support to charitable causes through the purchase of merchandise that is overtly displayed on the individual's person or possessions (e.g. the wearing of empathy ribbons)". However, this definition does not quite encapsulate all conspicuous donation behavior as the definition is restricted to the visible display of merchandise.

The recent world-wide donation appeals for the tsunami victims provide a perfect example of conspicuousness donation behavior that is not restricted to the overt display of charity merchandise. For example, in Malaysia, donation competitions were run by both the *New Straits Times* and *The Star* whereby the highest donor was promised front-page coverage (photo and editorial). This appeal was so successful that billionaires were fighting to get on the front page and resulted in the largest donation being M$24 million (donated by Hong Kong shipping magnate, Li Ka-sing). Furthermore, dozens of millionaire-wannabes were giving away anything between M$25,000 to M$350,000 in order to compete for front-page coverage (Kuppusamy, 2004). Similarly, donations for many different appeals are solicited by television stations and telethons around the world and these attract donors on the promise of publicizing their contributions. These type of appeals attract a certain type of individual i.e. one who seeks out conspicuous avenues to donate. What these individuals get in return are the intangible benefits associated with public

recognition just as the empathy ribbon wearer does. Therefore, Griffin and Grace's (2006) definition must be expanded to encapsulate the behavior of such donors. Conspicuous donation behavior (CDB) is *"the act of donating to charitable causes via the visible display of charitable merchandise or the public recognition of the donation"*. The key to this definition resides within the themes of *visible display* and *public recognition*. Thus, these people are clearly identified as donors by the conspicuousness of their behaviour. On the other hand, those individuals donating money to telethons and asking for their names to be withheld, or purchasing, but not displaying, charity merchandise, does not imply conspicuous donation behavior.

In contrast to other measures that relate to donation behaviour, it is believed that the CDB scale will be unique in its contribution. For example, a recent study by Sargeant, Ford and West (2006) examined the perceptual factors that influenced individuals' support for charitable organisations. Sargeant *et al* (2006) provided a model of perceptions of benefits as an explanation for individuals' nonprofit giving behaviour, which included the constructs of demonstrable utility, (e.g. local prestige, obtain recognition) and emotional utility (e.g. feel guilty, feel bad). Similar to Grace and Griffin (2005), Sargeant *et al* (2006) suggest that individuals' donation behaviour can be explained by factors such as public recognition. However, Grace and Griffin (2005) propose that the recognition is from the 'conspicuousness' of the donation act, based on the visual display of the particular charity's merchandise, in addition, to public recognition.

Moreover, studies that have examined helping behavior, have generally focused on the organisations rather than on the 'why' and 'how' individuals help (Bendapudi *et*

al 1996; Hibbert and Horne, 1996). For example previous research as focussed on and used measures to guage individual's helping decisions (Bendapudi, Singh and Bendapudi, 1996), the affect of appeals (Desmet and Feinberg, 2003), types of helping behavior (Einolf, 2007), donor characteristics (Bennett and Gabriel, 2000), intentions or willingness to donate (Tom and Elmer, 1994; Tscheulin and Lindenmeier, 2005), situational determinants (Hibbert and Horne, 1996) and attitude towards donating (LcTour and Manrai, 1989). This research attempts to address both of these points by suggesting that for some individuals it is the conspicuousness of the donation behaviour via the visible display of empathy ribbons and the like, which is the key to understanding 'why' they donate and 'how' they donate.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

This research develops a theoretical measurement scale for CDB, and, as such, consideration is given to scale type and validity issues. Flynn and Pearcy (2001) note that a common oversight, in relation to scale development, was the lack of recognition regarding the differences between theoretical and applied scales and that the same demands should not be made of applied and theoretical measures. They explain, "the ideal characteristics of a scale are not the same if a researcher is measuring a construct or phenomenon for diagnostic or managerial reasons vs. measuring the same construct for theoretical explanation" (415). For example, Flynn and Pearcy (2001) advocate that if the research aim is to test theory by examining constructs in relation to other phenomena then "no longer is an inventory of items necessary….we should be aiming for a concise list of items capturing the heart of the construct" (Flynn and Pearcy,

2001:p. 418), rather than, in the case of applied scales, trying to achieve complete coverage of the construct in order to make accurate predictions. Furthermore, DeVellis (2003) suggests that, in general, shorter scales are more efficient as less of a burden is placed on respondents. In terms of validity, construct validity is of major importance where theoretical scales are concerned, therefore, tests for convergent, discriminant and internal consistency should be entrenched in the scale development process (Spector, 1992). Thus, the research objective of this study is to develop a parsimonious measure of CDB, exhibiting sound psychometric properties, which can be reliably replicated and generalized across different sample populations.

SCALE DEVELOPMENT

The guidelines of DeVellis (2003), Churchill (1979) and Campbell and Fiske (1959) provided the direction of the research which adopted the Classical Test Theory (CTT) approach. CTT has its main focus on test-level information, although item difficulty and item discrimination are also important and its main advantage is its relatively weak theoretical assumptions (Hambleton and Jones, 1993). In contrast, the opposing measurement framework, Item Response Theory (IRT), is more theory grounded and its primary focus is on item-level information, rather than test-level information (Fan, 1998). While some have argued for the superiority of IRT, empirical evidence suggests that the two approaches produce very similar item and person statistics (Fan, 1998). Furthermore, the recommendations of Rossiter (2002) encapsulated in his C-OAR-SE procedure of scale development, particularly in relation to the reporting of scale points, have provided guidance for this research.

The research also gives careful consideration in the design of the scale development process in response to Flynn and Pearcy's (2001) four criticisms of scale development. The four criticisms involve inadequate development sample sizes, insufficient replications, inconsistency in usage of exploratory factor analysis and issues concerning applied versus theoretical scales. Therefore, the present study includes a scale development process in three stages, comprising of five separate data collections (one qualitative, four quantitative). The respondent pool includes two student sample and three general consumer samples. A student sample is deemed to be appropriate and is acceptable in the initial stages of the scale development process given that a representative mean value is not sought in this process but, more importantly, what is sought is evidence of internal consistency of the scale (see DeVellis, 2003). Data collections using snowball sampling involved the use of students to snowball the sample. Students were instructed to distribute the survey to respondents of varying ages, educational and occupational backgrounds in order to gain a good general sample. Each data collection used student groups from either different disciplines/different campuses to eliminate the potential problem of accessing the same respondents each time. Table 1 presents a summary of the data collections of this study and the ensuing discussion outlines the item generation, scale purification and scale validation stages of the CDB scale development process.

Stage One: Item Generation

The study incorporates a qualitative approach, including open-ended questionnaires to generate the initial item pool. A group of 160 consumers (accessed via snowball sampling) were asked a series of questions with regards to donation behavior (e.g. Do

you prefer to make a donation through purchasing something that you can display on your person? Please explain why or why not.). The sample was comprised of 42% male and 58% female with a mean age of 28.4 years and mean income of $29 thousand. The researchers, identified a number of themes that emerged from the responses, which included, attitudes toward donating, donation type preference, intrinsic rewards associated with donating, self-image and types of donation behaviour. The process involved the researchers identifying themes individually then coming together to compare their findings. Disagreement was only evident in the labeling of the themes, rather than their identification, and these differences were quickly resolved upon discussion. The researchers then worked together to generate the initial item pool, relating to all the themes, and the qualitative responses were once again used. This time, however, the qualitative data was used to provide rich information in relation to item wording. This process resulted in a 52 items being developed for scale purification purposes. In addition, a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (7) "strongly agree" with the mid point (4) being "undecided" was used due to its ability to measure opinions, beliefs and attitudes (DeVellis, 2003) and its common usage within the marketing domain. Given the decision to use a Likert response format, each item was presented as a declarative statement (DeVellis, 2003).

Stage Two: Scale Purification

Data were collected on campus from second and third year university students in a large Australian university. The sample totaled 246 students of which 36% were male and 64% were female. Ages ranged from 17 years to 47 years with a mean age of 22 years. Analysis included a combination of reliability analysis with particular attention

being given to corrected item-to-total correlations and exploratory factor analysis. These two analytical procedures were used simultaneously as recommended by Flynn and Pearcy (2001) and along similar lines to that used by Pecheux and Derbaix (1999). A ten-factor solution resulted from principal components factor analysis using oblique rotation (due to the expectation that any possible factors would be correlated), which explained 64% of the variance.

Item-to-total correlations were examined and those calculated at less than 0.40 were identified for possible deletion. This was followed by an examination of items that did not load strongly (i.e. loadings of <0.50) and had high cross-loadings (i.e. cross-loadings > 0.40) from factor analysis results. The result of these analyses was that 21 items were subsequently deleted. Factor analysis was conducted again and this resulted in a four-factor solution explaining 59% of the variance. Once again, poor performing items were deleted prior to re-running the analysis. This resulted in the item pool being reduced to 18 and the ensuing factor analysis resulted in a 3-factor solution explaining 57% of the variance. At this point, three clear and meaningful factors were beginning to emerge, however, 6 items did not load strongly (e.g. factors loadings under the recommended level of .50) and, thus, were removed prior to re-running the factor analysis. Thus, a 3-factor structure explaining 64% of the variance represented the remaining items. The three factors comprised of four items each and the factor loadings ranged from .62 to .88. The donation behaviour factors were labeled as (1) *conspicuous: other-oriented*, (2) *conspicuous: self-oriented*, and (3) *non-conspicuous: private.* It was interesting to note that, relating back to the themes that emerged in Stage 1, there was a clear connection between the theme of self-image in relation to Factor (1) *conspicuous: other-oriented*, self-image in relation to Factor

(2) *conspicuous: self-oriented*, and donation type and preference to Factor (3) *non-conspicuous: private*. However, given that the purpose of this study was to develop a scale that measures *conspicuous* (as opposed to private or covert donation behaviou), the third factor was considered not to be relevant and as a result these 4 items were removed from further analysis. The final factor analysis exhibited 2 distinct CDB factors, labeled as *other-oriented* and *self-oriented* (inter-factor correlation of .42), which explained 69% of the variance and exhibited factor loadings ranging from .65 to .88 (refer to Table 2 for these items). Furthermore, Cronbach's alpha was computed at .86, which indicated strong internal consistency of the scale.

Stage Three: Validation

Validation Sample 1:

The purpose of this sample was to conduct confirmatory factor analysis on the 8 items retained from the purification stage. Data were collected via a snowball sampling procedure which resulted in a sample of 207 respondents (43% male and 57% female with a mean age of 29 years). Using AMOS 5.0 with maximum likelihood estimation, initially, a one-factor model was run which produced poor fit statistics with a large chi-square of 146.75 (20 df) and an Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) of 178.79. The two-factor model was then run and the results indicated a good fit for the model with Chi-Square of 27.12 (18 df), normed Chi-square of 1.51, goodness of fit index (GFI) of .97, comparative fit index (CFI) of .97, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .05 and standardised root mean residual (SRMR) of .05 (refer to results in Table 3). Furthermore, the results of the two-factor model indicated an AIC of 63.12 which was significantly lower than the one-factor model

(178.79) thus indicating a much better representation of the data. As such, the results

provide evidence for the two-factor structure and convergent validity as the normed

chi-square is less than 3 (Hu and Bentler, 1995), GFI is above .95, CFI is above .90

(Chandon *et al* 1997), while the RMSEA is below .08 and the SRMR below .05

(Carmines and McIver, 1981).

Validation Sample 2:

The study uses data from the second validation sample to further assess the

dimensionality, reliability and construct validity of the CDB scale. Data were

collected via a snowball sampling procedure from 459 consumers aged 18 to 77 years

with a mean age of 31 years with 47% being male and 53% being female.

Confirmatory factor analysis, which was conducted via AMOS 5.0 using maximum

likelihood estimation resulted in a two-factor model with a normed Chi-square of

2.91. The GFI (.96) and the CFI (.97) were within acceptable levels, as was the

RMSEA (.06) and the SRMR (.04), thus indicating a good fit for the measurement

model and confirming the dimensionality and convergent validity of the CDB scale.

Furthermore, the reliability for the CDB scale, as calculated via Cronbach's alpha, is

confirmed at .89 (refer Table 3).

Convergent Validity: As argued by Fornell and Larcker (1981), convergent

validity is achieved if the average variance explained (AVE) in items by their

respective constructs is greater than the variance unexplained (i.e., AVE> .05).

Therefore, in order to assess the constructs (factors) for convergent validity, the

squared multiple correlations from the confirmatory factor analysis were used to

calculate the average variance explained. This resulted in the two factors having an

average variance explained (AVE) greater than or equal to .50, therefore meeting the recommended criteria for convergent validity. The calculated AVE for each of the factors are as follows – conspicuous: other-oriented (.61) and conspicuous: self-oriented (.62).

Discriminant Validity: Discriminant validity is evaluated via a similar process to Eastman *et al* (1999) whereby items relating to other constructs (e.g. exhibitionism and status consumption), considered distinct from, but closely related to, the CDB scale are examined via exploratory factor analysis. The survey for this data collection included a 7-item Exhibitionism Scale (Raskin and Terry,1988), 5 items from Eastman, Goldsmith and Flynn's (1999) Status Consumption Scale, the 8-item CDB scale and demographic items in order to achieve this validation. The exhibitionism scale was chosen because this scale provides a measure of overt behavioral tendencies. One would expect that exhibitionism is related to, but distinct from, CDB due to the overt nature of both. Similarly, CDB would be distinct from, but closely related to status consumption because status consumption is also derived from the same theory of conspicuous consumption. The factor analysis results indicate a clear four-factor structure, which explains 66% of the variance, with no cross loadings greater than 0.4. The first two factors (*exhibitionism* and the *conspicuous: other-oriented*) have eigenvalues greater than 2.0, while *status consumption* and the *conspicuous: self-oriented* have eigenvalues of 1.95 and 1.04 respectively. Therefore, the discriminant validity of the CDB scale is confirmed as no items from different scales loaded on the same factor (Lusch, 1976).

Validation Sample 3:

The purpose of this data collection was to further examine dimensionality, reliability, convergent, discriminant and predictive validity. Data were collected via a snow-balling sampling procedure from 239 consumers aged between 18 and 67 years (mean age 31 years), 41% of which were male and 59% were female. *Confirmatory factor analysis* reveals a good fit for the measurement model with a normed chi-square of 2.82 GFI = .97, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04 and RMSEA = .06. Furthermore, the reliability estimate of Cronbach's alpha .89 (refer Table 3) confirms the reliability of the scale.

Convergent Validity: Once again the squared multiple correlations from the confirmatory factor analysis were used to calculate the average variance explained for each of the factors. This resulted in both factors having an average variance explained (AVE) greater than or equal to .50, therefore meeting the recommended criteria for convergent validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). The calculated AVE for each of the factors are as follows – conspicuous: other-oriented (.55) and conspicuous: self-oriented (.56).

Discriminant Validity: Discriminant validity was once again evaluated via exploratory factor analysis (see Eastman *et al* 1999). The survey included items measuring *Reference Group Influence* (Park and Lessig, 1977), *Material Success* (Richins and Dawson, 1992) as these were all constructs expected to relate, in some manner, to CDB. Firstly, susceptibility to reference group influence is expected to correlate with CDB given that the behavior of conspicuous donors is influenced by the desire to display behavior to others because they care about what others think. Therefore, CDB will have a significant positive relationship with reference group

influence. Furthermore, material success would also be expected to be positively correlated to CBD as "materialists view themselves as successful to the extent they can possess products that project the desired images" (Richins and Dawson, 1992:p. 304). This being the case, it is expected that materialists may wish to establish positive images of themselves through displaying material evidence of their donation behaviour. The results indicate a clear four-factor structure, which explains 65% of the variance, with no cross loadings greater than 0.4. The first two factors (*reference group influence* and the *conspicuous: self-oriented*) have eigenvalues greater than 2.0, while *materialism* and the *conspicuous: other-oriented* have eigenvalues of 1.67 and 1.37 respectively. Therefore, the discriminant validity of the CDB scale is confirmed as no items from different scales loaded on the same factor (Lusch, 1976).

Predictive Validity: The CDB scale was further examined to determine if the summated CDB scale was related in the expected manner with other constructs, thus indicating predictive validity. In order to examine the proposed relationships, bivariate correlations were computed and all hypothesized relationships were supported. CDB is positively correlated with *material success* (.33) and *reference group influence* (.38). Furthermore, prior research has shown that, as people get older, the amount of money donated increases until the age of 65. (Schlegelmilch, Love and Diamantopoulos, 1997; Danko and Stanley, 1986). Older individuals may, therefore, be more involved with charities and donation behavior as they age and seek out less conspicuous avenues to make their donations. Thus, conspicuous donation behavior may be more common with younger donors and, therefore, a significant negative relationship between age and CDB is hypothesized. This was supported by the findings here with results indicating a negative correlation (-.27) (p < .001) between

age and CDB. Further evidence of construct validity of the CDB scale is, thus, provided given that the results support the three relationships proposed.

DISCUSSION

A parsimonious, two-dimensional scale, demonstrating reliability and validity results from the scale development process. The CDB scale consistently exhibits a two-factor structure across all data collections, with Factor 1 being labelled as *conspicuous: self-oriented* and Factor 2 being labelled as *conspicuous: other-oriented.* Clearly the four items in Factor 1, (as shown in Table 1), represents overt donation behaviour that is motivated by the desire to seek intrinsic benefits (or benefits to the self) whereas the 4 items in Factor 2 represent overt donation behaviour that is motivated by the desire to display the behaviour to others. The two factors are meaningful and together produce consistent results in relation to the measurement of CDB. In summary, a rigorous approach to the development of the CDB scale (as called for by Grace and Griffin, 2006) has been successfully undertaken and this phenomenon can be further explored from both a theoretical and practical basis.

In terms of theory, the CDB scale can be used to examine relationships between other consumption-related variables such as values, involvement, personality and demographic characteristics. For example, Grace and Griffin (2006) propose a number of relationships in relation to CDB such as with *consumer involvement* (negative relationship), *community values* (negative relationship), *self-monitoring* (positive relationship), *susceptibility to interpersonal influence* (positive relationship) and *age* (negative relationship). Moreover, the findings used to establish construct

16

validity, here, provide preliminary evidence in relation to two of these proposed relationships. For example, in validation sample 3, a significant positive relationship was found between *CDB* and *reference group influence* and a significant negative relationship was found between *CDB* and *age*. Furthermore, the CDB scale will enable the "meaningful examination of CDB within a nomological network of relationships" (Grace and Griffin, 2006:p. 152) that may include (but not be restricted to) a number of antecedents (e.g. personal characteristics, attitudes etc.) and consequences (e.g. loyalty, satisfaction, intentions etc.) of this behavior.

In addition, when examining individual characteristics and behavior the relationship is not always clear-cut. In terms of CDB, other variables may moderate this behavior. The charitable cause could represent one such moderating variable given that some people may prefer to be publicly linked to some charities rather than others. For example, some individuals may openly donate to a Children's Hospital Appeal but prefer to be more private with their donation to an appeal in relation to AIDS or mental health. This may be the case for the individual who tends towards CDB as they are likely to be the type of individual who worries about their public image or about what others think and, as a result, the type of charitable cause may significantly influence their actual donation behavior. Another possible moderator may be the stage of the life cycle of the charitable appeal. For example, more appealing to the conspicuous donor may be being the first to overtly display their support (e.g. the first to have their name flashed across the TV screen or the first to wear a new empathy ribbon) rather than later on in the appeal when many individual's have already displayed their support. Therefore, the life cycle of charitable appeals

that promote conspicuous behavior versus those that do not should be examined and compared. The issue of wear-out may be more relevant to some appeals over others.

In practical terms, the CDB scale will also be useful in examining conspicuous behavior in relation to the various charitable appeals. For example, some strategies such as the sale of charity merchandise, or conducting telethons etc. lend themselves towards CDB, whereas the likes of mail donations or shop counter collections do not. Consequently, charitable appeals could be categorized according to the types of behavior they motivate e.g. on a continuum from non-conspicuous through to conspicuous and this would assist non-profit organizations to understand the situations in which one appeal may be more appropriate than another. This information would be vitally important to organizations that also wish to target their appeals more effectively and efficiently i.e. match their appeals to their target markets or attract new market segments via the use of different charitable appeals.

LIMITATIONS

While the process of scale development for the CDB scale was considered to be thorough, expert opinion was not sought in the initial stages of item generation, as is usual practice in scale development. Although this may have resulted in the initial item pool being slightly altered, it is suggested that there would have been little effect on the final result (i.e. the CDB Scale) given the sound psychometrical properties of the scale. Through the various data collection reported herein, the CDB scale has demonstrated that it is a valid and reliable scale. However, the wording of some of the items may be slightly restrictive seeing as they refer specifically to empathy

ribbons. So that other forms of charitable merchandise (e.g. pins, bandanas etc.) are not excluded, it is suggested when using this scale for future research, the wording may need to be altered accordingly.

CONCLUSION

There are a multitude of immediate uses for the CDB scale in relation to the advancement of knowledge in both theoretical and practical domains. This trend of donor conspicuousness should be followed in order to reveal whether the conspicuous donor remains so overtime or whether, at some point, they have a preference for less conspicuous means. Yet to be discovered is to what degree the conspicuous donor remains loyal to a charitable cause in comparison to the more private donor and how charitable appeals of the future will change to accommodate the growing trend of conspicuous compassion (if this trend continues). No doubt, the CDB scale will play an integral role towards this end.

REFERENCES

Alvarado A. 2006. The United States Nonprofit Sector. Washington, DC: National
Council of Nonprofit Associations.

Bendapudi N, Singh SN, Bendapudi V. 1996. Enhancing helping behaviour: An
integrative framework for promotion planning. *Journal of Marketing* 60: (3)
33-49.

Bennett R, Gabriel H. 2000. Charity affiliation as a determinant of product purchase
decisions. *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 9: (4) 255-270.

Bruce I. 1994. *Meeting Need: Successful Charity Marketing*. ICSA Publishing:
Hempstead, UK.

Campbell DT, Fiske DW. 1959. Convergent and discriminant validation by the
multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin* 5: 81-105.

Carmines E, McIver JP. 1981. Analysing models with unobserved variables: Analysis
of covariance structures. In *Social Measurement: Current Issues*. Bohrnstedt
GW, Borgatta EF (eds). Sage Publications: Beverley Hills, CA.

Chandon JL, Leo PY, Philippe J. 1997. Service encounter dimensions – a dyadic
perspective: Measuring the dimensions of service encounters as perceived by
customers and personnel. *International Journal of Service Industry
Management* 8: (1) 65-76.

Chung E, Fischer E. 2001. When conspicuous consumption becomes inconspicuous:
The case of the migrant Hong Kong consumers. *Journal of Consumer
Marketing* 18: (6) 474-487.

Churchill Jr GA. 1979. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing
constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research* XVI: (February) 64-73.

Danko WD, Stanley TJ. 1986. Identifying and reaching the donation prone individual:
A Nationwide Assessment. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing* 2: (1/2)
117-122.

Dawson S. 1988. Four motivations for charitable giving: Implications for marketing
strategy to attract monetary donations for medical research. *Journal of Health
Care Marketing* 8: (2) 31-37.

Desmet P, Feinberg FM. 2003. Ask and ye shall receive: The effect of the appeals
scale on consumer's donation behavior. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 24:
349-376.

DeVellis RF. 2003. *Scale Development: Theory and Applications* (2nd Ed.) Applied
Social Research Methods Series Volume 26. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks,
CA.

Eastman JK, Goldsmith R, Flynn L. 1999. Status consumption in consumer behavior:
Scale development and validation. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 7:
(3) 41-52.

Fan X. 1998. Item response theory and classical test theory: an empirical comparison
of their item/person statistics. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 58:
(3) 357-381.

Einolf CJ. 2007. Empathic concern and prosocial behaviors: A test of experimental
results using survey data. *Social Science Research*.

Fornell C, Larcker DF. 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with
unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*
18: 39-50.

Flynn L, Pearcy D. 2001. Four subtle sins in scale development: Some suggestions for strengthening the current paradigm. *International Journal of Market Research* 43: (4) 409-433.

Grace D, Griffin D. 2006. Exploring conspicuousness in the context of donation behavior. *International Journal of Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Marketing* 11: (May) 147-154.

Guy BS, Patton WE. 1989. The marketing of altruistic causes: Understanding why people help. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 6: (1) 19-30.

Hambleton RK,Jones RW. 1993. Comparison of classical test theory and item response theory and their applications to text development. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 12: 93) 38-47.

Hibbert S, Horne S. 1996. Giving to charity: questioning the donor decision process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 13: (2) 4-13.

Kuppasamy B. 2004. Malaysia: Billionaires compete to donate the most. South China Morning Post (December 30).

LaTour SA, Manrai AK. 1989. Interactive impact of informational and normative influence on donations. *Journal of Marketing Research* 26: (3) 327-335.

Lusch RF. 1976. Sources of power: Their impact on intrachannel conflict. *Journal of Marketing Research* XIII: (November) 382-390.

Park CW, Lessig VP. 1977. Students and housewives: Differences in susceptibility to reference group influence. *Journal of Consumer Research* 4: 102-110.

Piacentini M, Mailer G. 2004. Symbolic consumption in teenagers' clothing choices. *Journal of Consumer Behavior* 3: (3) 251-262.

Pecheux C, Derbaix C. 1999. Mood and children: Proposition of a measurement scale. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 20: (5) 571-590.

Prendergast G, Wong C. 2003. Parental influence on the purchase of luxury brands of infant apparel: An exploratory study in Hong Kong. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 20: (2) 157-169.

Raskin R, Terry H. 1988. A principle-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54: (May) 890-902.

Richins ML, Dawson S. 1992. A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research* 19: (3) 303-316.

Rothschild ML. 1979. Marketing communications in nonbusiness situations or why it's so hard to sell brotherhood like soap. *Journal of Marketing* 43: (Spring) 11-20.

Sargeant A, Ford JG, West DC. 2006. Perceptual determinants of nonprofit giving behaviour. *Journal of Business Research* 59: 155-165.

Schlegelmilch BB, Love A, Diamantopoulos A. 1997. Responses to different charity appeals: The impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations. *European Journal of Marketing* 31: (8) 548-560.

Tom G, Elmer L. 1994. Alumni willingness to give and contribution behaviour. *Journal of Services Marketing* 8: (40) 57-62.

Tscheulin DK, Lindenmeier J. 2005. The willingness to donate blood: an empirical analysis of socio-demographic and motivation-related determinants. *Health Services Management Research* 18: 165-174.

Veblen T. 1912. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. George Allen and Unwin: London.

West P. 2004. *Conspicuous Compassion: Why Sometimes it Really is Cruel to be Kind*. Civitas Institute for the Study of Civil Society: London.

Wong NY, Ahuvia AC. 1998. Personal taste and family face: Luxury consumption in confucian and western societies. *Psychology and Marketing* 15: (5) 423-441.

Wilding K, Clark J, Griffith M, Jochum V, Wainwright S. 2006. The UK Voluntary Sector Almanac 2006: The State of the Sector. Central Books: London.

Zaichkowsky JL. 1985. Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research* 12: (3) 341-352.

TABLE 1. Validity and Reliability Confirmed by Data Collections

Stages of Scale Development	Source of Data	Provides Evidence For:
Stage 1 Item Generation	Qualitative Data - Consumers (N = 160)	Face Validity Content Validity
Stage 2 Purification	Survey One – Students (N = 246	Reliability (Internal Consistency) Dimensionality
Stage 3 Validation	Survey One - Consumer (N = 207	Dimensionality Reliability (Internal)
	Survey Two – Consumers (N = 459	Dimensionality Reliability (Internal Consistency) Convergent Validity Discriminant Validity
	Survey Three - Consumers (N = 239	Dimensionality Reliability (Internal Consistency) Convergent Validity Discriminant Validity Predictive Vality- Validity

Table 2. Conspicuous Donation Behavior (CDB) Scale

Survey Measures	Factor (1) Loading	Factor (2) Loading
Self-Oriented		
If I wear empathy ribbons it makes me feel like I have made a difference.	.87	
It increases my self-respect when I wear merchandise that benefits charities.	.82	
Wearing empathy ribbons makes me feel good.	.75	
I like to remind myself of the charities I support through buying merchandise that benefits charities.	.67	
Other-Oriented		
I like to buy empathy ribbons because I get to show something for my donation.		.88
I like to wear/display merchandise that benefits charities so that people know I am a good person.		.82
I like to show people I donate.		.76
I wear merchandise that benefits charities because it makes me look cool.		.65

TABLE 3. Psychometric Properties - Conspicuous Donation Behavior (CDB) Scale

Data Collections	Purification	Validation 1	Validation 2	Validation 3
Respondents	Student Sample	General Sample	General Sample	General Sample
N=	246	207	459	239
CDB (Composite Variable)				
Mean	24.4	23.6	27.1	28.8
St Deviation	9.24	7.91	9.95	8.74
EFA				
Variance Exp.	69%			
Loadings	.65 - .88			
CFA				
Normed Chi-Square		1.51	2.91	2.82
GFI		.97	.96	.97
CFI		.97	.97	.98
RMSEA		.05	.06	.06
SRMR		.05	.04	.04
RELIABILITY				
**Cronbach's Alpha	.86	.88	.89	.89
**Cronbach's Alpha is calculated as an average across both factors				