



Does Non-profit Brand Image Mean the Same Across Cultures? An Exploratory Evaluation of Non-Profit Brand Image in Three Countries

Journal:	<i>International Marketing Review</i>
Manuscript ID	IMR-10-2018-0284.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Non-profit Brand Image, Cross-National, Brand image, Charities, Donations

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Does Non-profit Brand Image Mean the Same Across Cultures? An Exploratory Evaluation of Non-Profit Brand Image in Three Countries

Abstract

Purpose – The current challenges international charities face with regards to their deteriorating image, as a result of recent scandals (e.g. Oxfam, Save the Children), provide the impetus for this exploratory research, which examines the conceptualization and dimensionality of non-profit brand image across national cultures.

Design/methodology/approach – The study employs a quantitative research design, using multi-country samples from India, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the UK. We first examine the psychometric properties of the non-profit brand image scale via confirmatory factor analysis across countries, identifying the optimal model for invariance testing. Further, we use multi-group invariance analysis to evaluate whether non-profit brand image (using an 18-item scale and six factors) provides equivalent measurement across cultures.

Findings – The study shows that individuals in the three countries perceive non-profit brand image equally, and as consisting of perceptions of usefulness, efficiency, affect, dynamism, reliability and ethicality. However, our results also indicate that the means of the dimensions of non-profit brand image are not comparable across different cultures.

Originality/value – The study extends limited current literature on non-profit brand image in international contexts, deriving insightful suggestions for further theoretical approaches in this under-developed research domain. It also yields key implications for charities and other nonprofit organizations operating internationally, as they can use nonprofit brand image and its dimensions as actionable tools in their communication campaigns to shape their brand image.

Does Non-profit Brand Image Mean the Same Across Cultures? An Exploratory Evaluation of Non-Profit Brand Image in Three Countries

Introduction

Prior research in the domain of international marketing suggests that non-profit organizations, despite being different from commercial ones, they equally seek to employ traditional marketing tools and ideas to achieve their mission (Dolnicar and Lazarevski, 2009). Specifically, the notion of branding is very crucial for the non-for-profit sector (Stride and Lee, 2007; Waters and Jones, 2011; Michaelidou, Micevski, and Siamagka, 2015b), with charitable organizations utilizing branding techniques in order to stand out from other similar organizations (Mort *et al.*, 2007). Indeed, branding is of particular significance to charities that operate at a global or international level (e.g., Unicef, Red Cross, Save the Children, ActionAid, WWF, Oxfam etc.), as it applies to a wide range of decisions in developing and communicating a globally consistent and stable image (e.g., see Whitelock and Fastoso, 2007) across different countries. For example, in comparing their brand image across countries, international charities may be able to identify problem areas (e.g., negative perception of ethicality) across different countries, diagnose the nature and cause of the problem, and take corrective action. Equally important is the fact that, charitable organizations that seek to leverage their scarce resources across countries need to know whether their image has equivalent measurement across national cultures [e.g., is understood the same by individuals]. Indeed, cross-cultural benchmarking is useful for tracking performance and developing strategies in domestic and international markets, and serves as a basis for designing global marketing campaigns.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nevertheless, current literature in the area of non-profit brand image (Michel and Rieunier, 2012; Michaelidou, Micevski and Cadogan, 2015a) has been exclusively developed in a single national context (*see* Netemeyer *et al.*, 1991; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Having no information about non-profit brand image measurement equivalence across different national contexts presents an important research gap from theoretical but also from practical standpoint. From theoretical view, without a strict proof of the equivalent and stability of measures of non-profit brand image, scholars cannot fully understand the conceptual comparability of the measure. In other words, we do not know whether similarities or differences observed across national contexts can be seen as related or should the conclusions regarding the brand image of non-profits be made in isolation, on country by country bases. From the standpoint of practitioners, without information of generally accepted scales to measure the non-profit brand image across nations, it is difficult to justify investment in international brand building initiatives. Indeed, national contexts within which international non-profit organizations are operating may vary greatly from country to country, and therefore, cross nationally invariant measures of non-profit brand image that work across national contexts would allow managers to more accurately decide about their brand positioning and communications strategies. In view of these gaps in the current international branding literature, this research attempts to answer the following questions: (RQ1): Does non-profit brand image conceptualization differ across national cultures? (RQ2): Is non-profit brand image and its dimensions comparable across national cultures?

To address these questions, we focus on assessing the cross-national invariance of a recently developed 18-item measure of non-profit brand image (Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a) across three countries – India, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the UK- and which show an adequate range of cultural variation. Data were drawn from 622 respondents in total, and initially analyzed

1
2
3
4 via confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in order to identify the optimal model for invariance
5
6 testing. Measurement invariance was assessed through a set of sequential testing procedures and
7
8 omnibus assessment that include testing for configural invariance, measurement invariance,
9
10 scalar invariance and factor variance invariance. As such, the study offers the several
11
12 contributions. First, we contribute to knowledge by extending scarce research in the international
13
14 branding and non-profit field (e.g., Christodoulides, Cadogan, and Veloutsou, 2015), focusing on
15
16 the equivalence of non-profit brand image in three national contexts. More specifically, and from
17
18 a theoretical point of view, our study places the notion of non-profit brand image in the domain
19
20 of international marketing, hence extending prior research focusing on non-profit organizations
21
22 in an international context (e.g., Bruce, 1995; Dolnicar and Lazarevski, 2009). A second
23
24 contribution is that the study examines the dimensionality/stability of the facets of non-profit
25
26 brand image (e.g., Netemeyer *et al.*, 1991) across three national contexts; thus, offering a
27
28 methodological assessment of the validity of the construct as a brand management tool and
29
30 advancing current research in the domain of non-profit brand image (e.g. Michel and Rieunier,
31
32 2012; Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a). Third, our results have an incremental practical value, in that
33
34 they have the potential to shape managerial decisions. For example, to improve how charities and
35
36 other non-profit organizations manage their image, and subsequently their resources,
37
38 internationally (e.g., Corley and Gioia, 2011). The latter point is particularly important, as lack of
39
40 accepted and cross-nationally valid scales to manage non-profit brand image suggests that it may
41
42 be more difficult for charities and other non-profit organizations to justify investment in brand
43
44 building activities internationally.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The following section provides a theoretical background, and subsequently the methodology and
5 analytical procedures are presented. The paper concludes with a discussion of the findings and
6 contributions to theory and practice.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Theoretical Background**

14 15 16 *Conceptualization and Measurement of Non-profit Brand Image*

17
18 In line with Keller (1993; 2001), non-profit image indicates individuals' perceptions of
19 non-profit brands as reflected by different brand associations held in memory, and which seem to
20 appeal to both emotional and rational considerations. The importance of brand image for non-
21 profit organizations is well documented in the literature (e.g., Bennett and Sargeant, 2005; Ewing
22 and Napoli, 2005; Sargeant *et al.*, 2008). Non-profit brand image is acknowledged as a "*critical*
23 *element of a [charity's] promotional program*" (Bendapudi *et al.*, 1996, p.37) to drive charitable
24 donations, given the intense competition non-profit organizations face to secure individuals'
25 monetary and time donations (Michel and Rieunier, 2012; Michaelidou, *et al.*, 2015b; Stride and
26 Lee, 2007). More specifically, Bendapudi *et al.*, (1996) argue that the image of charities provides
27 cues as to how well the charity represents its donors, thus charities which are perceived as
28 effective will be more successful in influencing donations including money and time
29 contributions (Bendapudi *et al.*, 1996; Stark, 1989).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Non-profit brand image has been previously conceptualized using primarily commercial
49 variables that do not generally underpin non-profit aspects of brand image (Michel and Rieunier,
50 2012). In particular, authors such as Sargeant *et al.*, (2008), Venable *et al.*, (2005), Voeth and
51 Herbst (2008) use personality traits, including Aaker's (1997) brand personality inventory (i.e.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, ruggedness) initially created to apply to
5 commercial brands (e.g., Sung and Kim, 2010), to measure non-profit brand image. However,
6 such measures have been criticized for having weak predictive validity (Michaelidou *et al.*,
7 2015a). Similarly, Bennett and Gabriel's (2003) conceptualization of non-profit brand image,
8 which is underlined by five factors, namely, compassion, dynamism, political orientation,
9 idealism and focus on beneficiaries, has also been criticized for drawing on 'for-profit' notions to
10 capture non-profit brand image (Michel and Rieunier, 2012). Lately, notable attempts have been
11 made to create a better conceptualization and measure of brand image specifically within the
12 non-profit domain (e.g., Michel and Rieunier, 2012; Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a). In particular,
13 Michel and Rieunier (2012) conceptualize non-profit brand image as consisting of four
14 dimensions - usefulness, efficiency, affect and dynamism, which encompass different attributes
15 of image, within the context of local French and international humanitarian aid charities. For
16 example, usefulness and efficiency reflect a functional image of the non-profit brand, linked to
17 rational perceptions that fulfil utilitarian considerations (Huang and Ku, 2016; Keller, 2001);
18 such as, whether the charity is managed-well, uses assets wisely, and it is efficient and useful in
19 achieving its mission. On the other hand, non-profit brand can encapsulate a symbolic or
20 affective image, reflecting individuals internally-generated and psychological needs (Keller,
21 2001). For instance, a symbolic or affective image comprises perceptions of charities being
22 compassionate, friendly and favorable, and it is thought to resonate with emotional
23 considerations (Keller, 2001). Michaelidou *et al.*, (2015a) further extend the conceptualization of
24 non-profit brand image, arguing that as charitable giving is grounded on moral principles and
25 values (e.g., such as benevolence and helping others, Webb *et al.*, 2000), non-profit brand image
26 should also include perceptions of ethicality and reliability; delineated via associations pertaining
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to the charity being perceived as: responsible, reputable, sincere, ethical, moral and righteous.

5
6 These perceptions highlight an 'ethical image' of the non-profit brand, and can be thought to
7
8 appeal to individuals' moral principles of being honest, trustworthy, sincere and righteous
9
10
11 (Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a).
12
13

14 15 16 *Non-profit Brand Image in International Context: The Research Gap* 17

18 In international business literature, there is abundance of evidence pointing to the
19
20 importance of tests establishing cross-nationally valid and reliable scales of measurement
21
22 instruments that exhibit the same dimensionality as initially intended, before employing such
23
24 measures as means of capturing phenomena abroad (Davis, Douglas, and Silk, 1981; Douglas
25
26 and Craig, 1983; Sekaran and Martin, 1982). Such tests enable drawing consequent conclusions
27
28 from the cross-national research with valid inferences. Indeed, limited work to date has mostly
29
30 focused on brand equity and examined the equivalence of brand equity measures across different
31
32 countries (e.g., Buil, de Chernatony and Martinez, 2008; Christodoulides, *et al.*, 2015; Yoo and
33
34 Donthu, 2001). For example, Christodoulides, *et al.*, (2015) evaluate consumer brand equity
35
36 across Germany, Greece and the UK. Their results failed to provide clarity as to the
37
38 discrimination of brand equity across the three national contexts. Other researchers have focused
39
40 on the question of variability of brand associations and image across countries. For instance,
41
42 previous research in branding shows differences in perceptions of brands across
43
44 countries/cultures with individuals relating different associations to them (Aaker *et al.*, 2001;
45
46 Foscht *et al.*, 2008; Kocak *et al.*, 2007; Sung and Tinkham, 2005). In a similar line, Foscht *et al.*,
47
48 (2008) identify differences in brand associations attributed to a single global brand with the same
49
50 positioning across countries. Specifically, the authors find that respondents in the UK and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Austria have stronger perceptions of 'competence' (e.g., efficiency) towards a global brand,
5 relative to individuals from Singapore who, instead, show stronger emotional associations.
6
7 Indeed, previous research argues for cross-national differences in image perceptions and brand
8
9 personality (Grohmann, 2009; Lieven and Hildebrand, 2016).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 However, extant research has failed to examine whether image consists of the same associations
17
18 across countries in the non-profit sector, and whether the salience of such associations will be
19
20 equivalent across these same countries. And although previous studies have examined the image
21
22 of brands in the for-profit sector across countries (e.g., Buil *et al.*, 2008; Christodoulides *et al.*,
23
24 2015), the non-profit context differs in terms of the value that charitable organizations produce,
25
26 that relates to the achievement of social purposes and the fulfilment of donors' expectations when
27
28 contributing to a cause supported by the charity (Moore, 2000). Given the intangibility and
29
30 abstraction which surrounds the 'non-profit brand' and its value, it may be difficult for
31
32 individuals and/or donors to discriminate between specific image associations, but rather being
33
34 easier for donors only to formulate an overall image of the charity (Christodoulides *et al.*, 2015).
35
36
37 Therefore, the extent to which charities enjoy consistent brand image across national contexts
38
39 remains seriously unclear. Additionally, as a lot of charities operate mostly at an international
40
41 level (e.g., Oxfam, Unicef, Red Cross, Save the Children), managers base their decision making
42
43 on research that involves comparing samples from two or more national contexts on non-profit
44
45 brand image. A methodological consideration in conducting comparisons focuses on ruling out
46
47 alternative explanations for differences and, thus, enhancing the interpretability of the results.
48
49
50
51 Lack of awareness of the level of equivalence of the measures will constitute any observed
52
53 differences in mean scores across samples subject to varied explanations. In other words, results
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 could be due to differences in national contexts, or merely due to measurement artifacts, which
5
6 makes observed image scores non-comparable directly.
7

8
9 Finally, how donors and the general public perceive charities and other non-profit
10 organizations is very relevant and important to the charitable sector, considering the recent
11 scandals involving humanitarian and children charities (e.g. Oxfam, Save the Children). For
12 instance, the Oxfam /Haiti scandal was characterized as "a blow to the charity sector" and has
13 tarnished the image of Oxfam, leading to high profile cancellations in individual donations, as
14 well as tensions between Haiti and other charities working in the country (Brindle, 2018; BBC,
15 2018). Examining whether the notion of non-profit brand image [and its dimensions] is
16 conceptually, functionally and metrically equivalent across national contexts (e.g., Meredith,
17 1993; Rosenzweig, 1994), will allow charities to ascertain if their image has the same meaning,
18 structure, pattern and comparable scores and means across national cultures; and will inform the
19 development of international charitable campaigns. Our study fills this important void in the
20 current scholarly research, as we use a set of diagnostic invariance measurement tests to assess
21 equivalence of non-profit brand image across three national contexts (e.g., India, Bosnia and
22 Herzegovina, UK).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

Country Selection

Data were collected in three countries: India, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the UK. The selection of the three countries is underpinned by the following rationale. First, within the non-profit domain, most studies are limited to, so called, WEIRD societies (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic) (e.g., Schlegelmilch *et al.*, 1997) which represent only a small proportion of humankind (Henrich *et al.*, 2010). However, scarce empirical evidence in the non-profit domain and outside the scope of Western countries confirms the legitimacy of inclusion of Asian cultural contexts for the improvement of relevancy and accuracy of charitable giving behavior (Hsu *et al.*, 2005). Compared to the rare non-profit domain studies conducted in Asia, studies conducted in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) are even more scarce. Thus, in addition to the UK, CEE as well as Asian countries offer useful and appropriate contexts to cross-nationally examine non-profit brand image. Second, Bosnia and Herzegovina and India reflect sufficient economic and cultural variation between each other and the UK simultaneously, which enables the examination of the conceptual equivalence of the non-profit brand image. Specifically, in terms of economic development, both, India and Bosnia and Herzegovina belong to the group of developing countries [compared to the UK]. Further, the selected countries present a great linguistic variation with English being an official language in India, and the first foreign language in Bosnia and Herzegovina (O'Reilly, 2001). Finally, India tops the list for the number of people donating money, while Bosnia and Herzegovina has experienced a significant rise in money donations to charities in 2018 [compared to the previous years]; and also, compared to other developed and developing economies, which have experienced marginal

1
2
3
4 declines in giving money. In fact, Bosnia and Herzegovina is among the 5 biggest movers in
5
6 terms of donation levels since 2015 (CAF, 2018).
7
8
9

10 11 *Pre-Tests and Data Collection* 12

13
14 The selection of the charities in each country was based on a series of pre-tests based on
15
16 previous research (Michel and Rieunier, 2012; Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a). Respondents were
17
18 asked to indicate the charitable sector that comes to mind first, and then name a 'typical' charity
19
20 reflecting the sector. In the case of India, 73% of respondents in the pre-test opted for the
21
22 children humanitarian aid sector, whereas the results of the pre-test in Bosnia and Herzegovina
23
24 showed highest spontaneous recognition of the humanitarian aid sector (80% of respondents). In
25
26 the case of the UK, respondents indicated the children's charity sector (58%). In the second pre-
27
28 test India respondents ranked the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
29
30 (UNICEF) as the highest scoring non-profit organization on the typicality measure (mean = 5.15;
31
32 sd. = 1.33; Likert scale 1-7). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, respondents identified the Red Cross to
33
34 be the most typical representative of that charity sector (typicality mean = 4.26; sd. = 0.77; Likert
35
36 scale 1-5). In the case of UK, the chosen charity was National Society for the Prevention of
37
38 Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) (typicality mean = 5.08; sd. = 1.2; Likert scale 1-7).
39
40

41
42 Subsequent to the choice of the charity, a large-scale questionnaire approach was used to collect
43
44 data which included measures of non-profit brand image, awareness of the charities, items
45
46 capturing past donation behavior, willingness to donate time and money to the chosen charities,
47
48 brand typicality (adapted from Rosch and Mervis, 1975) and a set of demographic variables (e.g.,
49
50 gender, age, employment status and annual income). Non-profit brand image was measured via
51
52 an 18-item scale developed by Michaelidou *et al.*, (2015a), which is the most recently-developed
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 scale measuring non-profit brand image. All items were measured on 7-point Likert scales. To
5
6 ensure respondents' knowledgeability, they were instructed not to complete the questionnaire if
7
8 they had no prior knowledge of the UNICEF (India), the Red Cross (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
9
10 and NSPCC (UK). Responses which indicated no prior or poor knowledge (scoring low on the
11
12 awareness level Likert scale, 1-5) were deleted from all samples. The questionnaire had an easy
13
14 to follow layout and page design (Dillman, 2006), where it was emphasized to respondents that
15
16 the questionnaire is anonymous in order to as to minimize concerns regarding social desirability
17
18 bias (Nederhof, 1985).
19
20
21

22
23 For the Indian sample (as well as the UK), the questionnaire was administered in English
24
25 given that English is an official language in India. In contrast the questionnaire was back
26
27 translated for administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina, following the procedure outlined by
28
29 Lonner and Berry (1986). Additionally, to assure that verbatim translation is avoided and true
30
31 meaning of the items is transferred, a group of five multilingual marketing scholars carefully
32
33 inspected the items. A total of 151, 271 and 200 responses were collected in India, Bosnia and
34
35 Herzegovina and the UK respectively. Table 1 summarizes descriptive statistics of the samples.
36
37 There is a good spread in terms of gender in all the samples (56.3% female and 43.7% male
38
39 respondents in the Indian sample; 55.7% female and 44.3% male respondents in the Bosnian
40
41 sample, and 50.5% female and 49.5% male respondents in UK sample).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 here.

Data Analysis

Measurement Model

The establishment of scale dimensionality in each country setting is one of the priorities in international studies if the scale is to be deemed applicable to other foreign settings (Netemeyer *et al.*, 1991). To this end, confirmatory factor analysis using Lisrel 8.71 with maximum likelihood estimation (ML) with covariance matrix as input, was conducted. For each of the three charities (UNICEF, Red Cross and NSPCC) all the 18 items loading on the pre-defined 6 dimensions of the non-profit brand image scale were specified. As per Table 2, the six-factor measurement model for UNICEF (India) yielded an excellent fit. Similarly, the six-factor measurement model for Red Cross (Bosnia and Herzegovina) also yielded excellent fit, which was the same for the UK. In addition, all items loaded on the same factors across the three samples.

Table 2 here.

Next, we assessed the internal consistency. As shown in Table 3, CR and AVE values are all above the recommended thresholds and consistent across all samples. With respect to reliability and CR values, in all three samples the values are all adequate, exceeding the critical threshold of 0.60 in all instances (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). The same situation is observed for Cronbach's alpha values, which all exceed Nunnally's (1978) 0.70 recommended minimum value. Inter-items correlations show strong internal consistency, with all the items correlating strongly, hence meeting the minimum recommended threshold value of 0.35 (Hair *et al.*, 2010). In addition, the path coefficients returned high t-values (significant at the 0.01 level), indicating

1
2
3
4 superior convergent validity (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Further,
5
6 convergent validity assessment through the average variance extracted (AVE) indicates that all
7
8 AVE values in all the samples exceed the recommended threshold of 0.5 (Fornell and Larcker,
9
10 1981). Table 3 provides a full list of the items for the 6 dimensions of non-profit brand image,
11
12 their CR and AVE values. To assess discriminant validity, highest shared variance (HSV) was
13
14 examined by comparing the AVE scores with the square of correlations between constructs
15
16 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) (see Table 4). All AVE estimates for each of the constructs and for
17
18 each of the samples is greater than the squared correlation estimate for each pair of construct and
19
20 hence, we achieve discriminant validity.
21
22
23
24

25 Table 3 here.

26
27 Table 4 here.
28
29
30
31

32 *Measurement Invariance Tests*

33
34 Researchers test for measurement invariance (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998), in order
35
36 to demonstrate evidence which supports a scale's cross-cultural validity and stability.
37

38 Establishing measurement invariance implies that the set of indicators is measuring the same
39
40 latent variables across groups or countries (Kline 2004). However, the form of invariance that
41
42 needs to be established is a function of the goals and objectives of the study. According to
43
44 Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) if the objective of the study is to explore the basic meaning
45
46 and the structure of the constructs cross-nationally, then configural invariance should be
47
48 established. Configural invariance reflects a lower level of invariance, which is a prerequisite
49
50 prior to obtaining higher-level invariance (e.g. metric). Configural invariance is satisfied if the
51
52 basic factor structure (i.e. the pattern of fixed and nonfixed parameters) is identified as invariant
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 across groups (Milfont and Fischer, 2015). Thus, one should establish this baseline model
5
6 without constraints on estimated parameters, permitting different parameter values to be freely
7
8 estimated across countries. This implies that respondents across different groups conceptualize a
9
10 construct in the same way. Having achieved configural invariance, Steenkamp and Baumgartner
11
12 (1998) suggest that one should conduct a stronger test, metric invariance, to examine whether
13
14 different groups of respondents understand the items in the same way. Thus, the test of metric
15
16 invariance requires constraining the factor pattern coefficients to be equal across countries.
17
18 Indeed, the model with metric invariance is more restrictive than the baseline configural model.
19
20 Having achieved metric invariance, factor variance invariance could be tested. If achieved, the
21
22 test indicates that the range of scores on a latent factor do not vary across groups. Factor variance
23
24 invariance is tested by constraining all factor variances to be identical across all three groups.
25
26 Finally, scalar invariance could be examined. This highest level of invariance is required if one
27
28 would like to compare (latent) means across groups. Scalar invariance is a precondition for
29
30 comparing latent factor means across multiple groups (Marsh *et al.*, 2009; Meredith, 1993;
31
32 Widaman and Reise, 1997). Achieving scalar invariance implies that the individuals who have
33
34 the same score across different dimensions of non-profit brand image, would obtain these same
35
36 scores regardless of the country they are coming from.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Results of Measurement Invariance Tests*

47
48 The objectives of this study concern whether non-profit brand image can be
49
50 conceptualized in the same way, across three different countries, namely India, Bosnia and
51
52 Herzegovina and UK. To examine this pre-condition, we initially tested for configural and metric
53
54 invariance. Subsequently, we examined higher levels of invariance (scalar invariance and factor
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 variance invariance), which allows for assessing the extent to which the measures are
5
6 comparable across the three countries. First, to test for measurement invariance, an omnibus
7
8 examination was undertaken. The omnibus test imposes the strictest level of invariance (we
9
10 examined whether these levels of invariance are fully satisfied or not, without considering partial
11
12 invariance). Therefore, through omnibus test, we assessed the measures across the three
13
14 countries for configural, metric, scalar, and factor variance invariance. The stability of the
15
16 measures was assessed using sequential testing procedures involving assessment of measurement
17
18 invariance (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998) in LISREL 8.71.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The requirement for configural invariance is that the number of factors should be the
26
27 same across the groups and that factor loading pattern is invariant. Inspection of fit indices
28
29 suggests that non-profit brand image has a consistent factor structure across all three countries
30
31 with a good fit to data (RMSEA was 0.047 and the other indices of fit were above 0.9).
32
33 Subsequently, metric invariance was assessed. A model with factor pattern coefficients was
34
35 constrained to be equal and yielded a good model fit. Results were compared with the previously
36
37 estimated model of configural invariance in terms of chi-square difference. The chi-square
38
39 difference test indicates that the metric invariance model did not significantly deteriorate from
40
41 the less restrictive configural model. However, having in mind that $\Delta\chi^2$ is sensitive to sample
42
43 size (e.g., Kelloway, 1995; Cheung and Rensvold, 2002), model size (Herzog *et al.*, 2007), and
44
45 non-normality (Brown, 2006) scholars (e.g., Cheung and Rensvold, 2002) recommend observing
46
47 ΔCFI as well. If the reduction in the value of CFI is smaller or equal to 0.01 in the constrained
48
49 model, then it is suggested that the constrained model does not deteriorate from the original
50
51 model. In this case, CFI went from 0.984 to 0.983, which indicated that both configural and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

metric invariance are supported showing that the relationships between the items in the scale are equivalent across countries. To ensure that these results are accurate and not affected by the items with loadings fixed to 1 (requirement for measurement model identification), the model was re-estimated after fixing the loadings of other items to 1.0 (Kline, 2004). Results suggested that measurement invariance is achieved regardless of which items are fixed to 1.

When testing factor variance invariance and scalar invariance, the results indicate significant changes in χ^2 and in all other fit indices, suggesting that factor variance invariance and scalar invariance could not be established. In practical sense this implies that systematic differences in the average item responses between countries exist, and that these differences could not be attributed to differences in the mean level of latent variables. Model fit indices and $\Delta\chi^2$ are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5 here.

In summary, measurement invariance results show that the non-profit brand image scale has identical dimensionality and factor structure across sampling countries, i.e. India, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the UK. In addition, respondents answered questions in the same manner. However, the analysis shows that cross-national differences in the means of the observed items are not due to differences in the means of the underlying construct. Namely, as scalar invariance is not reached, this indicates that there is no consistency between cross-national differences in latent means and cross-national differences in observed means.

Common Method Variance and Reliability Tests

To avoid CMV several procedural and statistical remedies were applied. In terms of procedural remedies, careful consideration of the questionnaire design was applied. Different format scales were used to minimize the potential for Common Method Variance (CMV) (Dillman, 2006). In addition, respondents were assured of their anonymity and were asked to agree to terms and conditions of the study provided at the introduction page of the questionnaire (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). Statistical remedies applied in the study were twofold. First, the Harman's single factor test was used. The results in the three countries' samples indicated that CMV is not a threat. The CMV single factor model fit is poor: $\chi^2 (135) = 861.66$; NNFI = 0.759; CFI = 0.787; SRMR = 0.127 and RMSEA = 0.189 for UNICEF (India); $\chi^2 (135) = 2107.132$; NNFI = 0.878; CFI = 0.851; SRMR = 0.10 and RMSEA = 0.231 for the Red Cross (Bosnia Herzegovina) and $\chi^2 (135) = 1192.962$; NNFI = 0.89; CFI = 0.861; SRMR = 0.09 and RMSEA = 0.198 for NSPCC (UK) and the improvement in model fit on moving from the CMV single factor model to the six-factor model is significant at 1% for all charities.

Discussion, Implications and Limitations

The present research assesses a significant topic with practical impact and relevancy, and for which prior research does not exist. The results provide support for the potential applicability of the non-profit brand image scales (Michaelidou, *et al.*, 2015a) in a cross-national setting, indicating, however, some limitations. Specifically, we examine the measurement equivalence of non-profit brand image across three countries (India, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the UK) using a set of invariance tests. The results of multi-group invariance analysis show that non-profit brand image (an instrument consisting of 18-item scales and six factors) is equivalent in terms of

1
2
3
4 having the same dimensionality and structure, and being perceived the same across the three
5 countries (configural and metric invariance). More specifically, the achieved configural and
6 metric invariance indicates that the items comprising the measurement instrument exhibit the
7 same pattern of factor loadings across the three countries. This means that the structure of non-
8 profit brand image, and the number of dimensions is conceptualized in the same way across
9 countries, with individuals perceiving non-profit brand image as having six dimensions, in line
10 with prior works - usefulness, efficiency, affect, dynamism, reliability and ethicality (e.g.,
11 Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 Additionally, the results indicate that, the item loadings of these six dimensions show that the
24 items are generally good measures of their corresponding dimensions, and that the number of
25 factors and observed variables associated with each factor are the same across countries.

26
27
28
29
30 Therefore, the 18 items proposed by Michaelidou *et al.*, (2015a) capture the dimensions of the
31 non-profit brand image scale satisfactorily. This finding suggests that the number of dimensions
32 and observed variables associated with each dimension are the same across countries. We also
33 find that each item contributes to the latent construct to a similar degree across groups. As we
34 show that the internal consistency and dimensionality exhibit a similar pattern across nations, we
35 can conclude that non-profit brand image and its dimensions hold the same meaning across
36 groups.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 First, 'usefulness' refers to perceptions of effectiveness in achieving the mission, and being
49 helpful to others, while efficiency denotes managing assets and resources well. These reflect
50 important non-profit image dimensions, given the declining trust towards charities (Charity
51 Commission, 2016), and particularly the recent negative attention towards non-profit
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 organizations following the Oxfam Haiti scandal (BBC, 2018). Additionally, 'affect' and
5
6 'dynamism' pertain to how friendly, favorable and innovative the non-profit organizations are
7
8 perceived to be; while 'reliability' and 'ethicality' reveal emotional considerations, and refer to
9
10 perceptions of responsibility, reputation, morality and righteousness respectively. In the three
11
12 countries studied, respondents view these dimensions as integral to the notion of non-profit brand
13
14 image for the specific charities. This suggests that perceptions associated with the non-profit
15
16 organizations are underpinned by similar values across the three countries, though the specific
17
18 magnitude of the effect of the construct may vary across countries. In a similar line, our analysis
19
20 shows metric invariance, confirming that individuals in the three countries respond to the items
21
22 in the same way. This finding shows that the strength of the relationship between the observed
23
24 variables and their underlying constructs is equivalent across the three country contexts, again
25
26 providing additional support for the equivalence of the meaning of non-profit brand image across
27
28 countries.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Overall, the results of this study are valuable for researchers as they establish that the same
38
39 conceptual frame of reference is being utilized across groups of respondents when answering on
40
41 non-profit brand image items (i.e., construct holds the same meaning across groups). On the
42
43 contrary, our results do not provide support for scalar invariance, suggesting that inconsistency
44
45 exists between cross-national differences in latent means and cross-national differences in
46
47 observed means. More specifically, even though the items measure the latent construct with
48
49 equivalent metrics across groups (metric invariance), scores on those items are either
50
51 systematically upward or downward biased (e.g., a score of five may be regarded as very high in
52
53 one country and only moderately so in another). Such lack of invariance may suggest that the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 non-profit brand image scales (Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a) should be researched further, either
5
6 conceptually or empirically.
7
8

9
10
11 *Theoretical, Methodological and Practical Contributions*
12

13
14 The results of the study have important implications for the international non-profit
15
16 research domain. In terms of contributions, by investigating non-profit brand image in a cross-
17
18 national setting, the study provides strong theoretical evidence regarding the consistent
19
20 dimensionality of the concept across three different countries. This is a novel finding, which
21
22 extends current limited understanding of the cross-national validity of non-profit brand image
23
24 constructs. Concurrently, the study offers an important methodological and practical
25
26 contribution: we confirm the psychometric properties of the nonprofit brand image measure, as
27
28 an actionable brand management tool or solution to international charities and non-profit
29
30 organizations, that seek to evaluate the image of their brand in the eyes of the general public.
31
32 Indeed, our study confirms the factor structure, internal consistency and construct validity of the
33
34 scale and shows that the scale is free from cultural connotations (Douglas and Craig, 2006). This
35
36 indicates that the scale measures a 'universal' non-profit brand image, and as such it is relevant
37
38 to non-profit organizations and charities, as it can be applied in diverse cultural and linguistic
39
40 settings for assessing non-profit brand image. Indeed, this work add incremental value in the
41
42 ability of charities to evaluate and manage their non-profit brand as it has the potential to shape
43
44 practice at an international level. Our findings suggest that the scale reflects a reliable and valid
45
46 practical measure/tool, that is able to capture non-profit brand image across international
47
48 contexts.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reflections and Conceptual Considerations Regarding the Non-profit Brand Image Scale

Further to the contributions of our study, we identify that the non-profit brand image scale (Michaelidou *et al.*, 2015a) is limited in terms of achieving factor variance and scalar invariance. Without evidence of scalar invariance researchers are unable to make inferences regarding the sources of differences in item means (e.g., are these differences a function of differences in the latent factor itself or the intercept?). Therefore, the question that is left unanswered is why is there a lack of consistency between cross-national differences in latent means and cross-national differences in observed means? One possible explanation might be found in donors' mindset across these three countries stemming for socio-economic differences and differences in their charitable spending habits both in terms money and time donations (CAF, 2018). For example, although India tops the list for donations, it ranks only 89th for participation rates when calculated as a proportion of the population (CAF, 2018). On the other hand, UK's population ranks 6th in overall charitable giving. Additionally, the advertising expenditure of charities varies across these countries: whereas advertising has tripled in the last 8 years in the UK (NPF Synergy, 2017), it has been negligible in Bosnia-Herzegovina and India. Socio-economic factors may, therefore, influence the awareness levels of potential donors, as well as the strength of associations they hold for the charities, thus influencing brand image (Yoo, Donthu and Lee, 2000).

Moreover, finding scalar non-invariance in this study, leaves various suggestions for further research. For example, scholars can investigate the cause of non-invariance by conducting additional tests, following procedures advocated by Putnick and Bornstein (2016). Additionally, and in reflection, we suggest that scholars consider gaining more insights into the

1
2
3
4 particular dimensions or items that failed to exhibit scalar invariance. It might be that certain
5 dimensions or items of the scale are especially susceptible to cultural or religious differences,
6
7 indicating that the scale should be 'conceptually' revisited in order to enhance its content validity.
8
9 Hofstede's dimensional model of culture, and particularly the individualism-collectivism
10
11 heuristic, is relevant to international marketing and has been commonly used to highlight
12
13 differences in values, perceptions, emotions, personality and image in cross-cultural and cross-
14
15 national consumer contexts (Aaker *et al.*, 2001; De Mooij and Hofstede, 2011; De Mooij and
16
17 Hofstede, 2002; Steenkamp *et al.*, 1999; Steenkamp, 2001). Prior research, for example, suggests
18
19 that collectivistic countries place strong emphasis and greater value on socially-shared norms,
20
21 welfare and duties (Iwao and Triandis, 1993) than individualistic countries (Triandis, 1995).
22
23 Collectivists are generally found to exhibit higher levels of affect towards brands compared to
24
25 individualistic countries (e.g., Siamagka *et al.*, 2015). People in individualistic countries place
26
27 more value on the achievements of tasks (Triandis, 1995), whereas collectivistic countries
28
29 emphasize high ethical sensitivity (Blodgett *et al.*, 2001). Furthermore, the religiosity of the
30
31 population is another factor that may be looked at to conceptualize non-profit brand image. In the
32
33 context of this study, our samples come from multi-religious countries and according to Smith
34
35 (2018), relative to the UK, in both Bosnia and Herzegovina and India, religion is perceived to be
36
37 important in daily life for a large share of the population (e.g., 65% in Bosnia Herzegovina to 76%
38
39 in India, compared to only 30% in UK). This variation may provide an explanation for the scalar
40
41 noninvariance observed in this study, providing the impetus for additional research to consider
42
43 religion in re-conceptualizing and/or operationalizing non-profit brand image. To this end,
44
45 theoretical reasons may be derived for the lack of scalar invariance across the three countries,
46
47 such as culture and socio-economic differences. Indeed, culture presents a stronger theoretical
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 platform for further consideration in the study of international non-profit brand image, which has
5
6 yet to receive adequate scholarly attention. We, hence, propose that researchers and scholars
7
8 utilize cultural frameworks for a subsequent study of international non-profit brand image.
9
10

11 12 13 14 15 16 **References**

17
18 Aaker, J. L. (1997), "Dimensions of brand personality", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 34
19
20 No. 3, pp. 347-356.

21
22 Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., and Garolera, J. (2001), "Consumption symbols as carriers of
23
24 culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs", *Journal of*
25
26 *Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 492-508.

27
28 Bagozzi, R. P., and Yi, Y. (1988), "On the evaluation of structural equation models", *Journal of*
29
30 *the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.16 No.1, pp. 74-94.

31
32 BBC (2018), "Oxfam Haiti allegations: How the scandal unfolded" available at:

33
34
35 <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-43112200> (accessed 21 February 2018).

36
37
38 Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. N., and Bendapudi, V. (1996), "Enhancing helping behavior: An
39
40 integrative framework for promotion planning", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 33-
41
42 49.

43
44
45 Bennett, R., and Gabriel, H. (2003), "Image and reputational characteristics of UK charitable
46
47 organizations: An empirical study", *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 276-289.

48
49
50 Bennett, R., and Sargeant, A. (2005), "The non-profit marketing landscape: guest editors'
51
52 introduction to a special section", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 58 No. 6, pp. 797-805.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Blodgett, J. G., Lu, L. C., Rose, G. M., and Vitell, S. J. (2001), "Ethical sensitivity to stakeholder interests: A cross-cultural comparison", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 90-202.
- Brindle, D. (2018), "Oxfam scandal is a body blow for the whole UK charity sector". Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/voluntary-sector-network/2018/feb/13/oxfam-scandal-body-blow-uk-charity-sector-sport-relief> (accessed 12th February 2019).
- Brown, T.A., (2006), *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*, The Guilford Press, New York.
- Bruce I. (1995), "Do not - for - profits value their customers and their needs?", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 77-84.
- Buil, I., de Chernatony, L. and Martinez E. (2008), "A Cross-National Validation of the Consumer-Based Brand Equity Scale", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 384-392.
- Charities Aid Foundation (CAF 2018), "CAF World Giving Index 2018 A global view of the giving trends", available at: https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/about-us-publications/caf_wgi2018_report_webnopw_2379a_261018.pdf (accessed 3rd February 2019).
- Charity Commission (2016), "Public trust in charities has fallen, reports Charity Commission" Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/public-trust-in-charities-has-fallen-reports-charity-commission> (accessed 28 September 2017).
- Cheung, G. W., and Rensvold, R. B. (2002), "Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance", *Structural Equation Modeling*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp.233-255.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Christodoulides, G., Cadogan, J. W., and Veloutsou, C. (2015), "Consumer- based brand equity measurement: lessons learned from an international study", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3/4, pp. 307-328.
- Corley, K. G., and Gioia, D. A. (2011), "Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution?", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 12-32.
- Davis, H. L., Douglas, S. P., and Silk, A. J. (1981), "Measure unreliability: a hidden threat to cross-national marketing research?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 98-109.
- De Mooij, M., and Hofstede, G. (2002), "Convergence and divergence in consumer behavior: implications for international retailing", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 78 No. 1, pp. 61-69.
- De Mooij, M., and Hofstede, G. (2010), "The Hofstede model: Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 85-110.
- De Mooij, M., and Hofstede, G. (2011), "Cross-cultural consumer behavior: A review of research findings", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 3-4, pp. 181-192.
- Dillman, D. A. (2006), *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (Vol. 2), New York: Wiley.
- Dolnicar S., and Lazarevski K., (2009), "Marketing in non - profit organizations: an international perspective", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 275-291.
- Douglas, S. P., and Craig, C. S. (1983), "Examining performance of US multinationals in foreign markets", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 51-62.

- 1
2
3
4 Douglas, S. P., and Craig, C. S. (2006), "On improving the conceptual foundations of
5 international marketing research", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 1-
6 22.
7
8
9
10
11 Ewing, M.T., and Napoli, J. (2005), "Developing and validating a multidimensional non-profit
12 brand orientation scale", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 58 No. 6, pp. 841-853.
13
14
15
16 Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable
17 variables and measurement error", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
18
19
20
21 Foscht, T., Maloles III, C., Swoboda, B., Morschett, D., and Sinha, I. (2008), "The impact of
22 culture on brand perceptions: a six-nation study", *Journal of Product & Brand
23 Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 131-142.
24
25
26
27
28 Grohmann, B. (2009), "Gender dimensions of brand personality", *Journal of Marketing
29 Research*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 105-119.
30
31
32
33 Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., and Tatham, R. L. (2010), *Multivariate
34 data analysis*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Huang, S. L., and Ku, H. H. (2016), “Brand image management for non-profit organizations:
6 Exploring the relationships between websites, brand images and donations”, *Journal of*
7 *Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 80-96.
- 8
9
10
11 Iwao, S., and Trlandis, H. C. (1993), “Validity of auto-and leterostereotypes among Japanese and
12 American students”, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 428-444.
- 13
14
15
16 Keller, K. L. (1993), “Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity”,
17 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No.1, pp. 1-22.
- 18
19
20
21 Keller, K. L. (2001), *Building customer-based brand equity: A blueprint for creating strong*
22 *brands*, Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- 23
24
25
26 Kelloway, E. K. (1995), “Structural equation modelling in perspective”, *Journal of*
27 *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 215-224.
- 28
29
30
31 Kline, R. B. (2004), *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling*, Guilford
32 Publications.
- 33
34
35
36 Kocak, A., Abimbola, T., and Özer, A. (2007), “Consumer brand equity in a cross-cultural
37 replication: An evaluation of a scale”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1-2,
38 pp. 157-173.
- 39
40
41
42 Lieven T. and Hildebrand C. (2016), “The impact of brand gender on brand equity: Findings
43 from a large-scale cross-cultural study in ten countries”, *International Marketing Review*,
44 Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 178-195.
- 45
46
47
48 Lonner, W. J., and Berry, J. W. (1986), *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*, Thousand
49 Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 50
51
52
53 Marsh, H. W., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Morin, A. J., and
54 Trautwein, U. (2009), “Exploratory structural equation modeling, integrating CFA and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 EFA: Application to students' evaluations of university teaching”, *Structural Equation*
5
6
7 *Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 439-476.

8
9 Meredith, W. (1993), “Measurement invariance, factor analysis and factorial invariance”,
10
11
12 *Psychometrika*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 525-543.

13
14 Michaelidou, N., Micevski, M., and Cadogan, J. W. (2015a), “An evaluation of non-profit brand
15
16 image: Towards a better conceptualization and measurement”, *Journal of Business Research*,
17
18 Vol. 68 No. 8, pp. 1657-1666.

19
20 Michaelidou, N., Micevski, M., and Siamagka, N. T. (2015b), “Consumers’ intention to donate
21
22 to two children’s charity brands: a comparison of Barnardo’s and BBC Children in Need”,
23
24
25 *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 134-146.

26
27 Michel, G., and Rieunier, S. (2012), “Non-profit brand image and typicality influences on
28
29 charitable giving” *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 65 No. 5, pp. 701-707.

30
31 Milfont, T. L., and Fischer, R. (2015), “Testing measurement invariance across groups:
32
33 Applications in cross-cultural research”, *International Journal of Psychological Research*,
34
35 Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 111-130.

36
37 Moore, M. H. (2000), “Managing for value: Organizational strategy in for-profit, nonprofit, and
38
39 governmental organizations”, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp.
40
41 183–204.

42
43 Mort, G. S., Weerawardena, J., and Williamson, B. (2007), “Branding in the non-profit context:
44
45 the case of Surf Life Saving Australia”, *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 2,
46
47 108-119.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Netemeyer, R., Durvasula, S., and Lichtenstein, D. (1991), “A cross-national assessment of the
5
6 reliability and validity of the CETSCALE”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 28 No. 3,
7
8 pp. 320-327.
9
10
11 NFPSynergy (2017), “Ad Infinitum – How Charity media expenditure patterns are changing”,
12
13 available at: <https://nfpsynergy.net/blog/charity-media-spending-report> (accessed 3rd
14
15 February 2019).
16
17
18 Nunnally, J. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
19
20
21 O'Reilly, C. (Ed.). (2001), *Language, Ethnicity and the State, Volume 2: Minority Languages in*
22
23 *Eastern Europe Post-1989*, Springer.
24
25
26 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), “Common method
27
28 biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies”,
29
30 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879–903.
31
32
33 Putnick, D. L., and Bornstein, M. H. (2016), “Measurement invariance conventions and reporting:
34
35 The state of the art and future directions for psychological research”, *Developmental*
36
37 *Review*, Vol. 41, pp. 71-90.
38
39
40 Rosch, E., and Mervis, C. B. (1975), “Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of
41
42 categories”, *Cognitive psychology*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 573-605.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 Sargeant, A., Ford, J. B., and Hudson, J. (2008), “Charity brand personality: the relationship with
giving behaviour”, *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 468-491.

- 1
2
3
4 Schlegelmilch, B. B., Love, A., and Diamantopoulos, A. (1997), "Responses to different charity
5 appeals: the impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations", *European Journal*
6
7
8
9
10
11 of Marketing, Vol. 31 No. 8, pp. 548-560
- 11 Sekaran, U., and Martin, H. J. (1982), "An examination of the psychometric properties of some
12 commonly researched individual differences, job, and organizational variables in two
13
14
15
16
17
18 cultures", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 51-65.
- 18 Siamagka, N. T., Christodoulides, G., and Michaelidou, N. (2015), "The impact of comparative
19 affective states on online brand perceptions: a five-country study", *International Marketing*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Review, Vol. 32 No. 3/4, pp. 438-454.
- 25 Smith, O. (2018), "Mapped: The world's most (and least) religious countries" available at:
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/maps-and-graphics/most-religious-countries-in-the-world/>
(accessed 3rd February 2019).
- 32 Stark, O. (1989), "Altruism and the quality of life", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 79 No.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 36 Steenkamp, J. B. E. (2001), "The role of national culture in international business", *International*
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 41 Steenkamp, J. B. E., and Baumgartner, H. (1998), "Assessing measurement invariance in cross-
42 national consumer research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 78-90.
- 46 Steenkamp, J. B. E., Hofstede, F. T., and Wedel, M. (1999), "A cross-national investigation into
47 the individual and national cultural antecedents of consumer innovativeness", *Journal of*
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 52 Stride, H., and Lee, S. (2007), "No Logo? No Way. Branding in the Non-Profit Sector", *Journal*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 55 of Marketing Management, Vol. 23 No.1-2, pp. 107-122

- 1
2
3
4 Sung, Y., and Tinkham, S. F. (2005), “Brand personality structures in the United States and
5
6 Korea: Common and culture-specific factors”, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 15
7
8 No. 4, pp. 334–350.
9
10
11 Sung, Y., and Kim, J. (2010), “Effects of brand personality on brand trust and brand affect”,
12
13 *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 27 No. 7, pp. 639-661.
14
15
16 Triandis, H. C. (1995), *Individualism and Collectivism*, Westview Press, Boulder.
17
18 Venable, B. T., Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., and Gilbert, F. W. (2005), “The role of brand
19
20 personality in charitable giving: an assessment and validation”, *Journal of the Academy of*
21
22 *Marketing Science*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 295-312.
23
24
25 Voeth, M., and Herbst, U. (2008), “The concept of brand personality as an instrument for
26
27 advanced non-profit branding—An empirical analysis”, *Journal of Non-profit and Public*
28
29 *Sector Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 71-97.
30
31
32 Waters, R. D., and Jones, P. M. (2011), “Using video to build an organization's identity and
33
34 brand: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' YouTube videos”, *Journal of*
35
36 *Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 248-268.
37
38
39 Webb, D. J., Green, C. L., and Brashear, T. G. (2000), “Development and validation of scales to
40
41 measure attitudes influencing monetary donations to charitable organizations”, *Journal of the*
42
43 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 299-309.
44
45
46 Whitelock J., and Fastoso F. (2007), “Understanding international branding: defining the domain
47
48 and reviewing the literature”, *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 252-270.
49
50
51 Widaman, K. F., and Reise, S. P. (1997), “Exploring the measurement invariance of
52
53 psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain”, *The science of*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *prevention: Methodological advances from alcohol and substance abuse research*, pp. 281-
5
6
7 324.

8
9 Yoo, B., and Donthu, N. (2001), "Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based
10
11 brand equity scale", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 1-14.

12
13
14 Yoo, B., Donthu, N., and Lee, S. (2000), "An examination of selected marketing mix elements
15
16 and brand equity", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 195-211.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Respondents Profile

	India		BH		UK	
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage	n	Percentage
Gender						
Female	85	56.3	151	55.7	101	50.5
Male	66	43.7	120	44.3	99	49.5
Age						
18 - 20	3	2.0	89	32.8	4	2%
21 - 30	95	62.9	164	60.5	102	51
31 - 40	38	25.2	13	4.8	65	32.5
41 - 50	12	7.9	5	1.8	17	8.5
51 and over	3	2.0	3	1.5	12	6
Employment						
Student	54	35.8	107	39.48	18	9
Full-time employee	67	44.4	138	50.92	141	70.5
Part-time employee	22	14.5	11	4.1	40	20
Unemployed	8	5.3	15	5.5	1	0.5

Note: BH – Bosnia and Herzegovina sample; UK – United Kingdom sample

Table 2: Fit Statistics for 6 dimensions of non-profit brand image

Model	χ^2	df	NNFI	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
India	184.33	120	0.961	0.970	0.067	0.059
BH	342.36	120	0.983	0.986	0.034	0.082
UK	286.93	120	0.979	0.984	0.036	0.083

Table 3: CFA Loadings: Constructs used in the study and factor loadings

Items:	Usefulness			Efficiency			Dynamism			Reliability			Affect			Ethicality		
	India	BH	UK	India	BH	UK	India	BH	UK	India	BH	UK	India	BH	UK	India	BH	UK
Effective*	0.815	0.837	0.821															
Worthwhile*	0.761	0.764	0.806															
Helpful*	0.796	0.852	0.733															
Efficient*				0.862	0.840	0.841												
Uses assets*				0.848	0.860	0.892												
Well-managed				0.762	0.847	0.911												
Innovative*							0.677	0.829	0.804									
Forward thinking*							0.718	0.877	0.930									
Progressive*							0.752	0.870	0.902									
Reputable*										0.748	0.797	0.893						
Sincere*										0.738	0.843	0.932						
Responsible*										0.803	0.890	0.843						
Compassion*													0.628	0.900	0.911			
Favourable*													0.817	0.875	0.952			
Friendly*													0.727	0.867	0.808			
Righteous*																0.742	0.840	0.937
Moral*																0.731	0.896	0.878
Ethical*																0.638	0.861	0.945
AVE	0.62	0.67	0.62	0.68	0.72	0.78	0.51	0.74	0.77	0.58	0.71	0.79	0.53	0.77	0.79	0.50	0.75	0.85
CR	0.83	0.86	0.83	0.86	0.88	0.91	0.76	0.89	0.91	0.80	0.88	0.92	0.77	0.91	0.92	0.75	0.90	0.94

Note: *Items of the non-profit brand image scale: *To what extent is charity:* effective; worthwhile; helpful; efficient; uses assets wisely; well-managed; innovative; forward-thinking; progressive; reputable; sincere; responsible; compassionate; favorable; friendly; righteous; moral; ethical

Table 4: Discriminant Validity of the Constructs

India	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Usefulness	0.79					
2. Efficiency	0.503	0.82				
3. Affect	0.464	0.567	0.73			
4. Dynamism	0.414	0.389	0.485	0.71		
5. Reliability	0.315	0.276	0.430	0.954	0.76	
6. Ethicality	0.507	0.455	0.559	0.445	0.324	0.70
BH	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Usefulness	0.82					
2. Efficiency	0.884	0.85				
3. Affect	0.870	0.79	0.88			
4. Dynamism	0.676	0.800	0.729	0.86		
5. Reliability	0.838	0.795	0.802	0.739	0.84	
6. Ethicality	0.784	0.664	0.800	0.598	0.870	0.87
UK	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Usefulness	0.79					
2. Efficiency	0.817	0.88				
3. Affect	0.798	0.751	0.89			
4. Dynamism	0.699	0.591	0.642	0.88		
5. Reliability	0.784	0.760	0.750	0.527	0.89	
6. Ethicality	0.777	0.755	0.798	0.720	0.730	0.92

Note: Correlations are below the diagonal, square root of AVE estimates are presented on the diagonal.

Table 5: Measurement Invariance Assessment

Model	χ^2	df	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δ df	RMSEA	NNFI	CFI	CAIC
Configural invariance	818.71	360	-	-	0.078	0.979	0.984	1950.877
Metric invariance	884.95	384	66.24	24	0.079	0.979	0.982	1844.112
Factor variance invariance	980.99	390	96.04	6	0.059	0.975	0.976	2297.758
Scalar invariance	1388.95	420	407.96	30	0.105	0.96	0.963	2518.821