



The Effects Of Corporate Reputation Perception On Organizational Performance: A Study In Private Hospitals

*

Dr. Emine ET OLTULU

Orcid No: 0000-0002-1180-4157

ABSTRACT

In today's world, reputation which is an important element for both public institutions and private sector companies is an abstract concept that means prestige and to be respected. Corporate reputations are seen as an abstract value place in the minds of partners, employees, customers, suppliers and in short all shareholders of a business. Reputation is a significant factor in enabling customer satisfaction and increasing market share. Therefore, reputation comes in the first place for companies.

The purpose of this study is to measure the effects of corporate reputation on organizational performance. In this study, reputation and corporate reputation terms are researched and performance and organizational performance concepts are studied. In the last section, the relationship between corporate reputation and organizational performance is analyzed also in this section which is the application part of this research, in light of the findings based on literature review, a questionnaire was conducted with 50 managers working at managerial positions at 8 different private hospitals to find out more about the effects of corporate reputation perception on organizational performance. Collected data was analyzed through SPSS software program. According to analysis results, answers regarding the effects of corporate reputation perception on organizational performance were evaluated.

Keywords: Corporate reputation perception, organizational performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations must create a good reputation in order to reach their goals and to attain reputation in the eyes of the stakeholders and society, and this obtained reputation needs being managed and sustained in a correct way. In the environments where the competitiveness increased as an important result of globalization, companies are looking for possible way to make difference and help them gain value in their products and services. At this point, corporate reputation is seen as a significant change maker tool and it is given importance. Corporate reputation is of great importance in terms of providing a competitive advantage for businesses. The purpose of this study is to measure the effects of corporate reputation on organizational performance. In this study, reputation and corporate reputation terms are researched and then performance and organizational performance concepts are studied. In the last section, the relationship between corporate reputation and organizational performance is analyzed also in the last section which is the application part of this research, in light of the findings based on literature review, a questionnaire was conducted with 50 managers working at managerial positions at 8 different private hospitals to find out more about the effects of corporate reputation perception on organizational performance. Collected data was analyzed through SPSS software program. According to analysis results, answers regarding the effects of corporate reputation perception on organizational performance were evaluated.

2. CONCEPTUAL FEMEWORK

2.1. Corporate Reputation

2.1.1. Reputation Concept

Reputation involves the perspectives of both organization employees and customers who are projected as external partners. Reputation is an Arabic word and it means being respected, the case of being valuable and credible, credibility and prestige. There are numerous definitions for reputation in the literature. Some of these are as follows: "Reputation is an abstract entity which shows the way how an organization is perceived by its employees and customers (Bedük, 2012: 108). Reputation is the collective evaluation related to the ability of providing invaluable results to partner organizations' representative groups (Fombrun vd., 2000: 243). Reputation is the positive and negative impressions of the public about the organization. Reputation expresses the public's positive or negative value judgements about the individuals or the organization (Bedük, 2012: 108-109). Reputation is the cumulative reflection of past work experiences and observed individual identifications (Markwick and Fill, 1997: 398). In other words, reputation is defined as a collective system regarding subjective beliefs among the members of a social group (Bromley, 2001: 316).

Reputation matters. It influences the attitudes and behaviours not only of existing and potential investors, customers, employees, and suppliers, but also those of regulators and the voice of local communities, pressure groups and media. Stakeholders not only have the ability to influence corporate reputation, they are its arbiters too (Neely vd., 2002: 1).

As of today, reputation has become an important asset that the organizations cannot give up on. It provides organizations with such advantages of overcoming crisis easily and acquiring new customers. Organizations gain reputation at the end of a long and difficult process. Alongside with this difficulty, they might lose it in a short time too. In this sense, sustaining reputation is as important as acquiring it.

2.1.2. Corporate Reputation

Corporate reputation, as a result of recently realized rapid changes in the business environment, has become a concept which is slightly increasing importance every day and even assumed to have a determining role in organizational sustainability. In a general expression, corporate reputation concept is the whole of public opinion, judiciary and thought about an organization, and the belief against an organization and the credibility. In other words, corporate reputation can be expressed as a set of all types of perceptions for organization (Eroğlu and Başak, 2012: 1).

Corporate reputation is the total of assumptions and opinions of organization environment regarding the business place. Corporate reputation concept expresses emotional reactions such as good or bad, and weak or strong by organization employees, customers, investors and the general public towards the organization itself (Fombrun, 1996: 37). While it takes a long time to gain, it might be lost all of sudden. The components of corporate reputation are divided by Charles Fombrun into six as follows: "product and service (to provide high quality products and services, to give value for money, to support innovation and their product), vision and leadership (to capture market opportunities, to have a clear vision for the future, to have excellent leadership skills), working environment (to provide a nice place to work, to have good employees), emotional appeal (reliable, honest, and arousing good feeling), corporate social responsibility (to be sensitive to the environment, to avoid damaging the environment, to promote the good things), and financial performance (strong profitability, low risk, strong growth potential, to perform better than its competitors)" (Bilbil, 2013: 163).

Corporate reputation is the worth in total market share of the trust created by the company. It is an expression of the company's intangible values. It is a prerequisite for being an institution liked and

appreciated by society. The importance of reputation can only be understood when it is lost (Kadıbeşegil, 2006: 55). The reputation of an institution or organization is among the most important values for the institution. Good reputation does not only help an organization gain an economic profit, but also overcome a crisis easily with the help of committed employees and customer.

2.2. Organizational Performance

2.2.1. Performance Concept

Either they manufacture goods or provide services; organizations are settled on realizing a number of tasks and goals. The degree of organizational purposes such as efficiency, productivity and profitability etc. in resource utilization has an important role in deciding to what extent the organization behave according to pre-set performance criteria or standards (Şimşek and Çelik, 2013: 131). Nowadays as a result of rapidly increasing competitiveness, business places need to analyze themselves in the process of product and service production and compare themselves with other businesses. In this comparison process, institutions keep the track of key indicators such as quality, cost, and delivery speed which represents organizational performance, they compare their overall performance in these areas with other businesses, and they endeavor to be multiplexed to the desired level of overall organizational performance criteria (Demir and Taşkın, 2012: 2).

For managers, it is important to ensure that the employees perform at the desired level. To make sure employees are working at the level expected of them and to evaluate the work of employees in the organization seriously, managers realize a systematic performance assessment process (Robbins vd., 2013: 176).

2.2.2. Definition of Performance

Performance can be defined as the results obtained by an employee through carried out works or duties in a certain limit of time (Şimşek and Öge, 2014: 295). According to Akal, “performance, in general meaning, is a qualitative or quantitative term which is obtained as a result of purposeful and planned activities. This result can be explained absolutely or relatively such as an athlete’s individual ranking or ranking in general order in high jump or production ratio of a planned production. For determining performance, the result of the performed activities must be considered. Value is a measurement tool used for explaining an asset or fact coming out as a result of an activity in an understandable, explicable, and reduced in specifications and increased in objectivity” (Akal, 2011: 17).

2.2.3. Organizational Performance

Organizational performance is the expression of the degree of fulfillment of business objectives or tasks obtained after a certain period of output/outcome (Akal, 2011: 15-16). Organizational performance, which is the achievement indicator of an organization’s activities, is the sum of each employee’s individual performance (Vural and Coşkun, 2007: 163). With the advent of globalization and rapid change in the world, it is observed that organizations’ understanding of competition is changing or they have to be in a position to change it. Today, organizations have to keep up with quality, innovation, flexibility, speed and distinctness features of competition dimensions. In this sense, it is important to use tangible and intangible assets owned by the organization in such a way that the organization obtains a competitive advantage by having these resources (Akgemci, 2008: 478).

Organizations founded with the goal of manufacturing goods and services necessary for human needs are in contact with their environments in terms of input and output. Organizations can perform high and sustain for longer periods of time when this interaction continue in a good way. In this context,

performance values of those who work in the organization and their competencies are placed among the significant indicators of organizational effectiveness and efficiency (Göksel, 2013: 2).

2.2.4. Organizational Performance Assessment

Organizational performance assessment is defined as quantitative indicators used to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of business operations, while performance assessment system is defined as the set of indicators used to measure an organization's activities' efficiency and its effectiveness (Neely vd., 1995: 80).

The companies have so far developed various performance measurement systems for assessment of their organizational performance. In initial times, the companies only used financial measures but recent years shows that they use and develop non-financial performance measurement models. The financial performance measurements are financial methods based on accounting data and they are generally conducted based on the principles of efficiency and profitability. Cost analysis, volume-profit analysis, budgets, standard costs are examples of.

Financial objectives of the organizations are usually operating income; the profitability of capital, and economic value added which are measurable/digitized goals (Akgemci, 2008: 53). Non-financial performance measures are classified as the following (Koçel, 2014: 449-450):

a) Indicators related to customers (customer satisfaction, the number of new customers, customer profitability, et al.),

b) Indicators related to corporate learning and innovation (employee skills, employee satisfaction, indicators related to information technology, the motivation of employees to the awards, the number and amount of turnover and absenteeism rates),

c) Performance indicators related to internal processes (quality, new products, production error rate etc.)

The basic criteria that can be used to measure organizational performance in general can be summarized as follows (Quoted by Şimşek and Öge, 2014: 297):

- Quality
- Productivity
- Profitability
- Cost
- Innovation
- Customer satisfaction
- Employee satisfaction

It is underlined that organizational performance assessment serves many purposes in the field of human resources. One of them is that it helps human resources managers on the issues of promotion, transfer and dismissal. These assessments also indicated the needs of training and development. They also demonstrate employees' ability and skills for the development of solution-generating programs. Finally, it provides feedback indicating how employees see their organizations performance (Welch, 2013: 565). At the same time, a decision about humans is a special condition which requires individual rules for each person. These decisions have the greatest impact on the performance of the organization (Drucker, 2012: 30).

2.3. Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance Relationship

The relationship between corporate reputation and organizational performance in business life has been a topic of interest and controversy for more than half a century. Moreover; company's reputation

affects the company performance in economy ways. Together with the technology employed, they determine transaction and transformation costs that make up total costs (North, 1991: 120).

The quality of manufactured goods and provided services affects corporate reputation and it also influences or determines employee performance. Having a good reputation in the eyes of the society is a sign of high quality and stronger performance. Therefore, employees are successful to the extent that they satisfy the customers. Positive customer feedback and high customer satisfaction indicate higher performance and the gained reputation as a result of this (Quoted by Izgar, 2012: 168).

In today organizations, protection and development of corporate reputation is crucial in learning, developing and growing. It also becomes prerequisite for Continuous learning, high job performance and organizational activity (Barutçugil, 2004: 334).

Corporate reputation provides benefits to many aspects of the businesses. For instance, when investors increase the company's market share, customers pay a high price to buy the products of a reputable company (Fombrun, 1996: 39). Employees might prefer to work with organizations with higher reputation –when all other conditions are the same– due to the cost advantages. Suppliers tend to prefer companies with a positive reputation regarding the dangers of the contract. When such kinds of organizations lead in decreasing operating and monitoring costs, it gives the opportunity to suppliers to concern less (Robert and Dowling, 2002: 1079). These advantages of corporate reputations also help organizational performance to increase.

3. MODEL PRACTICE

3.1.Method

3.1.1.Research Objective

The purpose of this study is to research the relationship between corporate reputation and organizational performance. For this goal, private hospital managers operating in Konya province were contacted in order to measure the effects of corporate reputation on organizational performance and a questionnaire was conducted with 50 managers who are working at 8 different private hospitals.

3.1.2. Sample

The research sample is consisted for private hospital managers in Konya province. The reason for that is only 8 of the contacted hospitals responded back. A questionnaire was carried out as a data collection tool and 50 questionnaires were administered. Research questionnaires are consisted of 3 parts.

3.1.3. Scales

In the first part, 6 items regarding the demographics (age range, education level, length of service in the profession, the number of hospital staff, the hospital's bed capacity, and position in the organization) were asked.

3.1.4. Corporate Reputation Scale

In the second part, corporate reputation scale consisting of 22 items and adapted to Turkey by Altıntaş in 2005 developed by Charles J. Fombrun was used. The questionnaire was taken from İrfan Yurt's Master's thesis (Yurt, 2012: 92). Collected data was evaluated by 5-point Likert scale. Statements in the scale are as follows: 1= strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree. 5-point Likert scale is consisted of 22 items and 7 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are as follows: Having general information about institution, Management Quality, Product and Services, Leadership, Difference, Reliability, Social Responsibility.

3.1.5. Organizational Performance Scale

In the third part, organizational performance scale developed by Latinen and consisting of 10 items was used. The questionnaire was taken from Umut Avcı' s Doctorate thesis (Avcı, 2005:163). Collected data was evaluated by 5-point Likert scale. Statements in the scale are as follows: 1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree. 5-point Likert scale is consisted of 10 items and 2 sub-dimensions. There is a meaningful and positive correlation between two dimensions of organizational performance (financial performance dimension and non-financial performance dimension).

Study Method: This study provided frequencies based on data. After the provision of this data, data was tested with Normal Distribution Compliance Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test in order to decide on which test to use. As a result of data normality and homogeneous variance, Parametric Tests applicability was decided to conduct. To investigate the differences between the averages, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was used. For correlations Pearson Correlation coefficient was used while for reliability analysis Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was used.

3.2. Findings

3.2.1. Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive and meaningful correlation between corporate reputation and organizational performance.

		Organizational Performance
Corporate Reputation	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	0,706
	p value	0,000

Pearson Correlation test was used for the correlation between corporate reputation and organizational performance, and it was found that there was a positive 70,6% correlation. As p value is $0,000 < 0,05$, it is possible to suggest that there is a meaningful correlation between Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance.

Hypothesis 2: Corporate reputation perspectives of research participants are positive.

One-sample t-test

	N	Average	Std Deviation
Corporate Reputation	50	4,1773	0,56087

	Test Value 4					
	T	Degrees of Freedom	P value	Average Difference	95% Confidence Interval For The Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Corporate Reputation	2,235	49	0,015	0,17727	0,0179	0,3367

Corporate reputation perspectives of research participants are positive ($p=0,015 < 0,05$).

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive and meaningful correlation between 7 dimensions of corporate reputation and 2 dimensions of organizational performance.

	Having general information about institution	Management Quality	Product Services and	Leadership	Difference	Reliability	Social Responsibility
Financial Performance Dimension	0,281	0,372	0,396	0,311	0,449	0,401	0,481
p-value	0,048	0,008	0,004	0,028	0,011	0,004	0,000
Non-Financial Performance Dimension	-0,037(**)	0,605	0,681	0,650	0,659	0,677	0,797
P- value	0,797	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000

Pearson Correlation test was used for the correlation between social responsibility dimension of corporate reputation and financial performance dimension of organizational performance, and a positive 48,1% correlation was found as a result of this test. As p value is $0,000 < 0,05$, it is possible to suggest that there is a meaningful correlation between social responsibility dimension of corporate reputation and financial performance dimension of organizational performance.

Pearson Correlation test was used for the correlation between having general information about institution dimension of corporate reputation and non-financial performance dimension of organizational performance, and a negative %3,7% correlation was found as a result of this test. As p value is $0,797 > 0,05$, it is possible to suggest that there is a meaningful correlation between having general information about institution dimension of corporate reputation and non-financial performance dimension of organizational performance.

All correlations among the other dimensions are meaningful and positive.

Hypothesis 4: Is there a difference between age variance groups according to Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance scale.

		N	Average	Std. Deviation	F-test Value	P-Value
Corporate Reputation	18-29	4	87,500	14,062	0,835	0,482
	30-43	24	90,041	2,508		
	44-55	20	95,200	1,645		
	56 and above	2	90,000	10,000		
Organizational Performance	18-29	4	39,000	3,109	0,925	0,436
	30-43	24	39,541	1,058		
	44-55	20	41,800	0,907		
	56 and above	2	40,500	3,500		

According to findings, as the p value is $0,482 > 0,05$ in the table above, it was found that age variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among age groups with regards to corporate reputation) on corporate reputation. Again in the same table, as p value is $0,436 > 0,05$ it was found that age variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among age groups with regards to organizational performance) on organizational performance.

Hypothesis 5: Is there a difference between education level groups according to Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance scale.

	Education Level	N	Average	Std. Deviation	F-test Value	P-Value
Corporate	High School	6	94,333	5,327	0,132	0,877

Reputation	University	32	91,468	2,327	0,826	0,444
	Master and above	12	91,833	3,007		
Organizational Performance	High School	6	41,666	1,145		
	University	32	39,781	0,779		
	Master and above	12	41,583	1,856		

According to findings, as the p value is $0,877 > 0.05$ in the table above, it was found that education level variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among education level groups with regards to corporate reputation) on corporate reputation. Again in the same table, as p value is $0,826 > 0.05$ it was found that education level variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among education levels with regards to organizational performance) on organizational performance.

Hypothesis 6: Is there a difference between hospital employee numbers according to Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance scale.

	Hospital Employee Numbers	N	Average	Std. Deviation	F-test Value	P-Value
Corporate Reputation	51-100	3	87,500	5,238	1,047	0,381
	101-150	12	90,041	3,980		
	151-250	20	95,200	2,345		
	250 and above	15	90,000	3,544		
Organizational Performance	51-100	3	41,333	2,185	0,275	0,843
	101-150	12	40,083	1,469		
	151-250	20	39,900	0,940		
	250 and above	15	41,266	1,491		

According to findings, as the p value is $0,381 > 0.05$ in the table above, it was found that hospital employee numbers have no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among hospital employee numbers with regards to corporate reputation) on corporate reputation. Again in the same table, as p value is $0,275 > 0.05$ it was found that hospital employee numbers variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among hospital employee numbers with regards to organizational performance) on organizational performance.

Hypothesis 7: Is there a difference between hospital bed capacity according to Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance scale.

	Hospital Bed Capacity	N	Average	Std. Deviation	F-test Value	P-Value
Corporate Reputation	30 and below	8	82,250	5,759	2,695	0,043
	30-60	23	95,956	1,767		
	60-90	5	97,200	4,465		
	90-120	7	87,000	3,970		
	150 and above	7	90,714	6,014		
Organizational Performance	30 and below	8	39,750	2,059	3,500	0,014
	30-60	23	40,956	0,758		
	60-90	5	42,800	2,332		

	90-120	7	35,285	1,614		
	150 and above	7	43,000	1,690		

According to findings, as the p value is $0,043 < 0.05$ in the table above, it was found that hospital bed capacity has an effect (or in other words, there is a difference among hospital bed capacity with regards to corporate reputation) on corporate reputation. Tukey was used in order to find from which group this effect is stemmed, and it was found that this is rooted from 30 and below and 30-60 groups.

Again in the same table, as p value is $0,014 > 0.05$ it was found that hospital bed capacity variable has an effect (or in other words, there is a difference among hospital bed capacity with regards to organizational performance) on organizational performance. Tukey was used in order to find from which group this effect is stemmed, and it was found that this is rooted from 90-120 group and other three groups. 90-120 groups have the least organizational performance score.

Hypothesis 8: Is there a difference between hospital working duration according to Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance scale.

	Hospital Working Duration	N	Average	Std. Deviation	F-test Value	P Value
Corporate Reputation	Less than 5 years	5	90,400	6,675	0,643	0,638
	5-8 years	16	89,125	3,771		
	8-14 years	16	95,875	1,823		
	14-20	11	90,818	3,895		
	More than 20 years	2	92,000	12,000		
Organizational Performance	Less than 5 years	5	39,000	2,323	1,010	0,413
	5-8 years	16	38,875	1,244		
	8-14 years	16	41,437	1,056		
	14-20	11	41,363	1,383		
	More than 20 years	2	43,500	6,500		

According to findings, as the p value is $0,638 > 0.05$ in the table above, it was found that hospital working duration has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among hospital working durations with regards to corporate reputation) on corporate reputation. Again in the same table, as p value is $0,413 > 0.05$ it was found that hospital working duration variable has no effect (or in other words, there is no difference among hospital working durations with regards to organizational performance) on organizational performance.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Being reputable is morally a necessity for both individuals and institutions. Feeling important in the society from the perspectives of individuals and organizations, and having some advantages in the environment they live in is only possible with the help of reputation. When strong organizations are observed, they manage to be afloat with their mutual relations by using various credits even when they experience economic problems and at crisis times. Reputation, which is one of the most significant assets of organizations, is a value that is earned through long time but can be lost at a short span of time. Therefore, it is important to protect this credibility and not to lose the reputation earned. Having a positive credibility in the eyes of the society for an organization is the indicator for high quality and better performance. Customer satisfaction levels of organizations are at the same time an

important indicator of their achievements. So, organizations are successful as long as they satisfy their customers, partners and the community.

This study was conducted with the purpose of researching the effects of corporate reputations on organizational performance involving 50 managers working at managerial positions in 8 private hospitals in Konya province. According to research findings, it was concluded that there is a meaningful correlation between Corporate Reputation and Organizational Performance and corporate reputation perspectives of research participants are positive.

It is possible to suggest that there is a meaningful correlation between social responsibility dimension of corporate reputation and financial performance dimension of organizational performance. On the other hand, it was found out that there is not meaningful correlation between having general information about institution dimension of corporate reputation and non-financial performance dimension of organizational performance.

It was detected that age variable and education level has no effect on organizational performance, and that hospital employee numbers have no effect on organizational performance. It was also concluded that hospital bed capacity has not effect on corporate reputation and organizational performance. Consequently, it is important to note that working duration at hospital has no effect on corporate reputation.

SOURCE

- Akal, Z. (2011). *İşletmelerde Performans Ölçüm ve Denetimi Çok Yönlü Performans Göstergeleri*, 7. Basım, Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayınları no:473, Ankara,
- Akgemci, T. (2008). *Stratejik Yönetim*, 2.baskı, Nisan, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Avcı, U. (2005). “İşletmelerde Örgütsel Öğrenme - Örgütsel Performans İlişkisi: Konaklama İşletmelerinde Örgütsel Öğrenme – Örgütsel Performans İlişkisine Yönelik İnceleme”, Doktora Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Barutçugil, İ. (2004). *Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*, Mart 2004, Kariyer Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Bedük, A. (2012). *Karşılaştırmalı İşletme Yönetim Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Atlas Yayınları, 3. Basım Konya.
- Bilbil, E.; Sütçü, S. & Kıyat, Banu (2013). “Türkiye’ de Telekomünikasyon Sektöründe İtibar Katsayısı ve Marka Sadakati Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 163-175.
- Bromley, D., B. (2001), “Relationships Between Personal and Corporate Reputation”, *European Journal of Marketing*, 35 (3-4), 316-334.
- Demir, A., S. & Taşkın, H. (2012). “İşletme Performansı Ölçme Modellerinin Karşılaştırılması: Kuantum Performansı, Maddi Olmayan Varlıkların İzlenmesi, Performans Prizması Ve Skandia Kılavuzu Modelleri”, 3(11), 1695 – 1709.
- Drucker, P., F. & Maciariello, J., A. (2012). *Yönetim*, Peter Drucker 100. Yıl Kitaplığı, Çeviren İlker Gülfidan, Optimist Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Eroğlu, E. & Solmaz, B. (2012). “Kurumsal İtibar Araştırması Ve Bir Uygulama Örneği”, *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, Cilt 1, Sayı 4, Gümüşhane.
- Fombrun, C., J. (1996). “Reputation: Realizing Value from The Corporate Image”, *Harvard Business School Press*, Boston, Massachusetts, 37-72.
- Fombrun, C.; Gardberg, N., A. & Sever, J., M. (2000). “The Reputation Quotient: A Multi-Stakeholder Measure of Corporate Reputation”, *The Journal of Brand Management*, 7 (4), 241-255.
- Göksel, A. (2013). *İşletmelerde Performans Değerleme Sistemi Tasarımı: Teori-Uygulama - Model*, 2. Baskı, Nobel Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Izgar, H. (2012). *Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi*, 3. Baskı, Şubat, Eğitim Yayınevi, Konya.
- Kadıbeşgil, S. (2006). *İtibar Yönetimi*, 3. Baskı, MediaCat Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Koçel, T. (2014). İşletme Yöneticiliği, Beta Yayınları, 14. Baskı, İstanbul.
- Neely, A.; Adams, C. & Kennerley, M. (2002). The Performance for Measuring and Managing Business Success, Pearson Education.
- Neely, A.; Gregory, M. & Platts K. (1995). "Performance Measurement System Design: A Literature Review and Research Agenda", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol:15, No:14.
- Nigel, M. & Chris, F. (1997). "Towards A Framework for Managing Corporate Identity", European Journal of Marketing, Vol:31, No:5/6, 396-404.
- North, D., C. (1991). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance, Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions, Cambridge University.
- Preston, L., E. & O'Bannon, D., P. (1997). "The corporate social-financial performance relationship, Business and Society", 36, 4; ABI/INFORM Global.
- Roberts, P., W. & Dowling, G., R. (2002). "Corporate Reputation and Sustained Superior Financial Performance", Strategic Management Journal, Vol:23(12), P:1077-1093.
- Robbins, S., P.; Decenzo, A. & Coulter, M. (2013). Yönetimin Esasları – Temel Kavramlar ve Uygulamalar, Ed. Adem Öğüt, Nobel Yayınları, Ankara.
- Robbins, S., P. & Judge, T., A. (2013). Örgütsel Davranış, Çeviri Ed. İnci Erdem, Nobel Yayınları, 14. Basım, Ankara.
- Şimşek, Ş. & Öge, H., S. (2014). İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, 6. Baskı, Eğitim Yayınevi, Konya.
- Vural, Akıncı, Z., B. & Coşkun G. (2007). Örgüt Kültürü, Nobel Yayınları, 1. Basım, Ankara.
- Yurt, İ. (2012). "Kurumsal İtibar Yönetim Algısının Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerindeki Etkisi: Düzce Üniversitesi Örneği", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Düzce Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Düzce.