

**Applying Triangulation Research to Inform Theory and Method: The Case of
Corporate Reputation**

Stephen Lloyd, PhD, Business School, AUT University, Private Bag 92006,

Auckland 1142, New Zealand

(649) 921-9999

Stephen.Lloyd@aut.ac.nz

Roger Baxter, PhD, , Business School, AUT University, New Zealand

Applying Triangulation Research to Inform Theory and Method: The Case of Corporate Reputation

Abstract

Purpose - This paper informs the development of measurement theory by employing methodological triangulation within the rigorous structure of a procedure for construct definition, scale development and testing.

Design/methodology/approach - The author collects data using multiple methods and among diverse sets of stakeholders, and uses a mix of qualitative (e.g., text analysis and the nominal group technique) and quantitative analysis approaches (e.g., linear regression analysis) guided by the C-OAR-SE scale development procedure.

Findings – Analysis of the data from research triangulation supports stakeholder theory of corporate reputation and stakeholder segmentation.

Research implications - The author breaks new ground by applying research triangulation in a systematic and rigorous way to develop a scale that captures the reputation-related evaluations of multiple stakeholders.

Practical implications - Results identify the opportunity for stakeholder segmentation and positioning approaches to stakeholder relationship and communications management.

Originality/value - This is the first study of corporate reputation in which all of a company's stakeholders are included and in which measurement scales are developed and validated for each of a company's multiple stakeholder segments.

Keywords - Corporate reputation, triangulation, stakeholders, segmentation.

Paper type - Research paper.

Introduction

There is continued interest among researchers in the concept of corporate reputation (CR) (Highhouse, Broadfoot, Yugo, & Devendorf, 2009; Walsh & Beatty, 2007; Walsh, Mitchell, Jackson, & Beatty, 2009). CR is a strategic construct that requires measurement and management over time (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001). Some researchers acknowledge a need to assess CR among specific stakeholder groups (Bromley, 2001). The working definition of CR that is used in this research is as follows: CR is that set of values, based on an estimation of a company, which predisposes a relevant stakeholder segment to think, feel and to behave more positively or negatively towards it. This definition of specifies (1) the object (organization), (2) the attribute (a set of values), and (3) the rater entity (stakeholder) (Rossiter, 2008) and provides the basis for development of a measurement scale. The theoretical assumption made here is that, with respect to an organization, stakeholders/raters differ about what they consider to be the components of CR. A further assumption is that the attribute “set of values” is a second-order formed attribute: a very abstract formed attribute (the main components add to form the attribute) that has formed attributes as components (Rossiter, 2002 pp. 310; 314).

This paper hopes to make a contribution to research methodology by seeking a more effective application of methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970) within the rigorous structure of the C-OAR-SE procedure, which is directed at providing content validity. It seeks a better definition of the CR construct as a means for more valid scale development and measurement. The paper attempts to break new ground by developing a formative scale that captures the reputation-related evaluations of multiple stakeholders and in so doing to make a contribution to theory.

Literature review

Triangulation is the use of a research design that draws on a variety of methods to collect and to interpret data (Arksey & Knight, 1999). The term has its origin in surveying, military strategy and navigation whereby two landmarks or reference points are used to identify the position of a third point (Webb, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966). Navigators triangulate among different distance points in order to determine a ship's bearing (Jick, 1979). Triangulation as a research procedure provides two main benefits: confirmation (Denzin, 1970) and completeness (Jick, 1979).

Denzin (1989) identifies four varieties of triangulation. Firstly, methodological triangulation (MT) which can be applied within-method and between-method. Within-method triangulation uses a variety of techniques within one single method. For example, survey work can draw on a package of measurement techniques that focus on the same variable. Between-method triangulation is where two or more distinct methods, for example semi-structured interviews, observation and diary accounts, are employed to measure the same phenomenon, but from a different angle. The rationale for between-method triangulation is that, cumulatively, the weaknesses of one research method are offset by the strengths of others. Secondly, in data triangulation a research design is used in which various, diverse data sources are used to explore the same phenomenon. Thirdly, investigator triangulation is where different researchers, interviewers or observers are used. Fourthly, theoretical triangulation means approaching the research with diverse perspectives and hypotheses in mind.

Denzin sees triangulation as a means for reducing bias and for improving validity, a belief that is challenged (Fielding & Fielding, 1985). Triangulation is criticized on two grounds: epistemological and ontological, and methodological. The

approach is considered inappropriate because it combines methods founded on different epistemological and ontological assumptions (Blaikie, 1991). While it is agreed that because research makes knowledge claims it is implicated in epistemological questions (Usher, 1996) the current triangulated research approach employs methods founded on similar epistemological and ontological assumptions: that is to say that an understanding of corporate reputation is in the minds of stakeholders. The working definition of the CR construct specifies, in addition to the object and the attribute, the rater entity (i.e., stakeholders). Methodological criticism is levelled because it is alleged that the results of triangulation research are seen to relate to different objects or events rather than to different aspects of the same phenomenon (Mason, 2002). This paper is concerned with construct definition, scale development and measurement of corporate reputation, based on the working definition discussed above. It relates, therefore, to different aspects of the same phenomenon. Considering these difference in basic assumptions a case can be made for a form of MT that is based on and incorporates “the use of systematic procedures, employing rigorous standards (and) respectful of the individuals we study” (Creswell & Miller, 2000). A form of MT that satisfies a need for significance at the level of meaning as well as of explanation (Weber, 1947).

A belief in the relevance of evaluations by stakeholder segments, which may have emerged from brand advertising (Drumwright, 1996) is the principal driver of the need for MT in this paper: to ensure that scale development and testing is grounded (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) in expert and stakeholder evaluations. There is continued interest in segmentation in the marketing literature (Dolnicar & Jordaan, 2007; Neeley & Coffey, 2007). There are no references in the CR literature to

segmentation as it may relate to collectivities of stakeholders defined on the basis of similarities or distinct differences from other stakeholder collectives.

Theory and research orientation

The theoretical assumption made in this paper is that stakeholders/raters differ about what they consider to be the components of CR for a specific organization. The paper does not, as does Whetton (1997 p. 30), see reputation as inherently value-laden and reflecting a set of beliefs; it is, according to the working definition adopted, a set of values, based on an estimation of a company, which predisposes a relevant stakeholder segment to think, feel and to behave more positively or negatively towards it.

Based on this explanation of the study's orientation, the following research questions are identified.

RQ₁: Does MT contribute to the delineation of a relevant set of independent variables by identifying the components of CR?

RQ₂: Does MT clarify the relationship between the independent variables and CR?

RQ₃: Does MT provide content validity of a scale for CR?

RQ₄: Does MT determine the principle drivers of CR for specific stakeholder groups?

The stakeholder perspective discussed above assumes differences between stakeholder groups in their evaluations of a company's reputation. No other research has tested this assumption, hence the value of addressing RQ₄. If each stakeholder group is distinct, differences may occur across stakeholder groups in the factors that drive CR. This possibility and the absence of evidence of research into the different drivers of CR support further the value of exploring RQ₄ which has relevance to the evaluation of the two CR theories dominant in this paper and discussed above: holistic, alignment theory and a more pluralistic stakeholder theory. The possibility that groups of stakeholders

may constitute segments will depend on this study showing that each grouping represents a large, mostly homogeneous group of influencers (Kotler, 1986).

Method

The principal driver for MT, as observed earlier, is the importance of ensuring that construct definition and scale development is anchored in expert and stakeholder evaluations. The C-OAR-SE procedure (Rossiter, 2002) has been used to provide a rigorous process directed at providing content validity and to develop a measurement approach. It satisfies the entreaty for greater relevance to the people behind the numbers (Churchill, 1979). A triangulated research design is implemented in order to achieve this

Methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970) in this research comprises four phases. Phase One examines the CR construct through text analysis of a large body of the academic literature on CR. Phase Two examines the CR construct as defined by stakeholders and develops initial measurement items using the nominal group technique (NGT). In Phase three items are then coded by expert judges and scales developed and pre-tested. Phase Four validates the measurement tool for CR through a survey across six different stakeholder groups.

Phase One: Text Analysis of the Literature

A lack of a unified definition of the CR construct and relationship structure weakens the ability to measure CR effectively. A comprehensive theoretical and empirical framework is needed. While recent studies (Highhouse et al., 2009) attempt to use a convenience sample of professors from the finance, marketing and human resources disciplines), this study conducts text analysis of the academic literature on CR to understand the structure of CR and the relationships between CR and other key concepts.

Method. After an initial review of the CR literature, impact rankings of academic journals (Starbuck, 2005) are used for journal selection. On-line journal databases are searched to provide a bibliography of the literature published during the period 1985-2009. A total of 575 journal articles is reviewed and 492 of those articles are text analyzed using the rigour and sensitivity of content analysis. Word-by-word analysis of academic articles is conducted and a matrix based on the frequency of key words developed. Analysis using UCINET 6 social network software is used to conduct matrix analysis routines, to provide centrality measures, subgroup identification and to provide visualization.

Results. Analysis indicates that CR, corporate image, corporate identity and corporate brand, which have been used interchangeably by some researchers, are distinct, yet related concepts. Further analysis using NetDraw1.0 (Borgatti, 2002) shows nodes to represent concepts and lines to represent ties or relations. In the Figure 1 the direction of the relationship is represented by an arrow from the chooser to each of the chosen. A directed graph connects nodes with lines that have arrowheads, indicating who is directing the tie toward whom. The node 'corporate', for example, represents a central concept with the greatest network of relationships, while the 'value' node is dependent in its relationships with corporate and reputation, but does not emerge as a 'chosen' node. These are the concepts that appear to have the strongest relationship with CR and which are explored further in Phase Two.

(Figure 1 here)

Phase Two: The Nominal Group Technique among Stakeholders

The literature is scarce on describing the process of generating the underlying items to develop a CR scale (Helm, 2005), and this includes the three measurement approaches discussed earlier (viz., social expectations that people have regarding

companies, corporate personality and trust). This study describes the process. The NGT provides insights into the perceptions and constructs individuals use (Hussey & Hussey, 1997). The goal of Phase Two is identify and to clarify, from stakeholders, the components of CR and to confirm their importance; to define the CR construct and to identify scale items.

Method. Stakeholders are people or groups with a disposition to buy an organization's products and services, to work, invest or trade with the company (Baker & Balmer, 1997). They can include, government regulators (Fombrun, Gardberg, & Sever, 2000) as well as others whose evaluations have implications for its financial performance (Roberts & Dowling, 2002). Nominal group discussions are conducted and data collected cross-sectionally among eight stakeholders groups appropriate to the general nature of this stage of the investigation. Group size and research protocols satisfy accepted NGT norms (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975). Each stakeholder is asked for ideas on what are the components of CR.

Results . The NGT builds on text analysis by yielding lists of key components of CR thought important by each stakeholder group. The network of relationships between CR and other key concepts identified in the text analysis is further refined and confirms the following as components of CR: identity, image, brand, ethical management and leadership, performance, financial performance, products and services, corporate management and management leadership, thereby addressing RQ₁: What are the components of the CR construct?

Discussion. Phase Two builds on Phase One and provides insights into the constructs stakeholders use to understand CR. Different stakeholders groups evaluate the components of the CR construct differently. Items in this study are not only relevant, but are expressed in stakeholders' own words.

Phase Three: Coding of Items by Expert Judges

In Phase Three five experts are provided with coding sheets and asked, for each of the specific ingredients/components of CR collected from the NGT sessions, to select the descriptor (the result of the text analysis) that best classifies that particular component. The coding of items by expert judges builds on and extends the domain of the construct. Expert judgment, therefore, is applied to categorize distinct components from those identified in the NGT sessions. The perceived dimensionality of the components is not relevant; all that is needed is a set of distinct components as decided by expert judgment (Rossiter 2002 p. 315). These main components are present in the scale for each stakeholder group because the items representing them are the defining items for the attribute. Content validity is established in that the items are a good representation of the construct and is sufficient for use of the scale (Rossiter 2002 p. 311).

Research conducted in the first three MT phases provide positive support for RQ₁ and RQ₂: MT contributes to the delineation of a relevant set of independent variables by identifying the components of CR; MT clarifies the relationship between the independent variables and CR. Furthermore, the components of CR identified in the first three phases suggest the value of considering stakeholder evaluations (cf., stakeholder perceptions), of CR in a definition of the construct, as suggested in the working definition above.

Phase Five: Quantitative Survey among Key Stakeholder Groups

The proposition that the various stakeholder groupings may comprise segments is hypothesized after NGT research and is tested in the quantitative phase. Analysis will need to show what each stakeholder group shares and what differentiates it from other groups and whether these may be considered the characteristics of a

stakeholder segment. Hence, the evaluation of a company's reputation is a shared evaluation and differs from the evaluation of other segments.

The stakeholder survey focuses on the CR of one company ("The Bank"). The survey is conducted across stakeholder groups and on a company that has relevance for the stakeholders and *vice versa*. The Bank satisfies the criteria of being well-known, locally-traded and whose condition, according to established industry ratings, is stable; it is experiencing no controversies that may prejudice the research.

The possibility that CR is evaluated differently by different stakeholder groups has been identified in the literature. That it should be measured differently has not until now been explored. Such a measurement approach would put a company in a position to manage its reputation more effectively. Insights into differences across stakeholder groups promise to make a valuable contribution to knowledge and to theory.

Method. The goal of Phase Four is to address the following research questions:

RQ₃: Does MT provide content validity of a scale for CR?

RQ₄: Does MT determine the principle drivers of CR for specific stakeholder groups?

The questionnaire assesses the reliability of a range of items. A key informational need is to measure the strength of agreement on the value of items within each stakeholder grouping and the significance of any differences between these groupings. Items included in the questionnaires vary by stakeholder grouping, based on the NGT research. Only those items representative of CR components and relevant to each stakeholder group are included in each stakeholder group's questionnaire. A final question asks respondents to evaluate the reputation of The Bank, overall, in terms of each individual's evaluation. This question becomes the dependent variable regression analysis.

Stakeholder Sample. The following stakeholders are selected as stakeholders relevant to The Bank's business outcomes: employees and customers; media; finance and investment specialists; CEOs of large companies and of SMEs; communications specialists. A probability sampling approach is taken to obtain a sample representative of the population for each stakeholder segment (Aaker, Kumar, & Day, 2004). Given the intention to use factor analysis a minimum sample size of 50 observations and at least five times as many observations as there are variables to be analyzed (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995) is assured, as shown by sample sizes and response rates in Table 1.

(Table 1 here)

Analysis and Results. Cronbach's alpha values range from 0.68 to 0.97 (see Table 2). Among all six stakeholder segments there is no indication that any one item is unrelated to the rest of its scale such that it should be removed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett test of sphericity are employed. The KMO measure across stakeholder groups and factors ranges from 0.50 to 0.81 which has been described as acceptable and meritorious respectively (Kaiser, 1974). Coefficients in the Bartlett's test are significant and not "0" and support the assumption of multivariate normality. These results provide quantitative support that builds of the NGT and the expert panel (Rossiter, 2002) data in support of RQ₃: MT provides content validity of a measurement scale for CR.

(Table 2 here)

Phase Two establishes the items that belong to each factor for each stakeholder group. Exploratory analysis tests these stakeholder groups to see whether, or not, factors load as expected. An exploratory factor analysis of the full data set using Promax rotation was also performed. The results from this analysis are unsatisfactory in

terms of identifying clear factors. These results are predicted and confirm that it is indeed unhelpful to group all stakeholders together. When each stakeholder group is considered separately, it is expected that differences in evaluations would be evident.

Each group factors well, each variable yields, through regression analysis (where the factors are shown to be highly correlated), the relative importance of the variables to each other group. In those cases where factor analysis is valid, i.e., in cases where a component is represented by two or more constituents, each of which was represented by a single item, principle component analysis is used to extract components. In all cases across all components and across all stakeholder segments, a single component is extracted. This supports the validity of all components of CR derived from the first three phases of MT: text analysis, NGT research and coding by expert judges.

Principal component analysis, using an orthogonal Varimax rotation confirms the independence of the factors: in all cases they load cleanly on to a single factor and are thereby considered suitable for subsequent regression analysis. Analysis of eigenvalues for all factors across all items among stakeholders indicates that none is less than 1, and should therefore be excluded.

ANOVA is used to inspect the significance of differences in the group means – evaluations of the performance of The Bank on key reputation attributes. ANOVA reveals large differences between some of the groups; the results of the analysis of means for each of the nine components of CR across stakeholder groups show evidence of differences between levels of agreement. A Hays Omega Square of $\omega^2 = .12$ is a moderate effect (Cohen, 1997). This finding confirms substantial variation among some of the means of the six stakeholder groups. The significance levels indicate this; the F value indicates roughly how strong the effect is. These are fairly large statistical

differences with an Omega squared of about 0.12 and 0.13, respectively (Cohen categorizes an effect over .15 as large). A stakeholder perspective would expect to see differences between the ways stakeholder groups evaluate the reputation of a company. There is no evidence for support of an alignment perspective which would expect to see congruence between external (e.g., customer) brand image and internal (e.g., employee) views and values. Results indicate that stakeholder groups evaluate the reputation of the same company differently and provide the foundation for addressing RQ₄: Does MT determine the principle drivers of CR for specific stakeholder groups?

(Table 3 here)

Respondents are asked to provide an overall evaluation of the reputation of The Bank. Inspection of the group mean for this question reveals a large difference between at least some of the groups ($F = 10.766, p < .001$). Hay's Omega Square of $\omega^2 = .12$ is a moderate effect and confirms that there is a difference between some of the means of the six stakeholder groups. Given these differences it is important to determine what is driving the evaluation of CR for each stakeholder group. Multiple regression analysis is conducted to answer this question. A visual scan of the partial plots of the variables in the regression analyses shows no evidence of a curvilinear relationship is found.

Each stakeholder segment's overall evaluation is regressed against its level of agreement that each of a range of statements is an accurate description of The Bank from each stakeholder's perspective. In all cases, for the regression analysis equation for each stakeholder group, the VIF values are well below 5 indicating that the correlations between variables are not sufficient to cause multi-collinearity problems. The regression equation for CEO, communication specialist, media specialist and employee data is highly significant; for customers it is significant; it is marginally significant for finance and investment specialist data. Table 3 shows a summary.

Results are supportive of a positive response to RQ₄: the drivers of stakeholders' overall evaluations of a company's reputation vary by stakeholder segment and support the need for a stakeholder orientation to CR management.

(Table 3 here)

Table 4 provides a summary of the drivers of stakeholder evaluations of CR for each stakeholder segment. The plurality of drivers for CEOs supports what was observed in the NGT sessions in which this segment showed a broad base of direct involvement with the various facets of reputation management. A focus by Communications Specialists on Image, Identity and Corporate Leadership can be understood better when the broad profile of the sample for this segment is considered. The sample included company and organizational communications directors, senior management of advertising agencies and marketing communications academics. Similarly, a predilection for Image by the Media segment is not surprising. The principal driver for Customers is Performance for which there was only one item in the Customers questionnaire (viz., "It is a company whose performance you can trust.") The principal driver for Employees is Products and Services for which there was only one item in the Employees questionnaire (viz., "It is a provider of quality goods and services.") The principal driver for Finance and investment specialists is Performance for which there was only one item in the Finance and Investment Specialists questionnaire (viz., "It has a record of success and of quality outcomes, including awards.")

(Table 4 here)

Discussion and Implications

Denzin sees triangulation as a means for reducing bias and for improving validity, a belief that is challenged (Fielding & Fielding, 1985). This paper addresses

criticism of triangulation on epistemological and ontological grounds (Blaikie, 1991) by employing methods founded on similar epistemological and ontological assumptions: that is to say that an understanding of corporate reputation is in the minds of stakeholders. Methodological criticism that the results of triangulation research relate to different objects or events rather than to different aspects of the same phenomenon (Mason, 2002) is not supported by this research, which relates to different aspects of the same phenomenon. Considering these difference in basic assumptions a case has been made for a form of triangulation that is based on and incorporates rigorous and systematic procedures (Creswell & Miller, 2000). This study develops a measurement procedure for CR that provides content validity (Rossiter, 2002), that reflects differences between stakeholder segments, and identifies the drivers of stakeholder evaluations of a company's reputation. It does this by utilizing research triangulation in a sequential way.

Implications for Theory and Measurement

A framework for a contribution to theory was discussed earlier (Whetton, 1997) against which the contribution of this research may now be discussed: Firstly, the research has delineated a relevant set of variables by identifying the components, or independent variables, of CR: identity, image, brand, ethical management and leadership, performance, financial performance, products and services, corporate and management leadership. This broadens the “nomological net” of CR beyond image and identity as key components of the construct (Whetton 1997 p 27-28).

Secondly, the research has identified the explicit relationship between the independent variables and CR and shown that the variables are mediated by stakeholder evaluations. The research has determined the principle drivers of CR for specific

stakeholder segments. Each of the six segments addressed in this study represents a large, mostly homogeneous group of influencers (Kotler, 1986).

Thirdly, the research supports an assumption made earlier that CR is set of values, a second-order formed attribute: a very abstract formed attribute (the main components add to form the attribute) that has formed attributes as components (Rossiter, 2002 pp. 310; 314).

Fourthly, there is support for the theoretical assumption that stakeholder raters not only differ about what they consider to be the components of CR for a specific organization but should be part of construct definition. This is supportive of a stakeholder, as distinct from an alignment (Chun & Davies 2006) orientation to CR.

The research identifies nine key components of CR and sets of constituents. Not all components are of the same importance to the various stakeholder segments; there are statistically significant differences in the ways stakeholder segments ranked the nine components in terms of the importance of their contribution to the CR of a company.

Implications for Research

The components of CR identified in the first three phases of research and confirmed in phase four suggest the value of considering stakeholder evaluations, as distinct from stakeholder perceptions, of CR in a definition of the construct. The orientation of this study towards specific stakeholder segments has enabled the CR of a well-known company to be evaluated and measured from the perspective of its key stakeholders. Future research could be directed also at the development of a stakeholder relationship management (SRM) paradigm; a paradigm within which relevance for the need states of specific stakeholder segments is central to effective reputation management. The concept of customer relationship management (CRM) paradigm is

well-established (Gronroos, 1994). An opportunity exists to explore the usefulness of the SRM to researchers and to marketers.

Conclusions

The multi-method, research triangulation approach has included text analysis of a large body of literature, qualitative research using the nominal group technique among stakeholders, and a quantitative survey also among stakeholders. The study has found support for stakeholder theory, for conformance of stakeholder groups to segments and has identified the opportunity for stakeholder segmentation and positioning approaches to stakeholder relationship and communications management. It has found holistic or alignment theory to be limited in identifying the full range of differences between the drivers of CR for various stakeholders. Analysis has established the validity of a formative scale for evaluating stakeholder evaluations of a company, for identifying the drivers of CR and differences in the drivers of CR across stakeholder groups. It has attempted to break new ground by developing a scale that captures the reputation-related evaluations of multiple stakeholders. In so doing it hopes to have made a contribution to theory through construct definition, through the identification of the components of CR and through further confirmation of the relevance of stakeholder (segmentation) theory.

References

- Aaker, D., Kumar, V., & Day, G. (2004). *Marketing Research* (8th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Arksey, H., & Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists: an introductory resource with examples* London: Sage.
- Baker, M. J., & Balmer, J. (1997). Visual identity: trapping or substance? *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5), 366-382.
- Blaikie, N. (1991). A critique of the use of triangulation in social research. *Quality and Quantity*, 25, 115-136.
- Borgatti, S. P. (2002). NetDraw: Graph Visualization Software. 1.0 Cambridge, MA: Harvard: Analytic Technologies.
- Bromley, D. B. (2001). Relationships between personal and corporate reputation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(3/4).
- Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Cohen, J. (1997). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3).
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group Techniques of Program Planning: A Guide to the Nominal Group and Delphi Processes*. Chicago: Scott-Foresman.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Dolnicar, S., & Jordaan, Y. (2007). A market-orientated approach to responsibly managing information privacy concerns in direct marketing. *Journal of Advertising*, 36(2), 123-149.
- Drumwright, M. (1996). Company advertising with a social dimension: The role of noneconomic criteria. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(4), 71-78.
- Fielding, N. G., & Fielding, J. L. (1985). *Linking Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Fombrun, C., Gardberg, N. A., & Sever, J. M. (2000). The reputation quotient sm: a multi-stakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 7(4), 241-255.
- Gotsi, M., & Wilson, A. (2001). Corporate reputation: seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications*, 6(1), 24-30.
- Gronroos, C. (1994). From marketing mix to relationship marketing: towards a paradigm shift in marketing. *Management Decision*, 32(2), 4-20.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Helm, S. (2005). Designing a formative measure for corporate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(2), 95-109, 115p.
- Highhouse, S., Broadfoot, A., Yugo, J. E., & Devendorf, S. A. (2009). Examining corporate reputation judgements with generalizability theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 782-789.
- Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). *Business Research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(4), 602-611.

- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). A index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Neeley, S. M., & Coffey, T. (2007). Understanding the "four-eyed, four-legged" consumer: A segmentation analysis of U.S. moms. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 15(3), 251-261.
- Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(12), 1077-1093.
- Rossiter, J. R. (2002). The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(4), 305.
- Rossiter, J. R. (2008). Content validity of measures of abstract constructs in management and organizational research. *British Journal of Management*, 19, 380-388.
- Starbuck, W. (2005). *Impact rankings in 2005*. from <http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~wstarbuc/>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Usher, R. (1996). A critique of the neglected epistemological and ontological assumptions of education research. In D. Scott & R. Usher (Eds.), *Understanding Educational Research*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, G., & Beatty, S. E. (2007). Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 127-143.
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V.-W., Jackson, P. R., & Beatty, S. E. (2009). Examining the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: A customer perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 20, 187-203.
- Webb, E. J., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Whetton, D. A. (1997). Theory development and the study of corporate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(1), 26-34.

Table 1: Actual sample sizes and response rates by stakeholder segment

Stakeholder segment	Questionnaires Sent	Actual No. of Respondents	Response %
CEOs	85	57	67
Communications specialists	145	129	89
Customers	300	62	21
Employees	115	58	50
Finance/investment specialists	125	85	68
Media	125	87	70
Total	895	478	53

TABLE 2: Cronbach's alpha values for stakeholder segments

Variable	CEOs	Communication Specialists	Customers	Media	Financial Investors	Employees
Image	n/a	0.92	n/a	0.96	0.73	0.84
Identity	0.86	0.90	0.77	0.96	0.68	0.83
Management Leadership	0.86	0.90	0.78	0.96	0.70	0.81
Performance	0.85	0.90	0.82	0.96	0.76	0.83
Corporate Brand	n/a	0.90	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Products and Services	0.86	0.90	0.76	0.96	n/a	0.86
Financial performance	n/a	0.90	n/a	0.96	0.78	n/a
Ethical Management and Leadership	0.85	0.90	0.78	0.96	0.72	0.85
Corporate Leadership	0.85	0.90	0.84	0.96	0.74	0.86

TABLE 3: Summary of the analysis of regression equations for each stakeholder group

Stakeholder group	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>²
CEOs	57	18.81	<.001	.69
Communications specialists	129	9.90	<.001	.43
Media specialists	87	5.08	<.001	.34
Employees	58	5.84	<.001	.45
Customers	62	3.13	<.010	.25
Finance and investment specialists	85	3.11	<.001	.22

TABLE 4: Drivers of perceptions of CR for each stakeholder segment

Stakeholder Segment	Drivers of CR
CEOs	Identity, performance, products and service, ethical management and leadership, corporate leadership
Communications specialists	Image, identity, corporate leadership
Customers	Performance
Media specialists	Image
Employees	Products and services
Finance and investment specialists	Performance