

The copyright © of this thesis belongs to its rightful author and/or other copyright owner. Copies can be accessed and downloaded for non-commercial or learning purposes without any charge and permission. The thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted as a whole without the permission from its rightful owner. No alteration or changes in format is allowed without permission from its rightful owner.



**DETERMINANTS OF DONOR BEHAVIORAL
INTENTION AMONG UUM ALUMNI**

PHOON LEE YONG



MASTER OF SCIENCE (MANAGEMENT)

UNIVERSITY UTARA MALAYSIA

JAN 2017

PHOON LEE YONG

**DETERMINANTS
DONOR BEHAVIORAL INTENTION
AMONG UUM ALUMNI**

**MSc.
(Mgt.)**

2017

**DETERMINANTS OF DONOR BEHAVIORAL INTENTION AMONG UUM
ALUMNI**



BY
PHOON LEE YONG

Universiti Utara Malaysia

**Thesis Submitted to
School of Business Management,
Universiti Utara Malaysia,
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Master of Sciences (Management)**



**Pusat Pengajian Pengurusan
Perniagaan**

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PENYELIDIKAN
(*Certification of Research Paper*)

Saya, mengaku bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(*I, the undersigned, certified that*)
PHOON LEE YONG (818690)

Calon untuk Ijazah Sarjana
(*Candidate for the degree of*)
MASTER OF SCIENCE (MANAGEMENT)

telah mengemukakan kertas penyelidikan yang bertajuk
(*has presented his/her research paper of the following title*)

DETERMINANTS OF DONOR BEHAVIORAL INTENTION AMONG UUM ALUMNI

Seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas penyelidikan
(*as it appears on the title page and front cover of the research paper*)

Bahawa kertas penyelidikan tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.
(*that the research paper acceptable in the form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the research paper.*)

Nama Penyelia Pertama : **DR. HASNIZAM BIN SHAARI**
(*Name of 1st Supervisor*)

Tandatangan :
(*Signature*)

Tarikh :
(*Date*)

13 DISEMBER 2016

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this research paper in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this research paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor or in their absence, by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business where I did my research paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this research paper parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the UUM in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my research paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this research paper in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of School of Business Management
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman



UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Faced with a tight budget, public universities are now looking at alternative ways to raise funds and one possible source is the university alumni. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the attitude of donor behaviour, peer pressure, university brand personality and religiosity with donor behavioural intention of Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) alumni. A set of questionnaire, based on the extended theory of planned behaviour model which included religiosity, was distributed to the alumni. The opinions of relevant experts and professors were used to validate the questionnaire. The data were analysed using Smart PLS-a software with graphical user interface for variance-based structural equation modeling (SEM) using the partial least squares (PLS) method. The finding reveals that attitude of donor behaviour, peer pressure; university brand personality and religiosity have a significant positive relationship with donor behavioural intention. The findings are useful for the university management to design strategies according to the behaviour of the alumni which could help increase the donation percentage. The funds raised will enable the university to maintain its reputation and quality. It is suggested that future studies should include alumni from all public universities in Malaysia.

Keywords: Attitude towards donor behaviour, peers pressure, university brand personality, religiosity, donor behavioural intention.



UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

ABSTRAK

Peruntukan belanjawan yang terbatas yang diberikan kepada universiti awam di Malaysia mendesak penggunaan kaedah lain untuk memperoleh dana daripada alumni universiti. Oleh yang demikian, niat tingkah laku penderma dikaji dalam penyelidikan ini. Kajian ini menyelidik hubungan antara sikap terhadap tingkah laku penderma, tekanan rakan sebaya, personaliti jenama universiti dengan kewarakan (*religiosity*) terhadap niat tingkah laku penderma alumni Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). Dalam kajian ini, soal selidik dihasilkan dengan menghuraikan teori lanjutan model tingkah laku yang dirancang yang merangkumi aspek kewarakan. Soal selidik diedarkan dalam kalangan alumni UUM. Pandangan pakar dan profesor yang berkaitan telah digunakan untuk menyemak keesahan soal selidik. SmartPLS yang menggunakan perisian berbantuan antara muka pengguna grafik untuk model persamaan struktur (SEM) berasaskan varian yang menggunakan kaedah kuasa dua terkecil separa (PLS) pula diupayakan untuk menganalisis data. Dapatan kajian memperlihatkan bahawa sikap terhadap tingkah laku penderma, tekanan rakan sebaya, personaliti jenama universiti dan kewarakan mempunyai hubungan yang signifikan lagi positif dengan niat tingkah laku penderma. Dapatan kajian berguna untuk membantu pihak pengurusan UUM membentuk strategi berdasarkan tingkah laku alumni UUM dan memperoleh lebih banyak derma serta mempunyai peruntukan yang cukup untuk mengekalkan reputasi dan kualiti universiti. Niat tingkah laku penderma perlu dianalisis dan dikaji dalam kajian akan datang. Persampelan juga perlu lebih meluas dan melibatkan semua universiti awam di Malaysia.

Kata kunci: Sikap terhadap tingkah laku penderma, Tekanan rakan sebaya, Personaliti jenama universiti, Kewarakan, Niat tingkah laku penderma

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

With the name of Lord Buddha, Praise Lord Buddha for the blessings, giving me strength and effort to complete this thesis. Without the blessings, I doubt that I am unable to go through all these processes.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge my lovely supervisor, Dr Hasnizam Shaari, for the kind guidance and continuous support during the writing process. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. Furthermore, I would like to thank Signature Research Consultancy for organised PLS-SEM workshop. With the guidance and help from the speakers-Dr. Francis Chuah and Dr Jacky Cheah of the workshop, I learned the way to analyse data by using PLS-SEM. I would also like to extend special gratitude to Dr Francis Chuah for devoting his time to guide and teach me in this research.

Special thanks to Academic Affairs Department UUM and Student Development and Alumni Department UUM for providing the data of alumni. Without it, the questionnaire will be unable to be distributed to the selected respondents.

I would like to express my appreciation to my beloved parent- Phoon Yoon Thiam and Lim Lek Kiang. Thanks for the guidance and effort to build me up for years. Daddy and mummy, I love you. Many thanks to my sisters- Lee Ling, Chin Pei, and Yi Jun and brother- Mike Chan for the continuous physical and mentally support, bring joys to my life whenever I am feeling down. To Adrian Law, thanks for being with me and accompany me go through every up and down along my master life. Love all of you.

To all the respondents, thanks for your valuable time in completing the questionnaires. Lastly, thanks to all who were, directly and indirectly, involve in this research associated with this study.

Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| CERTIFICATE OF THE THESIS WORK | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| PERMISSION TO USE..... | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| ABSTRAK | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | vi |

CHAPTER 1: RESEARCH OVERVIEW

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement | 2 |
| 1.3 Research Questions | 6 |
| 1.4 Research Objectives | 7 |
| 1.5 Significance of study | 7 |
| 1.5.1 Theoretical contributions | 8 |
| 1.5.2 Practical contributions | 8 |
| 1.6 Scope of the study | 9 |
| 1.7 Definitions of the key terms | 9 |
| 1.7.1 Alumni donor behavioural intention..... | 9 |
| 1.7.2 Attitude towards donor's behaviours | 10 |
| 1.7.3 Peers Pressure | 10 |
| 1.7.4 University Brand personality | 10 |
| 1.7.5 Religiosity | 10 |
| 1.8 Organization of the Study..... | 10 |
| 1.9 Chapter Summary | 12 |

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.0 Introduction | 13 |
| 2.1 Donor Behaviour | 13 |
| 2.1.1 Intention to Donate | 14 |
| 2.2 The Importance of Intention to Donate | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Increase the Reputation of University | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Future Investment | 16 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.2.3 Beneficial to Future Generations | 17 |
| 2.2.4 Giving Back Show Gratitude | 17 |
| 2.3 Theory Related to Donor Behavioural Intention. | 18 |
| 2.3.1 Theory of Planned Behaviour | 18 |
| 2.4 General Stimulus for Donor Behavioural Intention | 26 |
| 2.4.1 Individual Factors | 26 |
| 2.4.2 Interpersonal Factors..... | 26 |
| 2.4.3 Organizational Factors | 26 |
| 2.5 Previous studies of Donor Behavioural Intention | 27 |
| 2.5.1 Prediction of Donor Behavioural Intention | 27 |
| 2.6 Variables Related to the Study | 31 |
| 2.6.1 Attitude Towards Donor Behaviour | 31 |
| 2.6.2 Peers Pressure | 32 |
| 2.6.3 University Brand Personality | 33 |
| 2.6.4 Religiosity | 35 |
| 2.7 Theoretical Framework | 37 |
| 2.8 Research Hypotheses..... | 37 |
| 2.9 Chapter Summary | 38 |

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.0 Introduction | 39 |
| 3.1 Research Design | 39 |
| 3.2 Sample Design..... | 40 |
| 3.2.1 Population | 40 |
| 3.2.2 Sample and Unit of Analysis | 40 |
| 3.2.3 Sample Frame and Sample Size..... | 41 |
| 3.2.4 Sampling Procedure | 42 |
| 3.2.5 Sampling Techniques..... | 43 |
| 3.3 Questionnaire Preparation | 44 |
| 3.3.1 Section A: Demographic Information..... | 50 |
| 3.3.2 Section B: Alumni Donor Behavioural Intention | 50 |
| 3.3.3 Section C: Attitude Towards Donor Behaviour..... | 51 |
| 3.3.4 Section D: Peers Pressure | 52 |
| 3.3.5 Section E: University Brand Personality | 52 |
| 3.3.6 Section F: Religiosity | 53 |
| 3.4 Instrumentation and Measurement of Variables | 54 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.4.1 Research Instruments | 54 |
| 3.4.2 Translation of Research Instrument | 54 |
| 3.4.3 Measurement Type of Scales | 55 |
| 3.4.4 Scaling Design | 56 |
| 3.5 Pre-Test and Pilot Test Procedure | 56 |
| 3.6 Data Collection Procedure..... | 58 |
| 3.7 Techniques of Data Analysis..... | 60 |
| 3.7.1 Data analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)..... | 60 |
| 3.8 Measurement Model Analysis using PLS-SEM..... | 63 |
| 3.8.1 The relationship between constructs and items | 63 |
| 3.8.2 Assessment of Construct Reliability..... | 64 |
| 3.8.3 Assessment of Convergent Validity | 65 |
| 3.8.4 Assessment of Discriminant Validity | 65 |
| 3.9 Structural Model Analysis using PLS-SEM..... | 65 |
| 3.10 Chapter Summary | 67 |

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.0 Introduction | 68 |
| 4.1 Participation and Response Rate | 68 |
| 4.2 Data Screening and Non-Response Biases..... | 70 |
| 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Background..... | 70 |
| 4.3.1 Gender..... | 71 |
| 4.3.2 Age..... | 71 |
| 4.3.3 Ethnic Group..... | 72 |
| 4.3.4 Religion..... | 73 |
| 4.3.5 Education Level | 73 |
| 4.3.6 Marital Status..... | 74 |
| 4.3.7 Employment Status | 75 |
| 4.3.8 Year Graduated | 75 |
| 4.3.9 Household Income | 76 |
| 4.4 Measurement Model Analysis | 78 |
| 4.4.1 Assessment of Construct Reliability..... | 79 |
| 4.4.2 Assessment of Convergent Validity | 81 |
| 4.4.2 Assessment of Discriminant Validity | 82 |
| 4.4.4 The Overall Measurement Model Evaluation..... | 85 |
| 4.5 Assessment of Structural Model..... | 86 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| 4.6 Overall Hypothesis Results | 89 |
| 4.7 Chapter Summary | 90 |

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

| | |
|---|-----|
| 5.0 Introduction | 91 |
| 5.1 Research Summary | 91 |
| 5.2 Achievement of Research Objectives..... | 93 |
| 5.3 Contributions of the study | 98 |
| 5.3.1 Theoretical Contribution..... | 98 |
| 5.3.2 Practical Contribution | 99 |
| 5.4 Limitation of the study | 100 |
| 5.5 Future Research | 100 |
| 5.6 Conclusion..... | 102 |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| REFERENCES | 103 |
|-------------------------|-----|



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Pages |
|--|-------|
| Table 2.1 The Demarcation of Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)..... | 19 |
| Table 2.2 Summary of TPB studies (Year 2007 till Year 2016)..... | 23 |
| Table 2.3 Prominent Studies on Predictors of Donor Behavioural Intention (Year 2000 -2015)..... | 29 |
| Table 2.4 Summaries of Research Objectives and Hypotheses Development. | 38 |
| Table 3.1 Number of Questionnaire Distributed..... | 44 |
| Table 3.2 Overview of Measurement Items of the Study and Reliability from the Previous Study | 47 |
| Table 3.3 Items of Demographic Information | 50 |
| Table 3.4 Items of Alumni Donor Behavioural Intention | 51 |
| Table 3.5 Items of Attitude Towards Donor Behaviour | 51 |
| Table 3.6 Items of Peers Pressure | 52 |
| Table 3.7 Items of Religiosity..... | 53 |
| Table 3.8 Result of Pilot Test..... | 58 |
| Table 3.9 Rule of Thumb to Choose CB-SEM or PLS-SEM | 62 |
| Table 4.1 Summary of Participation and Response. | 68 |
| Table 4.2 Sample Size Recommendation in a PLS-SEM for a Statistical Power at 80% | 69 |
| Table 4.3 Summarises of the Respondent Profile | 77 |
| Table 4.4 Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity Reporting | 80 |
| Table 4.5 Loading and Cross Loading of Constructs..... | 82 |
| Table 4.6 Fornell-Larcker Criterion..... | 84 |
| Table 4.7 Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) Criterion..... | 84 |
| Table 4.8 Collinearity Assessment..... | 86 |
| Table 4.9 Path Coefficient Assessment..... | 87 |
| Table 4.10 Determination of Co-efficient (R^2) and Predictive Relevance (Q^2)..... | 89 |
| Table 4.11 Summarizes of Hypotheses and Result of the Research. | 89 |
| Table 5.1 Research Objectives and Hypotheses with Interpretation..... | 97 |

LIST OF FIGURE

| Figures | Pages |
|--|-------|
| Figure 2.1 Ajzen (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour..... | 20 |
| Figure 2.2 Theoretical Framework of the Study | 37 |
| Figure 3.1 G-Power Analysis for Sample Size | 42 |
| Figure 4.1 Gender of Respondents..... | 71 |
| Figure 4.2 Age of Respondents..... | 72 |
| Figure 4.3 Ethnic Groups of Respondents | 72 |
| Figure 4.4 Religion of Respondents..... | 73 |
| Figure 4.5 Education Level of Respondents | 74 |
| Figure 4.6 Marital Status of Respondents..... | 74 |
| Figure 4.7 Employment Status of Respondents | 75 |
| Figure 4.8 Year Graduated of Respondents | 76 |
| Figure 4.9 Household Income of Respondents | 77 |
| Figure 4.10 Measurement Model Result | 79 |



UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

LIST OF ABREBRIATIONS

| | |
|---------|---|
| AVE | Average Variance Explained |
| CB SEM | Covariance Based Structure Equation Modeling |
| CFA | Confirmatory Factor Analysis |
| HEA | Academic Affairs Department (Hal Ehwal Akademik) |
| HEP | Students Affair Department (Hal Ehwal Pelajar) |
| HTMT | Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio Criterion |
| PBC | Perceived Behavioural Control |
| PLS SEM | Partial Least Square Structure Equation Modeling |
| PPA | Student Development and Alumni (Pejabat Pembangunan Pelajar dan Alumni) |
| PTPTN | National Higher Education Fund Corporation (Perbadanan Tabung Pendidikan Tinggi Nasional) |
| SEM | Structure Equation Modeling |
| SBM | School of Business |
| SPSS | Statistical Package for the Social Sciences |
| TPB | Theory of Planned Behaviour |
| UUM | Universiti Utara Malaysia |
| VIF | Variance Inflation Factor |



UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

APPENDICES

| Appendices | Pages |
|--|-------|
| APPENDIX A1: SET OF QUESTIONNAIRE | 114 |
| APPENDIX A2: LETTER OF REQUESTING ALUMNI DATA..... | 121 |
| APPENDIX A3: RESULT FROM PLS-SEM..... | 122 |



CHAPTER 1

RESEARCH OVERVIEW

1.0 Introduction

This section delivers the fundamental information of the study. It begins with the background and issues of study followed by the problem statement. Research objective and questions are the next in the section of the chapter. Besides, it is including significance and scope of the research. The final point of this chapter covered the definition of the main terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Brand management is no longer a new practice for the profit-oriented organisation. Interestingly, today, in non-profit-oriented society such as universities, branding and brand management have become a major emphasis throughout the globe (Stone, 2016). A branding initiative such as consistent brand delivery through teaching, researchers and publications, employability, internalisation as well as providing an excellent conducive environment and had a strong bond with the community become major concerns of universities specifically in maintaining their ranking. University effort in sustaining and improving their ranking strongly associate to display favourable brand image and reputation (Kim, Kim, & An, 2003) and could position as a core competitive advantage in operating in today's challenging higher education environment.

Public universities in Malaysia faced a tight budget from the government thus demands universities to be more creative to maintain the competitive advantage such as on ranking requirement. Contrary to Western countries which have the alternative

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1996). Building strong brands. *New York: The Free.*
- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347–356.
- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81(3), 492.
- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347–356.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I., (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 52, 27–58.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1970), “The prediction of behavior from attitudinal and normative variables”, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 6, pp. 466-87.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allen, D. R., & Rao, T. R. (2000). *Analysis of customer satisfaction data: a comprehensive guide to multivariate statistical analysis in customer satisfaction, loyalty, and service quality research*. Milwaukee, Wis.: ASQ Quality Press
- Allport, G.W., 1935. Attitudes. in C.A. Murchinson (ed.), *A Handbook of Social Psychology*, Worcester, MA: Clark, University Press, pp 789-844.
- Alpizar, Francisco, Carlsson, Fredrik, Johansson-Stenman, Olof, 2008. Anonymity, reciprocity, and conformity: evidence from voluntary contributions to a national park in Costa Rica. *Journal of Public Economics* 92 (5–6), 1047–1060 June.
- Atuahene-Gima, Kwaku, Janet Y. Murray (2004) Antecedents and Outcomes of Marketing Strategy Comprehensiveness. *Journal of Marketing*: October 2004, Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 33-46.
- Baruch, Y., & Sang, K. J. C. (2012). Predicting MBA graduates’ donation behaviour to their alma mater. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(8), 808–825. <http://doi.org/10.1108/02621711211253268>
- Bearden William O, Netmeyer Richard G. (1999) *Handbook of marketing scales*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

- Becker, G. S. (1974). A theory of social interactions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 1063–1073.
- Becker, P. E., & Dhingra, P. H. (2001). Religious involvement and volunteering: Implications for civil society. *Sociology of Religion*, 62(November 1999), 315–335. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3712353>
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2010). A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* (Vol. 40). <http://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>
- Belfield, C. R., & Beney, a. P. (2000). What Determines Alumni Generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 8(1), 65–80. <http://doi.org/10.1080/096452900110300>
- Blue, C.L., Wilbur, J. and Marston-Scott, M. (2001), “Exercise among blue-collar workers: application of the theory of planned behavior”, *Research in Nursing&Health*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 481-93.
- Bock, G.W., Zmud, R.W., Kim, Y.G. and Lee, J.N. (2005), “Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 87-112.
- Bosnjak, M., Bochmann, V., & Hufschmidt, T. (2007). Dimensions of brand personality attributions: A person-centric approach in the German cultural context. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 35(3), 303–316.
- Burgoyne, C. B., Young, B., & Walker, C. M. (2005). Deciding to give to charity: A focus group study in the context of the household economy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 383-405.
- Chang, C. (2014). Guilt regulation: The relative effects of altruistic versus egoistic appeals for charity advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 43(3), 211–227.
- Cheung, C.-K., & Chan, C.-M. (2000). Social-cognitive factors of donating money to charity, with special attention to an international relief organization. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23(2), 241–253. [http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7189\(00\)00003-3](http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7189(00)00003-3)
- Chin, W. W. (2010). “How to Write Up and report PLS Analyses,” *Springer-Verlag*, pp. 655-690.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159.
- Cohen, R. T. (2006). Black College Alumni Giving: A Study of the Perceptions,

Attitudes, and Giving Behaviors of Alumni Donors at Selected Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(3), 200–220. <http://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ijea.2150030>

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*.

Contingency. (2010). *Transforming Education System*. Malaysia.

Cunningham, B., & Cochi-Ficano, C. (2002). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education: An empirical inquiry. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(3), 540–569.

Crosen, R. and Gneezy, U. (2009), “Gender differences in preferences”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 1-27.

De Vries, R.B., Van Den Hooff, B. and De Ridder, J. (2006), “Explaining knowledge sharing: the role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs”, *Communication Research*, Vol. 33, pp. 115-35.

DIAMANTOPOULOS, A. (2006) The error term in formative measurement models: interpretation and modeling implications. *Journal of Modeling in Management*, 1, 7.

Dvorak, T. and Toubman, S.R. (2013), “Are women more generous than men? Evidence from alumni donations”, *Eastern Economic Journal*, Vol. 39, pp. 121-131.

Eckel, C. C., Herberich, D. H., & Meer, J. (2014). A field experiment on directed giving at a public university. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 0, 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.04.007>

Ecklund, E. (2007). Religious Diversity and Community Volunteerism Among Asian Americans. *Journal For the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46, 233–244.

Eisend, M., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2013). Brand personality: A meta-analytic review of antecedents and consequences. *Marketing Letters*, 24(3), 205–216.

Fernandez, J., & Ibrahim, A. E. (2002). Introduction In A Giving Society? *The State of Philanthropy in Malaysia*. p.19.

Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, England : SAGE.

Foddy, W.H. (1994) *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theory and Practice in Social Research*. New Edition, *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, UK.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with

Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1) DOI: [10.2307/3151312](https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312)

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G * Power 3 : A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social , behavioral , and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191.
<http://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193146>
- Geisinger, Kurt F. (1994) *Psychological Assessment*, Vol 6(4), 304
312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.304> Special Section: Normative Assessment.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P.J., Ghramaleki, A.F., Morris, R.J. and Hood, R.W. Jr (2002). Muslim-Christian religious orientation scales: distinctions, correlations, and cross-cultural analysis in Iran and the United States, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 12, 69-91.
- Harrison, D. A., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Mapping the criterion space for expatriate success: task and relationship based performance, effort and adaptation. *The international journal of human resource management*, 18(8), 1454-1474.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis. *Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall*.
- Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *SAGE Publications*.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M. (2014). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., and Mena, J.A. (2012). “An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 414-433.
- HEA Graduate Studies and International. (2016). Number of Alumni. Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.
- HEP Alumni Centre. (2016). Number of Alumni. Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.
- Hemsley-Brown, J. (2012). ‘The best education in the world’: Reality, repetition or cliché? International students' reasons for choosing an English university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(8), 1005–1022.

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-based Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43 (1), 115-135
DOI: 10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8
- High, R. (2000). Important factors in designing statistical power analysis studies. *Computing News*, Summer issue, 14-15.
- Holdcroft, B. (2006). Review of Research What Is Religiosity? *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 10(1), 89–103.
- Hoyt, J. (2004). Understanding Alumni Giving: Theory and Predictors of Donor Status. *44th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research & Management Studies*. Retrieved from <http://www3.airweb.org/forum04/330.pdf>
- Hunter, C., Jones, E., & Boger, C. (1999). A study of the relationship between alumni giving and selected characteristics of alumni donors of Livingstone college, NC. *Journal of Black Studies*, 29(4), 523–539.
- Hyungsuk Choo , Kwangho Ahn , James F. Petrick , (2016) "An integrated model of festival revisit intentions: Theory of planned behavior and festival quality/satisfaction", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 28 Iss: 4, pp.818 – 838 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2014-0448>
- Iskhakova, L., Hilbert, A., & Hoffmann, S. (2016). An Integrative Model of Alumni Loyalty—an Empirical Validation Among Graduates From German and Russian Universities. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 28(2), 129–163. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2015.1006490>
- James H. McAlexander, H. F. K. (2012). Building communities of philanthropy in higher education: contextual influences. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21(May), 3–12. <http://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm>
- Johnson, J.W., Grimm, P.E., 2010. Communal and exchange relationship perceptions as separate constructs and their role in motivation to donate. *J. Consum. Psychol.* 20, 282–294.
- Kashif, M., Sarifuddin, S., & Hassan, A. (2015). Charity donation: intentions and behaviour. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 90–102. <http://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-07-2013-0110>
- Kasri, R. A. (2013). Giving behaviors in Indonesia: motives and marketing implications for Islamic charities. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 4, 306–324. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-05-2011-0044>
- Khodayarifard, M. Ghobari-Bonab, B. Shokoohi-Yekta, M. Faghihi, A. Beh-Pajooh,

- A. Afrooz, G. Abedini, Y. and Paknejad, M. (2013). Developing a Religiosity Scale for Iranian College Student, *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 82, 432-435.
- Keating, B., Pitts, R., & Appel, D. (1981). United Way contributions: coercion, charity or economic self-interest? *Southern Economic Journal*., 47(January), 816–823.
- Kim, H., Kim, W., & An, A. (2003). The effect of consumer-based brand equity on firms. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 335-51.
- Kim, Y.J., Chun, J.U. and Song, J. (2009), “Investigating the role of attitude in technology acceptance from an attitude strength perspective”, *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 67-77.
- Kiriakidis, S. (2015). Theory of Planned Behaviour: the Intention-Behaviour Relationship and the Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC) Relationship with Intention and Behaviour. *International Journal of Strategic Innovative Marketing*, 3, 40–51. <http://doi.org/10.15556/IJSIM.02.03.004>
- Knabe, A. (2012). Applying Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior to a Study of Online Course Adoption. *Public Relations Education*, 186.
- Knowles, S. R., Hyde, M. K., & White, K. M. (2012). Predictors of Young People’s Charitable Intentions to Donate Money: An Extended Theory of Planned Behavior Perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(9), 2096–2110. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00932.x>
- Kottasz, R., 2004b. Differences in the donor behaviour characteristics of young affluent males and females: Empirical evidence from Britain. *Voluntas, International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations* 15 (2), 181 – 203.
- Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities Robert. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 38(1), 607–610. <http://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Lee, L., Piliavin, J., A., Call, V., R., 1999. Giving time, money, and blood: Similarities and Differences. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62 (3), 276-291.
- Lin, H.F. and Lee, G.G. (2004), “Perceptions of senior managers toward knowledge-sharing behaviour”, *Management Decision*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 108-25.
- Loch, A., Hilmi, I. N., Mazam, Z., Pillay, Y., & Choon, D. S. K. (2010). Differences in attitude towards cadaveric organ donation: Observations in a multiracial Malaysian society. *Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 17(3), 236–243.
- Loveday, C. H. (2012). An Analysis of the Variables Associated with Alumni Giving and Employee Giving to a Mid- Sized Southeastern University.

- Mathew, S., M., King M., R., Glynn S., A., Dietz S., Caswell S., and Schreiber G.,(2007). Opinions about donating blood among those who never gave and those who stopped: a focus group assessment. *Transfusion*. 47 (April), 729-735.
- Malaysian Education Blueprint (September 2012). *Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025*.
- Maniam, P., & Zolkepli, I. A. (2015). GENERATION Y AS ORGAN DONOR : INFORMATIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE INFLUENCE OF SOCIALIZATION AGENTS ON ATTITUDE TOWARDS ORGAN (pp. 1–19). *2nd International Conference on Media, Communication and Culture (ICMCC2015)*.
- Masud, M. M., Al-Amin, A. Q., Junsheng, H., Ahmed, F., Yahaya, S. R., Akhtar, R., & Banna, H. (2016). Climate change issue and theory of planned behaviour: Relationship by empirical evidence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 113, 613–623. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.11.080>
- McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(3), 310–321.
- Meer, J. (2011). Brother, can you spare a dime? Peer pressure in charitable solicitation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7–8), 926–941. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.026>
- Metawie, M., & Mostafa, R. H. A. (2015). Predictors of Egyptian University Students ' Charitable Intentions : Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior Business Administration Department Ain Shams University Business Administration Department Ain Shams University. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(8), 204–215.
- Min Teah and Michael Lwin, I. C. (2014). Moderating role of religious beliefs on attitudes towards charities and motivation to donate. *Journal of Global Mobility*, 2(3), 343–374. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09564230910978511>
- Mokhlis, S. (2009). Relevancy and Measurement of Religiosity in Consumer Behavior Research. *International Business Research*, 2(3), 75–84. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v2n3p75>
- Morgan, R. A., & Donahoo, S. (2014). Factors that lead Millennial alumni to donate to their alma mater.
- Nigg, C. R., Lippke, S., & Maddock, J. E. (2009). Factorial invariance of the theory of planned behavior applied to physical activity across gender, age, and ethnic groups. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10(2), 219–225. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.09.005>

- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: *McGraw-Hill*.
- Nur Zainie, A. H., Rohaida, B., & Narehan, H. (2013). Factors influencing intention to donate blood: The application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(4), 344–348. <http://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2013.V3.259>
- O’Cass, M. Lee, W. & Siahtiri, V. (2013). Can Islam and status consumption live together in the house of fashion clothing?, *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 17(4), 440-459.
- Okunade, A., & Berl, R. (1997). Determinants of charitable giving of business school alumni. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(2), 201–214.
- Ozer, A., Ekerbicer, H. C., Celik, M., & Nacar, M. (2010). Knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of officials of religion about organ donation in Kahramanmaras, an Eastern Mediterranean City of Turkey. *Transplantation Proceedings*, 42(9), 3363–3367. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2010.08.035>
- Pentecost, R., Andrews, L., 2010. Differences between students and non student’s willingness to donate to a charitable organization. *Int. J. Nonprofit Voluntary Sect. Marketing* 15 (2), 122–136.
- Plummer, J. T. (1985). Brand personality: A strategic concept for multinational advertising. Marketing educators' conference (pp. 1–31). New York: *Young & Rubicam*.
- Popp, N., & Barrett, H. (2016). Examining the Relationship between Age of Fan Identification and Donor Behavior at an NCAA Division I Athletics Department. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 9, 107–123.
- QS Top Universities. (16 September, 2016). Retrieved from Universiti Utara Malaysia: <http://www.topuniversities.com/universities/universiti-utara-malaysia-uum>
- Rauschnabel, P. A., Krey, N., Babin, B. J., & Ivens, B. S. (2016). Brand management in higher education: The University Brand Personality Scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3077–3086. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.023>
- Riecken, G. and Yavas, U. (2005), “The attitudes of donors and non-donors to the March of Dimes charity in the United States: a case study in non-profit marketing”, *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 572-581.
- Roberts, J.A. and Roberts, C.R. (2012), “Money matters: does the symbolic presence of money affect charitable giving and attitudes among adolescents?”, *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 329-336.

- Robinson, J. P.; Shaver, P. R.; Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes. (Measures of social psychological attitudes, Vol. 1). New York, NY: *Academic*
- Rohayati, M. I., Najdi, Y., & Williamson, J. C. (2016). Philanthropic fundraising of higher education institutions: A review of the Malaysian and Australian perspectives. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 8(6).
<http://doi.org/10.3390/su8060541>
- Ryu, S., Ho, S.H. and Han, I. (2003), “Knowledge sharing behavior of physicians in hospitals”, *Expert Systems with Applications*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 113-22.
- Sargent, A. (1999), “Charitable giving: towards a model of donor behaviour”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 40, pp. 215-238.
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Trust and relationship commitment in the United Kingdom voluntary sector: Determinants of donor behavior. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21(8), 613–635. <http://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20021>
- Sarstedt, M. and Mooi, E.A. (2014), A Concise Guide to Market Research: The Process, Data, and Methods Using IBM SPSS Statistics, *Springer*, Berlin.
- Schlegelmilch, B.B., Love, A. and Diamantopoluos, A. (1997), “Response to different charity appeals: the impact of donor characteristics on the amount of donations”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 8, pp. 548-560.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2013). Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach. *Jhon Wiley & Sons Ltd.*
- Sen, A. K. (1978). Rational fools: a critique of the behavioural foundations of economic theory. In H. Harris (Ed.), *Scientific models and men* (pp. 317–344). London: *Oxford University Press*.
- Shaker, G. G., Borden, V. M. H., & Kienker, B. L. (2016). Workplace Giving in Universities: A U.S. Case Study at Indiana University. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(1), 87–111.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014565468>
- Shang, Jen, Croson, Rachel, Reed, Americus, 2004. “I” Give, But “We” Give More: The Impact of Identity and the Mere Social Information Effect on Donation Behavior. *University of Pennsylvania. Manuscript*.
- Sheth, J. N., Mittal, B., and Newman, B. I., 1999. Consumer Behaviour; Consumer Behaviour, and Beyond. *The Dryden Press*, Orlando Fl.
- Showers, V. E., Showers, L. S., Beggs, J. M., & Cox, J. E. (2011). Charitable Giving Expenditures and the Faith Factor. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 70(1), 152–186. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.2010.00767.x>
- Slater, F. Stanley, Atuahene-Gima, Kwaku (2004), CONDUCTING SURVEY

RESEARCH IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT, in (ed.) *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management (Research Methodology in Strategy and Management, Volume 1)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.227 – 249

Simmons, W. and Emanuele, R. (2007), “Male-female giving differentials: are women more altruistic?”, *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 534-550.

Smith, J. R. (2007). *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 363-386., (August 2006), 363–386.

Smith, H., & Smith, S. (2012). Peer Pressure. *Research in Public Policy*, Summer(14), 1.

Smith, J. R., & McSweeney, A. (2007). Charitable Giving: The Effectiveness of a Revised Theory of Planned Behaviour Model in Predicting Donating Intentions and Behaviour. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 17(July 2007), 363–386. <http://doi.org/10.1002/casp>

Stebbins, E., & Hartman, R. L. (2013). Charity brand personality : can smaller charitable organizations leverage their brand ’ s personality to influence giving, 215(August), 203–215. <http://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm>

Steinman, R. B. (2012). Brand Personality, Brand Transgression and Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Business and Commerce*, 2(1), 76–83.

Stephenson, M. T., Morgan, S. E., Roberts-Perez, S. D., Harrison, T., Afifi, W., & Long, S. D. (2008). The Role of Religiosity, Religious Norms, Subjective Norms, and Bodily Integrity in Signing an Organ Donor Card. *Health Communication*, 23(October), 436–447. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10410230802342119>

Stangor, C. (2010). *Research methods in social psychology* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Stone, N. K. (9 Oct, 2016). The Role of Brand in the Nonprofit Sector. Retrieved from Stanford Social Innovation Review: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_role_of_brand_in_the_nonprofit_sector

Sura, S., Ahn, J., & Lee, O. (2016). Factors influencing intention to donate via social network site (SNS): From Asian’s perspective. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(1), 164–176. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.04.007>

Sun, P.Y.T. and Scott, J.L. (2005), “An investigation of barriers to knowledge transfer”, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 75-90.

Sung,M., &Yang, S. (2008). Toward themodel of university image: The influence of brand personality, external prestige, and reputation. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 20(4), 357–376

- The Star Online. (4 Nov, 2014). Retrieved from PTPTN reduces loan amount by 5% and 15%: <http://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2014/11/04/ptptn-reduces-loan-amount-by-5-and-15/>
- Tohidinia, Z., & Mosakhani, M. (2010). Knowledge sharing behaviour and its predictors. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 110(4), 611–631. <http://doi.org/10.1108/02635571011039052>
- UUM Official Website. (27 7, 2016). Retrieved from UUM Official Website: <http://www.uum.edu.my/index.php/en/about-uum>
- University of Oxford. (08 October, 2016). Retrieved from Finance and funding: <https://www.ox.ac.uk/about/organisation/finance-and-funding?wssl=1>
- Van der Linden, S. (2011). Charitable Intent: A Moral or Social Construct? A Revised Theory of Planned Behavior Model. *Current Psychology*, 30(4), 355–374. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-011-9122-1>
- Verhaert, G. A., & Van den Poel, D. (2011). Empathy as added value in predicting donation behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1288–1295. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.12.024>
- Voorhees, C., Brady, M., Calantone, R., & Ramirez, E. (2016). Discriminant Validity Testing in Marketing: An Analysis, Causes for Concern, and Proposed Remedies. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44 (1), 119-134 DOI: 10.1007/s11747-015-0455-4
- Wilkes, R. E., Burnett, J. J. & Howell, R. D. (1986). On the meaning and measurement of religiosity, *Consumer Research Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14, 47-56.
- Worthington, E. L., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J. T., Ripley, J. S. et al. (2003). The religious commitment inventory-10: development, refinement, and validation of a brief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 84-96.
- Yoo, J. H., & Harrison, W. B. (1989). Altruism in the 'market' for giving and receiving: a case of higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 8, 367–376