Measuring Consumer spirituality through a valid scale

Dr. Ritu Narang,

Assistant Professor,

Department of Business Administration,

University of Lucknow, Lucknow-226007, U.P., India.

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Abstract

Spirituality has hardly received any attention from the marketing and consumer behaviour scholars. This study seeks to bridge that gap by addressing the issue of consumer spirituality and its measurement through CONSPIRIT scale. A parsimonious 11-item scale called CONSPIRIT to measure the spirituality tendencies of consumers has been developed. Data was collected from 225 respondents during the first stage while 2000 respondents were contacted at the second stage of scale development. The evaluation of the psychometric properties of the CONSPIRIT scale revealed that it tests well for reliability and validity. CONSPIRIT scale may be utilized to understand the role of consumer spirituality in making purchase choice decisions and can provide direction towards designing of marketing communication and customer relationship programs.

Keywords: CONSPIRIT Scale, Consumer Spirituality, Consumer Behaviour, Marketing Strategy

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Measuring Consumer spirituality through a valid scale

Introduction

In the present era of globalization, where competition from both national and multinational companies has intensified it has become imperative to make concerted and continuous efforts to understand the spiritual motivations of consumers, whose consumption habits are driven not by life style goals alone. It is being observed there is an emergence of new 'spiritual ecology' (Greeley, 2001; Kale, 2004; Lesser, 2000) arising due to proliferation of technology, enhanced dissemination of information and accelerated pace of globalization. On the one hand, there has been an upsurge in consumerism and materialism and on the other hand, a rising desire within the consumers to seek spirituality that is likely to impact their behaviour in various spheres of life, particularly with respect to choices that they make (Emmons, Cheung, & Thehrani, 1998) including consumption decisions. For instance, they may consciously boycott products from socially irresponsible organizations or reject unethical products to show their moral concern (Shaw, 2007) in order to satisfy some of their spiritual aspirations. Though one may argue that some consumers may be unconcerned about the ethical behavior of the companies or there may be large number of ethical consumers across the nations who are unaware of ethical product choices (Sudbury Riley, Kohlbacher & Hofmeister, 2012) but an upward trend among the buyers in taking interest not only in the product attributes but also in the ethical and socially responsible behavior of the organizations cannot be ignored. These developments point out the need to understand spirituality in the context of consumer behaviour, particularly, when the spiritual needs of consumers are likely to translate into demands for goods and services that may be of great interest to marketers (Kale, 2004). The current study is

designed to develop a reliable and valid scale for measuring consumer spirituality to fill up the gap that exists in the current consumer behaviour literature.

What is consumer spirituality?

Spirituality

The term 'spirituality' is derived from the Latin term *spiritus* which translates into breath of life. In many disciplines of social sciences and natural sciences spirituality is considered as an inner drive that seeks to find meaning in life (Fry, 2003). According to Emmons (1999), spirituality tends to "encompass a search for meaning, for unity, for connectedness, for transcendence, and for the highest of human potential" (p.5). Kale (2004) expresses a similar view by stating that spirituality is "the engagement to explore and deeply and meaningfully connect one's inner self-to the known world and beyond" (p.93).

Review of Indian philosophy, which is about four thousand years old shows that its main objective has been to relieve the sufferings of human beings by making them realize their spiritual nature. The individual spirit is called *Jiva* in Sanskrit, from the root *Jiv* which means "to live." "It is the spark of life, the animating principle, the feeling of persistency experienced by every individual. It is that which produces the feeling of *Being*" (Bernard, 1981 p. 91). Individuals differ in their past deeds, or *Karma* and take birth in this world to reap the fruits of their *Karma* and also to free themselves from its shackles (Saksena, 1970). The theory of karma believes in the spiritual nature of universe and continuity of the universe (Bernard 1981; Bowes 1978; Saksena 1970). It involves the notion of rebirth and postulates that good actions in the present lead to good consequences in the future and conversely, bad actions in the present lead to bad consequences in the future (Bernard 1981; Bowes 1978; Saksena 1970; Krishan, 1983). Belief in the concept of karma links an individual's current conduct to future consequences

which may manifest either in this life or in the next (Herman 1976, p. 73, 131). This belief entails a focus on long run consequences, that is, a long-term orientation which implies that people who believe in karma may be more honest with themselves in general (Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010, p. 251). Tagore has summed up the quintessence of India's spiritual philosophy as *Santam. Sivam. Advaitam* (Peace, Goodness and Unity of all beings) (Saksena, 1970, p. 15).

On the whole, spirituality has been linked with good life. People who possess strong inner spiritual resources lead a morally good life (Van Dierendonck, 2011). It has been empirically proved that spirituality is an important element of human well-being and happiness (Ellison, 1991; Van Dierendonck & Mohan, 2006). Studies in organizational settings have established positive relationship between organizational spirituality and organizational performance (Schmidt-Wilk, Alexander & Swanson, 1996) and also with the employee's personality (MacDonald, 2000). When Petchsawang and Duchon (2009) point out that people work with not only their hands, but also their hearts (spirit) it implies that a person's behavior is determined not only by his physical and mental motivations but also his spiritual aspirations. Emphasizing upon the significance of spirituality in an individual's life it may be stated that a "whole" person, a person who is able to express his/her spirituality, will be a "better" (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009) or more satisfied being than one who is not a "whole".

Spirituality is multi-dimensional in nature (Pandey, Gupta, & Arora, 2009; Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009). Pandey, Gupta and Arora (2009) postulate that spirituality is based on a dynamic balance of three factors: harmony with self, harmony with environment and transcendence. Harmony with self could be interpreted as finding meaningfulness in one's activities, enjoying activities, a general feeling of well-being; harmony in work environment is

reflected in comfortable interpersonal relationships and common purpose while transcendence means placing more emphasis on something greater than self. Transcendence (Emmons, Cheung, & Thehrani, 1998; Schneiders, 1989; Pandey, Gupta, & Arora, 2009; Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009) may be interpreted as a connection with higher power, which is not God that evokes faith and adoration for cosmic energy which is mystical in nature. Spirituality has been found to be associated with people's sense of purpose, meaning and community (Fry, 2003). Petchsawang and Duchon, (2009) have identified five such dimensions to describe it: connection, compassion, mindfulness, meaningful work and transcendence. Connection refers to how an individual experiences a deep sense of connection with other people while compassion involves awareness of other people's needs with a desire to help (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009). Hope, love, trust, forgiveness, faith in humanity and compassion have been identified as the basis of one's relationship with others (Dyson, Mark, & Forman, 1997). Engaging in meaningful activities (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009) may generate vibrant emotions such as joy (Zinnbauer *et al.*, 1997) and rapture. These activities could range from caring for physical and biological self to preservation of environment. Engaging in meaningful activities and developing a quality relationship with others pertain to the environmental and social dimensions of spirituality. Mindfulness (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009; Sheth, Sethia & Srinivas, 2011) has been identified as another important aspect. It reflects the personal domain of spirituality. Mindfulness involves being constantly aware of one's thoughts, words and behaviour (Schmidt-Wilk, Heaton & Steingard, 2000; Sheth, Sethia & Srinivas, 2011) so that one is able to exercise control over them.

Spirituality as distinct from religion

Traditional concepts did not make any distinction between spirituality and religion. The relationship between spirituality and religion has now become the topic of debate (Hill *et al.,* 2000). Some consider spirituality to be a part of religion (Hill *et al.,* 2000), others regard it to be too broad (Koenig, McCullough, & Larson*,* 2001) while some observe both as synonymous (Hall & Edwards, 2002). Kale (2004), however, views religion as a roadmap for spirituality. Griffiths (2008) contradicts by asserting that spirituality is not derived from any religion; it refers to an ability to find peace, tranquillity, justice and a capability to foster these in a fast-moving world.

Wuthnow (1998) distinguished between religion and spirituality in terms of 'dwelling' and 'seeking'. Religious dwellers accept the traditional forms of religious authority, seek religious institutions, offer prayers and worship the sacred privately or publically. In contrast, individual autonomy is more important to spiritual seekers than external control by religious authority or doctrines. They seek self development, inner happiness, self-actualization and sacredness in relationship with other individuals, experiences and objects. Similarly, Koenig, McCullough, and Larson (2001) postulate that religion represents the institutional, doctrinal and formal expression while spirituality connotes inward, emotional, subjective and free expression of individuals. Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997) have reported that most people are able to differentiate between spirituality and religion. They regard spirituality as personalized form of faith and religion as the formal and institutional aspect of faith. Though there has been criticism on the issue of segregation of religion and spirituality into institutional and personal domains (Hill *et al.,* 2000) the distinction between the two is being greatly acknowledged. Koenig *et al.* (2001) have clearly driven home the point that

'religion is an organized system of beliefs, practices, rituals and symbols designed to facilitate closeness to the sacred or transcendent (God, higher power, or ultimate truth/reality)' whereas *'spirituality is the personal quest for understanding answers to ultimate questions about life, about meaning and about relationship to the sacred or transcendent, which may (or may not) lead to or arise from the development of religious rituals and the formation of community'* (p.18).

Keep the above literature review in mind, the current study considers spirituality as distinct from religion and defines *Consumer Spirituality* as *the intrinsic motivation to seek and express autonomy, inner satisfaction and self-actualization, maintain harmonious and sacred relationship with others, and desire sacredness in products, services and experiences.*

Consumer spirituality and behaviour

Spirituality had been, for a long time, confined to the field of psychology and sociology and was traditionally relegated to the realm of religion. But now it is being recognized by studies in consumer behaviour that spirituality impacts consumption behaviour of people (Curasi, Price, & Arnould, 2004; Gould & Stinerock, 1992; Thompson, 2004). Pandey, Gupta and Arora (2009) have affirmed positive relationship between the spiritual climate of organizations and the customers' experiences of the services. However, still there is no clarity about spirituality and its impact on consumer choices. A number of studies have been conducted to understand spirituality with respect to family and marriage therapy (Keeling *et al.,* 2010), counsellor education students (Osborn, Street & Bradham-Cousar, 2012), heritage tourism (MacCannnell, 2002), ownership of automobiles (Belk 2004). Some (for example, O'Guinn & Belk, 1989) have sought to examine the impact of spiritual aspirations on consumption with respect to religious orientation but have made no distinction between religion and spirituality. Further, studies on sustainable

consumption have indicated relationship between spirituality and consumption (Subrahmanyan & Gould, 2012-13) with respect to a divide between the sacred and profane (Belk, Wallendorf & Sherry, 1989) while spiritual orientation in the context of voluntary simplicity adopted by consumer has been examined by Pepper, Jackson and Uzzell (2009).

As mentioned earlier in the section on literature review, the Indian philosophy deals with spirituality and strongly advocates the path of righteousness or *Dharma.* Following the path of *Dharma* human aspirations have to be based on the principle that one's good does not clash with the good of another (Saksena, 1970, p 15). Indian philosophy also emphasizes upon the notion of karma. A strong belief in the concept of karma makes one responsible for his own conduct/ behavior in the present due to its impact in the future in this life or hereafter (Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010). It may be concluded that belief in karma (Bernard 1981; Bowes 1978; Saksena 1970; Krishan, 1983, 1997) will influence many aspects of a person's life in India including his purchase behavior (Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010). The concept of mindful- consumption has been introduced recently in the literature of marketing by Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas (2011). The concept of mindfulness is embedded in spirituality and mindful-consumption pertains to the awareness on the part of the consumer about the consequences of his behaviour.

A number of studies (Goodwin, Nelson, Ackerman, & Weisskopf, undated; Schwartz, 1994; Stillman *et al.,* 2012) have provided empirical evidence to establish that spirituality and consumption, particularly the conspicuous consumption, are conflicting values. It is asserted that a high sense of spirituality corresponds to reduced value being placed on material goods that in turn reduces their desire to consume material goods. Similar viewpoint has been postulated by Sorokin (1941/1992) who suggests that spirituality frees the man from the clutches of unlimited desires and therefore results in diminished consumption. Adopting a contradictory viewpoint,

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Gould (2006), however, argues that people may adopt spiritual practices to satisfy their need to feel superior over others and this could lead to increased conspicuous consumption when in a spiritual mindset (Stillman *et al.,* 2012). Yun (undated), on the other hand, has advocated reasonable consumption for sustainable social development and spiritual pursuits.

Getting into the argument whether spirituality leads to enhanced consumption or reduces the desire for materialistic possessions is not the interest of this study. Rather, the paper is based on the premise that consumer spirituality affects his purchase choices. Spiritually motivated people are likely to be cognizant of the purchases they make and its subsequent impact on society, ecology and their own lives. Here, the idea is that they may not consider consumption as evil but would be conscious of why they buy, from whom they buy, how they use the product, the outcome of the entire procurement and consumption activities and its ability to satisfy their spiritual motivations. This implies that high levels of spirituality in consumers may lead to rejecting products from socially irresponsible business organizations or turning towards eco-friendly products or people may buy or avoid certain products or services if they consider them to be conducive or detrimental to their spiritual pursuit.

Extensive review of literature on consumer points out that there is no instrument available to measure consumer spirituality. Though there has been a proliferation in the development of scales on spirituality in the recent years but they are mainly in the field of sociology and psychology and some in the context of organizational setting. There is a lack of specific scale that measures the consumer spirituality which may impact their purchase attitudes and decisions. The overarching purpose of this study is to develop a reliable and valid scale for measuring consumer spirituality.

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Methodology and results of scale development

CONSPIRIT scale has been developed to measure the *spirituality tendencies* of consumers when they are purchasing products and services from different organizations. Tendency here refers to the consumers' general disposition to purchase or reject offerings from ethical or unethical organizations as perceived by them. The instrument does not measure the perceptions towards the organizations but rather the spiritual tendencies of consumers that may influence his purchase decision from a particular source. Construction of this unique scale was necessary because the classic measure of spirituality and the scale on organizational spirituality would not have been relevant in the context of consumer behaviour.

The study adopted the accepted paradigm for scale development provided by Churchill (1979), and Shimp and Sharma (1987). The scale development process employed in this study comprised six steps: (1) domain specification and item generation (2) finalizing the list of items (3) collecting data (4) purifying the measurement scale (5) collecting data from a new sample (6) assessing reliability and validity of the scale.

Domain specification and item generation

After conducting extensive literature review a preliminary study was conducted in the cities of Allahabad, Varanasi, Kanpur and Noida in the state of Uttar Pradesh, India to get insights into the consumers' thoughts towards spirituality. More than 180 respondents comprising college students, housewives, academicians, retired government employees, businessmen were asked to describe their views on spirituality in general and specifically on how spirituality can be related to product purchase, brand selection and acceptance of products from an organization. Care was taken to ensure that the respondents were drawn from different educational, social, economic, religious and occupational background. Additionally, seven focus

group discussions were conducted to address the same questions. Prior to asking the questions related to spirituality, the respondents were asked to explain the meaning of religion as understood by them. This was done to understand whether the respondents considered these terms as synonymous or treated them as distinct concepts. The author believed that this would help in minimizing the overlapping of religion domain into the spirituality domain. Surprisingly, a very large majority of the respondents distinguished between the two. They used the terms rituals, religious practices, place of worship, priests and conformance to religious authority when describing religion. Spirituality was explained by using words such as elevation of individual spirit, inner power, purification of self, embracing others, conscientiousness. This exploratory study resulted in generation of over 200 items. The generated items corresponded well with the reviewed literature. The items that were overlapping with each other were deleted. 190 items were retained and were used as source for development of scale.

Based on the content analysis of the statements along with insights of relevant literature and the author's own judgment the statements were categorized into eight facets: (1) relatedness with universe (2) inner orientation (3) consumption with concern for posterity (4) concern for improvement (5) consumption keeping in mind social benefit (6) concern for ethical and socially responsible practices of organizations (7) concern for technologically improved and green products (8) sacredness in relationship with others. The generated items were employed to scale these dimensions. The items were examined and out of the pool of 190 items generated through primary source 122 items were accepted. The rest were rejected as they were found to be redundant or open to misinterpretation.

A five member judgment panel comprising a professor of philosophy, two professors of consumer behaviour and senior managers of two different consumer product companies, was

asked to assign each of the 122 items to the eight dimensions identified earlier. Based on an *a priori* rule, only that item was accepted if at least four members chose the same category. This resulted in acceptance of 112 items with ten items getting rejected due to non-compliance of the rule. Rust and Cooil (1994) have identified PRL (proportional reduction in loss) measure along the lines of Cronbach alpha to address the issue of reliability of qualitative data. It has been calculated keeping in mind the number of judges and proportion of inter-judge agreement. Adopting their measure shows that the reliability of the qualitative data generated by this study is very high as a 0.80 proportion of inter-judge agreement among the five judges yields 0.98 PRL reliability (Rust & Cooil, 1994, p. 7). The panel was further requested to edit or rephrase the remaining items to improve clarity in understanding. Their suggestions were incorporated and the statements were modified accordingly.

Scale purification process

First stage.

In the first stage of scale purification data was collected on a 112- item instrument from a sample of 225 respondents through email. This sample size was considered to be adequate as other studies conducted in the area of marketing had also used similar sample size for similar number of scale items in the initial stage of scale purification (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). A large number of statements were worded negatively as recommended (Churchill, 1979) for development of a new scale. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

Analysis of data resulted in alpha values along with corrected item-to-total correlations. Items with very low correlations were deleted. This resulted in reduction of 112 items to a set of 57 items. Factor analysis was performed on the 57- item scale to determine the underlying

structure and also to further reduce the number of items. The principal component analysis process with Oblimin rotation was employed and the study of scree plot suggested a 5-factor solution. Items that had high loadings on more than one factor were deleted. Further, items that had loading of < 0.5 on any factor were also deleted (Hair *et al*., 2006). This resulted in additional deletion of 23 items. Continuing further with principal component with Oblimin rotation, a clear 5-factor structure emerged. The reliability of the entire scale was a high alpha value of 0.92. Next, the alpha value for all the sub-scales was determined. One factor with six items had a very low alpha value of 0.15. It was dropped from the final scale. The iterative process of factor analysis was further carried out using the Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalization till a clear four factor structure appeared explaining 63.91% of overall variances. These factors were named as relatedness, self-actualization, transcendence and sacredness. This 26-item refined scale had a Cronbach alpha value of 0.94 and the alpha value for the sub-scales ranged from 0.77 to 0.94 indicating good internal consistency among the items within each dimension (Nunnally, 1978) and the item loadings varied from 0.59 to 0.93. The results from the first stage of purification are summarized in Table 1. The 26-item scale was retained for the second stage of purification.

Second stage: Finalizing the measurement scale.

To further evaluate the psychometric properties of the scale the 26- item questionnaire was sent to 2000 respondents who were selected purposively from northern, central, eastern and southern regions of India. It was ensured that the respondents in the study were at least 20 years old and had completed their graduation or were pursing it as it was felt that those below this age and education would, perhaps, be not able to appreciate the difference between religion and spirituality. 275 respondents were visited personally and the rest were contacted through email

and encouraged to participate in the study. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" where strongly disagree = 1 and strongly agree= 5. A total of 990 questionnaires were received back indicating a response rate of 49.5%. The break up revealed that while the response rate from personal visit was 84 percent (231 questionnaires) it was only 44 percent through email. After excluding 20 incomplete questionnaires 970 usable questionnaires were utilized for further analysis. The sample profile is shown in Table 2.

Data was subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with maximum-likelihood estimation in AMOS version 16 to substantiate the four factor dimensionality of the scale obtained from the first stage of purification. The fit of the measurement model for data was based on goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed fit index (NFI), and comparative fit index (CFI). Additionally, the reliability and validity of the CONSPIRIT scale were assessed through several criteria based on Byrne (2001); Hair *et al.*, (2006), Kline (2005); Schumacker and Lomax (2005). To indicate that the model is adequately fit, the cut-off values are 0.90 or higher for CFI (Byrne 1998; Kline, 2005; Schumacker & Lomax, 2005), 0.08 or lower for RMSEA, and 0.10 or lower for RMR (Byrne, 1998; Jöreskog & So¨rbom, 2001; Kline, 2005; Schumacker & Lomax, 2005).Additionally, the reliability and validity of the CONSPIRIT scale were assessed through several criteria based on Byrne (2001), Kline (2005), Hair *et al.*, (2006) and Schumacker & Lomax (2005).

Initially, the model did not yield a satisfactory result with $\chi^2 = 3314.39$ (*df*= 283), p=0.00, GFI= 0.774, AGFI = 0.729, NFI =0.657, CFI= 0.676. A look at the modification indices suggested that the discrepancy between the proposed and estimated model could be reduced. Larger covariance in the modification indices were addressed first, starting with the largest value

and then the minor ones were taken care of. Examination of residuals revealed that there were a number of standardized residual covariances with an absolute value greater than 4.0. Starting with the highest significant value of residuals, the items were deleted one by one in order to fix the model fitting. After deletion of each item, CFA was run to determine if the parameters could be further improved upon. Residual covariances were checked and the significant ones were deleted. This iterative process continued till all the standardized residual covariances reported an absolute value less than 4.0. This resulted in deletion of 15 items. The remaining items loaded on their respective constructs reporting significant standardized regression weights greater than the cut-off value of 0.5.

The study reported a very high and significant chi square value of 6. The chi square value, however, is widely recognized to be problematic as it is very sensitive to sample size (Jöreskog, 1969). Further, most researchers are interested in the approximate fit of the model to the data instead of an exact fit evaluation determined solely by the χ^2 test (Bentler, 1990). Therefore, it was preferred to evaluate model based on other parameters. Examination of the resultant model reported a good fit with GFI value = 0.96, AGFI value =0.93, NFI =0.91, CFI= 0.92 and RMR=.05. The RMSEA value was below the accepted 0.08 threshold (Byrne, 1998; Jo¨reskog & So¨rbom, 2001; Kline, 2005; Schumacker & Lomax, 2005), while values of overall fit (GFI, AGFI, CFI and NFI) were all above 0.90 for an acceptable model fit (Byrne, 1998). The next step involved the checking of reliability and validity of the purified 11-item scale, CONSPIRIT.

Before proceeding further let's take a relook at the scale based on confirmatory factor analysis (Table 3) that supports the four dimensionality of the CONSPIRIT scale (relatedness, self-actualization, transcendental, and sacredness) revealed by the exploratory factor analysis.

Relatedness comprises two items, 'I think the current problems in society are due to conflict between the individual's and the society's goals' and 'I buy products to fulfil my personal needs and not to impress others or to meet expectations of others'. This factor seeks to understand how consumer relates his inner self with the society at large. His inner, deep self guiding the purchase decision is likely to refrain him from buying products that are detrimental to people or society at large. Studies conducted in other contexts (Fry, 2003; Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009) support the existence of this dimension. The dimension 'self-actualization' includes two items, 'My efforts are directed towards understanding the purpose and meaning of life' and 'I connect to the universe on a daily basis'. It emphasizes the consumer's urge to find meaning and purpose in life by constantly working on self and its relation with universe (Kelemen & Peltonen, 2005; Schneiders, 1989); and in that pursuit satisfy his quest for identity and worth. The desire to express meaningful aspect of his life is expected to get translated into purchase preferences. The third dimension, 'transcendental' consists of four items, namely, 'I prefer to use products that are efficient and less energy consuming for both my personal and society's benefit', 'My purchases are aligned with my philosophy of life', 'Being true in relationships is important to me' and 'I respect everyone'. This dimension reflects an individual's relationship with the ultimate reality (Emmons, Cheung, & Thehrani, 1998; Schneiders, 1989). The transcendental aspect of consumer will make him mindful of his actions (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009; Sheth, Sethia & Srinivas, 2011) and impel him to rise above his selfish interest in the interest of society and environment. Driven by this aspect of spiritual motivation, the consumer will have respect not only for his personal consumption needs but also for those of others including posterity. He is also likely to reject products that are threatening to current ecosystem. The last dimension, 'sacredness' deals with the ethical and moral aspect (Van Dierendonck, 2011) of consumer behaviour and includes

three items: 'I consider ethical issues in making purchase decisions', 'I make my purchases to please myself and not under any pressure from society' and 'I prefer to buy from those retail outlets that are reliable and trustworthy'. This facet of spirituality will impel the consumer to *purify* his thoughts and actions amidst this *impure* world. He is likely to make consistent endeavours to refrain from indulging in unethical activities and be vigilant towards organizations' ethical practices as well (Bezencon & Blili, 2010; Shaw & Shiu, 2003). Guided by 'sacredness', consumer may ensure that his purchase or consumption behaviour does not contribute in perpetuating others' (friends, relatives, organizations etc.) immoral activities. The four dimensions, thus identified will help to measure spirituality among consumers that is likely to impact their purchase and consumption pattern..

Reliability and validity assessment of CONSPIRIT scale

CONSPIRIT scale satisfied the criteria of content validity as it was based on a thorough examination of the subject domain and constructs with subsequent review being conducted by the judgment panel. The construct reliability was measured to assess the internal consistency of the observed indicator variables. It was computed from the sum of factor loadings, squared for each construct and the sum of the error variance terms for a construct. The reliability for each of the constructs was 0.71; 0.69; 0.83 and 0.73 respectively (Table 4). The rule of thumb for a good reliability estimate is 0.7 or higher, which means that all items consistently represent the same latent construct. But Hair *et al.* (2006) also asserted that reliability between 0.6 and 0.7 may be acceptable given that other indicators of convergent validity (i.e. standardized factor loadings in the measurement model and Average Variance Extracted) are good, i.e. above 0.50. The construct 'Self-Actualization' showed the construct reliability of 0.69 and AVE value of 0.53.

These values point towards sound psychometric property of the scale as suggested by Hair *et al.* (2006).

The standardized factor loading, squared multiple correlation, average variance extracted, and composite construct reliability for the measurement items and the constructs were examined as evidence of convergent validity (Netemeyer, Johnston & Burton, 1990). The AVE for the three latent constructs (Table 4) was significant and above .5 (.47 for construct "sacredness") suggesting that the variables in the scale have an acceptable level of convergent validity in explaining the theorized constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair *et al.*, 1998; 2006).

Discriminant validity was examined by comparing the AVE estimates for each factor with the squared inter-construct correlations (SIC) associated with that factor (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). All construct AVE estimates were found to be larger than the corresponding SIC estimates which means that each construct is unique and captures some aspect of consumer spirituality which other factors do not. This result establishes the discriminant validity of the scale (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Netemeyer, Johnston & Burton, 1990) (See Table 4). The literature also stresses on the importance of establishing nomological validity (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955; Netemeyer, Durvasula, & Lichtenstein, 1991). To test the nomological validity of the scale all the four constructs were examined to identify whether the correlations among the constructs in the measurement theory made sense (Hair *et al.,* 2006). The correlations between all the constructs were positive and significant, thus establishing the nomological validity (See Table 5). So, it may be said that the scale developed by this study to measure spirituality among consumers was found to be both reliable and valid.

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Discussion and contribution

Price, quality, religion, personality are well established factors that impact buying behaviour of customers. However, now the consumer is also becoming very conscious of the ethical aspect of practices adopted by the companies. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) have concluded that individual spirituality influences whether an individual perceives a questionable business practice as ethical or unethical. However, the concept of spirituality has received very little attention from the marketing and consumer behaviour scholars. The current study seeks to bridge that gap by addressing the issue of consumer spirituality and its measurement through CONSPIRIT scale in the domain of marketing and consumer behaviour. The objective of the study was achieved by developing a parsimonious and multiple-item scale that may be utilized to understand the role of consumer spirituality in making purchase choice decisions. A rigorous approach was adopted to develop and investigate the psychometric properties of the scale by following the accepted paradigm for scale development provided by Churchill (1979) and augmented by other researchers (Bentler, 1990; Byrne, 1998; Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair *et al.*, 2006; Jöreskog, 1969; Jo¨reskog & So¨rbom, 2001; Kline, 2005; Netemeyer *et al.,* 1990; Nunnally, 1978; Schumacker & Lomax, 2005). The composite reliability for all the four dimensions of the developed scale was reported to be good, ranging from .69 to .83. All the standardized loadings were significant and above 0.5. Further, the average variance extracted for all the factors was above 0.5 confirming the convergent validity of the measure. All construct AVE estimates were found to be larger than the corresponding SIC estimates and the correlations between all the constructs were positive and significant. These two measurements established discriminant and nomological validity respectively. Thus, the finalized scale was reliable and valid.

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

As stated earlier, the dimensions (relatedness, self-actualization, transcendental, and sacredness) of the CONSPIRIT scale emphasize upon the four important aspects of a consumer's spirituality. First, he relates or connects his individual self with the society at large. Second, he is motivated to find the purpose of his life in this vast universe. Third, he is not driven by his selfish needs and is considerate of the impact of his consumption on others. Fourth, the scale emphasizes upon the ethical or moral aspect of his conduct. This scale differs from those measuring religiosity in many aspects. Concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic aspect of religiosity as developed by Allport (1950) have been widely employed to measure religious orientation. Religiosity scales reflect relationship of man with God (Koenig, McCullough, & Larson, 2001) which may generate various differing emotions with him such as fear, disillusionment, security, comfort, (Allport, 1950; Hill & Pargament, 2008) anger, wonder, awe, peace, hope, etc. Even the *Spiritual Assessment Inventory* developed by Hall and Edwards (1996) to measure spiritual development includes two primary dimensions, awareness of God and one's relation with God. The items 'I connect to the universe on a daily basis' and 'my efforts are directed towards understanding the purpose and meaning of life' of the CONSPIRIT scale must not be confused with portrayal of any kind of relationship with God. Conversely, they express a desire to improve one by understanding the true meaning of life and its relationship with universe that encompasses the entire ecosystem. Further, identification with a particular religious group and participation in church, temple, mosque activities (Koenig, Parkerson & Meador, 1997; Koenig, McCullough, & Larson, 2001) and carrying out religious rituals such as baptism, religious wedding ceremonies, and organized prayers, studying religious texts (Bardis 1961; Hill *et al.,* 2000) and authority afforded to religious leaders can be said to reflect the social dimension of religiosity which may be used for interaction, relations, status, solace and other social gains (Allport, 1950).

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Relatedness, Transcendental and sacredness dimensions of the developed scale talk about the intrinsic aspect as well as the individual and group interests but the context is totally different and cannot be compared with the performance of rituals, place of worship and participation in group activities (Bardis 1961; Koenig, Parkerson & Meador, 1997; Hill *et al.,* 2000; Koenig, McCullough, & Larson, 2001) that are a part of religiosity scale or the intrinsic aspect of the Allport's (1950) scale. CONSPIRIT scale is different from the scales of religiosity/religiousness and the traditional spirituality scales that encompass religiosity as well. This scale is based along the concept of spirituality as stated by Koenig *et al.* (2001) and Wuthnow (1998) and seeks to measure spirituality in a consumer which is likely to influence his consumption behaviour. It is also based on the basic premise that people are able to distinguish between religion and spirituality (Zinnbauer *et al.,* 1997).

CONSPIRIT scale has potential uses for modern marketer. It may be employed by organizations in their periodic tracking studies. Global marketers need to understand the consumers (Indian) who align their thinking with the socio-cultural norms where cultural ideals (for example, the belief in theory of karma) need to form the basis for designing of marketing communication appeals (Briley & Aaker, 2006). CONSPIRIT scale may be employed to measure differences in spirituality among the consumers from different demographic background. Understanding the consumer spirituality can provide directions to the marketer in designing the communication, particularly the advertising messages that are viewed with doubt by ethical consumers (Shrum, McCarthy & Lowrey, 1995). They may need to strongly position their products or brands as ethical and substantiate their claims with proofs. However, a word of caution may be sounded here. It would be prudent not to segment the market on the sole criterion of consumer spirituality. It may be correlated with other demographic or psychographic variables

to arrive at a more meaningful segmentation and suitable design of marketing communication programs. Marketers seeking to launch new products could also benefit from understanding the consumer spirituality. If their products are ecologically safe, technologically improved and lead to improvement in an individual's life then the chances of the acceptance of these products by consumers high on spirituality are likely to be more. Not only this, if the organizations are acting irresponsibly towards the local community then the chances of rejection of their offerings are likely to be more if the consumer spirituality is high. However, these need further investigation.

The concept of consumer spirituality may be beneficial in designing customer relationship programs. For instance, the use of CONSPIRIT scale may help the marketer realize that if emphasis on honesty and transparency is required in building trust and long term relationship with their customers. They can also find out if responsible, caring attitude and sacredness in dealing with consumers at every point of interaction is related with consumer spirituality. Another aspect of consumer spirituality that needs to be kept in mind is that it is not a static concept. As the consumer matures *spiritually* through his interactions and experiences with the organizations and their products, his buying behaviour may alter accordingly. This may require attention from the marketer and his approach towards his consumers.

Studies in the field of consumer behaviour and marketing have generally made no distinction between religion and spirituality. Most of the studies have either assumed the two concepts to be synonymous or have chosen to ignore any distinction between the two. The concept of consumer spirituality and its measurement through CONSPIRIT scale provides a new direction to the future research with respect to consumer religion and spirituality. Further studies may be conducted by using this tool to understand the behaviours of the consumers with same religious background and orientation but differing levels of spirituality. Further, religion has been, till

hitherto studied as an antecedent to the concept of consumer ethnocentrism. The tool of CONSPIRIT may now be used to investigate the relationship between the concept of consumer spirituality (as an independent variable, distinct from religion) and consumer ethnocentrism. CONSPIRIT scale can also be employed in correlational studies involving demographics, psychographics aspects along with other predictors of consumers' attitudes and behaviours.

There are several issues related to development of consumer spirituality that may be examined. It would be interesting to explore how socio-economic and educational background, exposure to other cultures, personal experiences of interactions with various organizations, awareness about impact of organizational activities on local community and ecology lead to strengthening of consumer spirituality. Related to this area could be further investigation on consumer perception of an organization being socially and ecologically responsible and its relationship with consumer spirituality. These two variables can be further explored to examine their influence on acceptance or rejection of a product or service from a particular organization.

Limitations and recommendations for further research

It may be stated that the current study makes significant contribution to the growing body of antecedents of consumer purchase behaviour by emphasizing upon the concept of consumer spirituality and developing the CONSPIRIT scale that has several potential uses. The developed scale has proved to be both reliable and valid but it is important to acknowledge its limitations and provide directions for future research. The purposive nature of the study may have its own limitations considering that the study is limited to certain socio-economic group. For instance, it deals with those who have certain level of educational qualification and are adults. It neglects school-goers or children who contribute significantly to consumption and also act as major influencers in purchase decisions. Further, it ignores the illiterate population of the country. Then

again, the study assumes that consumers are able to differentiate between the concepts of spirituality and religiosity. This assumption may be a limitation where people are fuzzy about their meanings. Keeping these in mind the generalization for the entire population has to be done very cautiously. Further research is warranted to examine whether the scale is able to differentiate consumers with different demographic factors than the ones tested upon in this research. Studies emphasize upon the impact of cultural ideals on consumer behaviour (Briley & Aaker, 2006; Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010). As the current study was conducted in the cities of India it needs to be investigated whether respondents in other cultures and countries conceptualize the construct in identical manner. Future research is, therefore, necessitated to examine that the relationship among the items and constructs remains the same across different samples. Though the nomological validity was examined but it could be tested further by employing some other related constructs such as psychological well-being. Finally, it is hoped that this study will trigger interest in consumer spiritually.

References

Allport, G. (1950). *The Individual and His Religion: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Bardis, P. (1961). A Religion Scale. *Social Science*, 36, 120-23.

Belk, R. W. (2004). Men & Their Machines. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 31, 273-278.

Belk, R. W., Wallendorf, M., & Sherry, John Jr. (1989). The Sacred & the Profane in Consumer Behaviour: Theodicy on the Odyssey. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 1-38.

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural equation models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.

Bernard, T. (1981). *Hindu Philosophy*, Delhi: M. Banarsidass.

Bezencon, V., & Blili, S. (2010). Ethical products & consumer involvement: what's new? *European Journal of Marketing*, 44 (9/10), 1305-1321.

Bowes, P. (1978). *The Hindu Religious Tradition: A Philosophical Approach*. Boston, MA: Routledge.

Briley, D. A., & Aaker, J.L.   (2006). When Does Culture Matter? Effects of Personal Knowledge on the Correction of Culture-Based Judgments. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43, 395-408.

Byrne, B.M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS & SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, application, & programming.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Churchill, G. A., Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64-73.

Cronbach, L.J., & Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281–302.

Curasi, C. F., Price, L. L., & Arnould, E. J. (2004). How Individuals' Cherished Possessions Become Families' Inalienable Wealth. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 609.

Dyson, J., Cobb, M., & Forman, D. (1997). The Meaning of Spirituality: A Literature Review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 1183-1188.

Ellison, C. G. (1991). Religious involvement & subjective well-being. *Journal of Health & Social Behaviour,* 32, 80-99.

Emmons, R. A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concerns: motivation & spirituality in personality.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Emmons, R. A., Cheung, C., & Thehrani, K. (1998). Assessing spirituality through personal goals: Implications for research on religion & well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 45, 391-422.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable & measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.

Fry, L.W. (2003). Towards the theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.

Giacalone, R.A., & Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2003). *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality & Organizational Performance*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Goodwin, N., Nelson, J. A., Ackerman, F., & Weisskopf T. (undated). Consumption & the Consumer Society. Retrieved from http://www.environmental-economics.org/teaching/Goodwin_Nelson_Ackerman_Weisskopf_Consumption_&_the_Consumer_Society.pdf.

Gould, S. J. (2006). Cooptation through conflation: Spiritual materialism is not the same as spirituality. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 9, 63–78.

Gould, S.J., & Stinerock, R. N. (1992). Self-Fashioning Oneself Cross-Culturally: Consumption as the Determined & the Determining. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19, 857-860.

Greeley, A. (2001). The future of religion in America. *Society*, 38(3), 32-37.

Griffiths, J. (2008). Wellness Management Benchmarking Survey. *Australian Institute of Management*. Retrieved from http:// wwwwellkom.com.au.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Uppersaddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Taltam, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis with readings*, 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (1996). The initial development and factor analysis of the Spiritual Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 24(3), 233-246.

Hall, T.W., & Edwards, K.J. (2002) The Spiritual assessment inventory: A theistic model & measure for assessing spiritual development. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 341-357.

Herman, A. L. (1976). *An Introduction to Indian Thought.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hill, P.C., & Pargament, K.I. (2008). Advances in the Conceptualization and Measurement of Religion and Spirituality: Implications for Physical and Mental Health Research. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, S (1), 3–17.

Hill, P. C., Pargament, K.I., Hood, R. W., McCullough, M. E., Swyers, J.P., Larson, D.B., & Zinnbauer, B.J. (2000). Conceptualizing religion & spirituality: Points of commonality, points of departure. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30, 51-77.

Jöreskog, K.G., & So¨rbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Jöreskog, K.G. (1969). A general approach to confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 34, 183-202.

Kale, S.H. (2004). Spirituality, religion, & globalization. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 24, 92-107.

Keeling, M. L., Dolbin-MacNab, M. L., Ford, J., & Perkins, S.N. (2010). Partners in the spiritual dance: learning clients' steps while minding all our toes. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 36, 229–243.

Kelemen, M., & Peltonen, T. (2005). Spirituality: A Way to an Alternative Subjectivity? *Organization Management Journal*, 2, 52-63.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles & practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Koenig, H.G., McCullough, M., & Larson, D. (2001). *Handbook of religion & health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koenig H., Parkerson G., & Meador K. (1997). Religion index for psychiatric research: a 5-item measure for the use in health outcome studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154, 885-886.

Kopalle, P.K., Lehmann, D.R. & Farley, J.U. (2010). Consumer Expectations and Culture: The Effect of Belief in Karma in India. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 251-263.

Krishan, Y. (1983). Karma Vipāka, *Numen*, 30 (2), 199-214.

Krishan, Y. (1997). *The Doctrine of Karma*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

Lesser, E. (2000). Twenty-first century spirituality. *Tikkun,* 15, 22-23.

MacCannnell, D. (2002). The ego factor in tourism. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 146–151.

MacDonald, D.A. (2000). Spirituality: description, measurement, & relation to the Five Factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 153-197.

Malhotra, N.K., & Dash, S. (2010). *Marketing Research: An applied orientation*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Netemeyer, R.G., Johnston, R.G., & Burton, M.W. (1990). Analysis of role conflict & role ambiguity in structural equations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 148–158.

Netemeyer, R.G., Durvasula, S., & Lichtenstein, D.R. (1991). A cross-national assessment of the reliability & validity of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 320–327.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Guinn, T. C., & Belk, R.W. (1989). Heaven on Earth: Consumption at Heritage Village, USA. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 227-238.

Osborn, D., Street, S., & Bradham-Cousar, M. (2012). Spiritual Needs & Practices of Counsellor Education Students. *ADULTSPAN*, 11(1), 27-38.

Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K., & Arora, A.P. (2009). Spiritual climate of business organizations & its impact on customers' experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88, 313-332.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64, 12-40.

Pepper, M., Jackson, T., & Uzzell, D. (2009). An Examination of the Values that Motivate Socially Conscious & Frugal Consumer Behaviours. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, March, 33, 126-136. doi: 10.1111/j.1470-6431.2009.00753.x

Petchsawang, P., & Duchon, D. (2009). Measuring workplace spirituality in an Asian context. *Human Resource Development International*, 12, 459-468.

Rust, R.T., & Cooil, B. (1994). Reliability measures for Qualitative Data: Theory and Implications. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 31, 1-14.

Saksena, S. K. (1970). *Essays on Indian Philosophy.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Schmidt-Wilk, J., Alexander, C.N., & Swanson, G.C. (1996). Developing consciousness in organizations: the Transcendental Meditation program in business. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10, 429-444.

Schmidt-Wilk, J., Heaton, D. P., & Steingard, D. (2000). Higher education for higher consciousness: Maharishi university of Management as a model of spirituality in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 25, 580-611.

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation model,* 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects of the structure & contents of human values. *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19–45.

Shaw, D. (2007). Consumer voters in imagined communities. *International Journal of Sociology & Social Policy,* 27, 135-150.

Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. (2003). Ethics in consumer choice: a multivariate modeling approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 1485-1498.

Sheth, J., Sethia N.K., & Srinivas, S. (2011), Mindful consumption: A consumer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 21–39.

Shimp, T.A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 280- 289.

Shrum, I.J., McCarthy, J.A., & Lowrey, T.M. (1995). Buyer characteristics of the green consumer & their implications for advertising strategy. *Journal of Advertising*, 24, 71-82.

Sorokin, P. A. (1941/1992). *The crisis of our time.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Stillman, T.F., Fincham , F.,D., Vohs, K.D., Lambert, N.M., & Phillips, C.A. (2012). The material & immaterial in conflict: Spirituality reduces conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33, 1–7.

Subrahmanyan, S., & Gould, S. (2012-13). Achieving Sustainable Consumption through Spiritual Practices. *Purushartha*, 5, 79-92.

Sudbury Riley, L., Kohlbacher, F., & Hofmeister, A. (2012). A cross-cultural analysis of pro-environmental consumer behavior among seniors. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 290-312.

Thompson, C.J. (2004). Marketplace Mythology & Discourses of Power. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 162-180.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Spirituality as an essential determinant for the good life, its importance relative to self-determinant psychological needs. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1-16. doi 10.1007/s10902-011-9286-2.

Van Dierendonck, D., & Mohan, K. (2006). Some thoughts on spirituality & eudemonic wellbeing. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 9, 227-238.

Wuthnow, R. (1998). *After heaven: spirituality in America since the 1950s*. CA: University of California Press, Berkeley.

Yun G. (undated) Research on Consumption Evaluation of University Students. Retrieved from http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/upload/product/200909/2008jyhy04a1.pdf .

Zinnbauer, B.J., Pargament, K.I., Cole, B., Rye, M.S., Butter, E.M., Belavich, T.G., Hipp, K.M., Scott, A.B., ... Kadar, J.L. (1997). Religion & spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 549-564.

MEASURING CONSUMER SPIRITUALITY THROUGH A VALID SCALE

Table 1

Summary of results from first stage of purification

Dimensions	Reliability Coefficient (Alpha value)	Number of items	Factor loadings	Eigenvalue
Relatedness	0.94	10	0.737	8.69
			0.926	
			0.889	
			0.585	
			0.848	
			0.787	
			0.711	
			0.907	
			0.759	
			0.757	
Self-Actualization	0.82	5	0.694	3.47
			0.723	
			0.839	
			0.807	
			0.795	
Transcendence	0.85	8	0.673	2.71
			0.698	
			0.604	
			0.737	
			0.709	
			0.772	
			0.677	
			0.666	
Sacredness	0.77	3	0.809	1.74
			0.716	
			0.788	
Reliability of the Total Scale				0.94
Total Percentage of Variance Explained				63.91

Table 2

Sample profile

	No of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sex		
Male	489	50.4
Female	481	49.6
Age [a]		
Under 21	2	.2
21-30	182	18.8
31-40	272	28.0
41-50	186	19.2
Above 50	326	33.6
Income (in Rs.)[b]		
280 28.9		
>=5,000	259	26.7
5,001-10,000	288	29.7
10,001-25,000	284	29.3
Above 25,000	139	14.3
Education [a]		
Under Graduate	280	28.9
Graduate	468	48.2
Post Graduate	220	22.7
Occupation [a]		
Student	169	17.4
Self-Employed	230	23.7
Working	564	58.1
Unemployed/Retired	4	.4

[a]some values are missing

[b]1US dollar = Rs. 60 approximately

Table 3

CFA 4-factor scale

Items	Item Loading on factors				Item Reliability
Relatedness	I	II	III	IV	
I think the current problems in society are due to conflict between the individual's and the society's goals	.78				.61
I buy products to fulfill my personal needs and not to impress others or to meet expectations of others	.70				.49
Self-Actualization					
My efforts are directed towards understanding the purpose and meaning of life		.75			.56
I connect to the universe on a daily basis		.70			.49
Transcendental					
I prefer to use products that are efficient and less energy consuming for both my personal and society's benefit			.70		.49
My purchases are aligned with my philosophy of life			.79		.62
Being true in relationships is important to me			.79		.62
I respect everyone			.70		.49
Sacredness					
I consider ethical issues in making purchase decisions				.66	.44
I make my purchases to please myself and not under any pressure from society				.78	.61
I prefer to buy from those retail outlets that are reliable and trustworthy				.61	.37
Variance Extracted	53%	49%	52%	46%	

Table 4

Convergent and discriminant validity

Constructs	Average Variance Extracted	Construct Reliability Estimates	Standaradized Covariances	SIC
Relatedness	.55	.71	.52; .67; .66	.27; .45; .44
Self-Actualization	.53	.69	.41; .49;.52	.17;.24;.27
Transcendental	.56	.83	.67; .41; .57	.45; .17; .32
Sacredness	.47	.73	.65;.49; .57	.42; .24; .32

Table 5

Nomological validity

Constructs	Covariance Estimates	S.E.	C.R.	Inter-Construct Correlation Estimates	P
Relatedness <--> Self-Actualization	.41	.043	9.439	.52	***
Relatedness <--> Transcendental	.36	.033	10.897	.66	***
Relatedness <--> Sacredness	.49	.041	11.768	.65	***
Self-Actualization <--> Transcendental	.21	.028	7.588	.41	***
Self-Actualization <--> Sacredness	.35	.038	9.102	.49	***
Transcendental <--> Sacredness	.28	.028	9.929	.57	***

*** *indicates all correlations are significant*