Effect of Corporate Reputation on the Performance of the selected Commercial Bank in Enugu State, Nigeria
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Abstract- The purpose of this study focuses on the effect of corporate reputation on the performance of the selected Commercial Bank in Enugu State, Nigeria. Specifically the study aimed to pursue the following objectives: to determine the effect of quality product on customer satisfaction in Commercial Bank in Enugu State Nigeria, to ascertain the nature of the relationship between good working condition and productivity of Commercial Bank in Enugu state Nigeria, to ascertain the extent to which social responsibility affect creativity and innovation in commercial Bank in Enugu state Nigeria. The study has a population size of 355, out of which a sample size of 188 was realized using Taro Yamane’s formula at 5% error to tolerance and 95% level of confidence. Instruments used for data collection were primary questionnaires and interview. The total numbers of 188 copies of the questionnaire were distributed while 177 copies were returned and 11 copies were not returned. Survey research design was adopted for the study. Three hypotheses were tested using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and simple linear regression tool. The findings indicated that quality product significantly affects productivity in selected Commercial Bank (r = 0.742, t = 6. 541; F = 143.525; p < 0.05). There is a positive relationship between good working environment and productivity in selected Commercial Bank (r = 0.935, P< .05). Social responsibility to a larger extent significantly affect creativity and innovation in selected Commercial Bank (r = 0.736; t=14.362; F = 206.279; p < 0.05). The study concluded that a corporate reputation is a tool used by firms to attract the best employees, raise capital effectively, become a good community member, gain and retain loyal customers. The study recommends that organizations should ensure that their product are of good quality that will serve as a competitive tool to win the market, retain the new customer and that will enhance productivity and increase profitability.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The concern of corporate reputation is not a new phenomenon. It has been around ever since morality and ethics have been discussed (Power, 2007). As a business term, reputation emerged during the 1990’s and became an organizing concept that stretched across many management areas, such as marketing, accounting, and organizational strategy. Corporate reputation has been defined as “stakeholders’ perceptions about an organization’s ability to create value relative to competitors”, but since the concept is intangible the definition is somewhat diffuse and various (Rindova, Williamson Petkova and Sever, 2005)[22]. Academics and senior executives have long held the position that firms with superior corporate reputation achieve higher levels of financial performance. Corporate reputation has been frequently identified as an intangible source of competitive advantage (Barney, 1991[2]; Hall, 1992[12]; Rao, 1994)[21], and able to provide a range of organizational benefits that ultimately contribute to a firm’s capacity to earn above average profits. These benefits include the capacity to attract and retain talented staff (Gatewood, Gowan, and Lautenschlager, 1993)[10] as well as investors (Milgrom and Roberts, 1986)[17], to signal higher quality (Gerstner, 1985), and to charge higher prices (Houser and Wooders, 2006). It is therefore not surprising that corporate reputation has been viewed as fundamental to a firm’s performance and therefore long-term survival. A good corporate reputation has been argued to have effects on the economic choices made by stakeholders’ and thereby direct influence on the financial performance of the organization (Rindova, Williamson, Petkova and Sever, 2005)[22]. it is clear that a good corporate reputation has an increasingly significant effect on organizations success. Organizations need to build a character to separate themselves from their competitors when the commercial messages from a buzz and the quality of services and products are similar (Malmsten, 2002, 12-13)[14]. A favorable reputation can serve as an effective form of differentiation and source of competitive advantage since its casual ambiguous nature makes an imitation by competitor’s impossible (Hall, 1992)[12]. Corporate reputation is a collective perception of stakeholders of a firm (Fombrun, 1996)[6] the
resource-based view (RBV) proposes that rare, socially complex, and difficult to imitate intangible assets significantly contribute to performance differences among organizations (Amit and Shoemakers, 1993; Barney, 1991; Rao, 1994). Firms place a high priority on building a favorable reputation, and they deploy significant resources towards this purpose. In academia, corporate reputation attracts the attention of scholars from different disciplines such as economics, accounting, finance, sociology, management, strategy, and marketing (Gotsi and Wilson, 2001). Moreover, reputation is a tool that is used to signify an organization’s perceived capacity to meet their stakeholders’ expectations (Waddock, 2000). In other words, firms use corporate reputation in order to give a positional advantage by using various strategies to differentiate themselves from competitors (Hall, 1992; McMillan and Joshi, 1997). Devine and Halpern (2001) argued that corporate reputation plays a role in value creation for shareholders. These authors contend that a firm’s corporate reputation is a signal for top quality products, good working conditions, and excellent service quality. It is also used to attract investors (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). Akerlof (1970) and Punette et al. (2007) argued that corporate reputation is an information signal that firms often use to protect its capital accumulated and assets. Especially, the development of good corporate reputation amongst customers encourages the production of top-quality products (Nelson, 1970; Milgrom and Roberts, 1986).

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
As mentioned above, a good corporate reputation is seen as a valuable and competitive asset. How it evolves and how to manage the phenomenon is, therefore, interesting to investigate since it can give an organization a more lucrative way of running their business. Since corporate reputation is an intangible asset the components of the concept can be versatile. Communicating with stakeholders to separate themselves from competitors is a way to influence their perception about the organization. When organizations operation is not favoring the stakeholders of the organizations they are bound to paint the image of the organization black which will cause the organizations to start experiencing decline in productivity, and profitability, dissatisfaction of customer, increase in staff turnover. Thus the study seeks to investigate the effect of corporate reputation on the performance of the selected Commercial Banks.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The main thrust of this study focuses on effect of corporate reputation on performance of selected commercial banks in Enugu state.

1. To determine the effect of quality product on customer satisfaction in Commercial Banks in Enugu State Nigeria
2. To ascertain the nature of the relationship between good working condition and productivity of Commercial Banks in Enugu state Nigeria
3. To ascertain the extent to which social responsibility affect creativity and innovation in Commercial Banks in Enugu state Nigeria

3.1 Research Questions
To achieve the above objectives, the following research questions were raised
1. What is the effect of quality product on customer satisfaction in Commercial Banks in Enugu state Nigeria?
2. What is the nature of the relationship between good working condition and productivity of Commercial Banks in Enugu State Nigeria?
3. To what extent does social responsibility affect creativity and innovation in Commercial Banks in Enugu State Nigeria?

3.2 Research Hypotheses
The study proposes the following hypotheses
1. Quality product significantly affects customer satisfaction in Commercial Banks in Enugu state Nigeria
2. There is a positive relationship between good working condition and productivity of Commercial Banks in Enugu State Nigeria
3. Social responsibility to a larger affect creativity and innovation in Commercial Banks in Enugu State Nigeria?

4. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
4.1 Concept of Reputation
Corporate reputation is an attribute or a set of attributes ascribed to a firm and inferred from the firm’s past actions. It is the belief of market participants about a firm’s strategic character (Weigelt and Camerer, 1988). Roberts and Dowling (2002) assert that corporate reputation is the public’s cumulative judgment of firms over time. Corporate reputation as a history of customer perception about the firm, such as collective beliefs that exist in the organizational field about a firm’s identity and prominence (Rao, 1994; Rindova and Kotha, 2001), corporate reputation is described as either a traitor signal (Kreps and Wilson, 1982; Shapiro, 1989) which can be transmitted from a company to its customers to give some clues about products or give an advance warning about retaliations if competitors make any adversarial moves (Weight and Camerer, 1988). Fombrun (1996) defines corporate reputation as “a perceptual representation of a company’s past actions and future perceptual representation of a company’s past actions and future prospects that describe the firm’s overall appeal to all of its key constituents when
compared with other leading rivals”. According to Balmer (1998), corporate reputation refers to the perception of an organisation which is built up over a period of time and which focuses on what it does and how it behave Corporate reputation “the whole sensory perceptions and thought interrelationships associated with an entity by one individual” (Enis, 1967) and as “impressions and mental pictures about things” (Kennedy, 1977). Fombrun (1996) defined corporate reputation as “a perceptual representation of a company’s past actions and future prospects that describes the firm’s overall appeal to all of its key constituents when compared with other leading rivals, Carter, (2006) defined reputation as “a set of key characteristics attributed to a firm by various stakeholders”, and while this is clearly an appropriate definition of corporate reputation, it makes no reference to competitors or comparison with others in an industry or field. This definition does, however, suggest ‘comparison’. Rather than comparison occurring among competitors or industry leaders, the comparison in this instance is between various stakeholders’ identifications of a set of key characteristics of the firm.

4.2 Measuring Corporate Reputation

When analyzing or measuring a company’s reputation one must keep in mind that reputation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon and evaluations on a company’s reputation are made based on these dimensions. Before listings became a key factor in defining corporate reputation there have been studies on how corporate reputation should be measured. One of the earliest theories is a Reputation Quotient by Fombrun et. al. (2000)[9]. Reputation Quotient is a multi-stakeholder (for example, investors, customers, employees, etc.) measure of corporate reputation and it consists of six dimensions:

1. Emotional Appeal: Stakeholders are content with the company and the way it executes its strategies and operations. They trust the company.
2. Products and Services: In the stakeholders’ opinion the products and services that the company provides are of high quality, innovative, and valuable.
3. Financial Performance: Stakeholders are confident that the company’s future prospects are solid, the company is profitable and able to outperform competitors, and it is a low-risk investment.
4. Vision and Leadership: The Company has a clear vision which helps it to prosper in the future as well as take advantage of market opportunities. In order to execute the vision the company’s leadership has to be on point as well.
5. Workplace Environment: Stakeholders agree on the fact that the company has well educated and efficient employees who are well managed, and that the company is able to attract new and able employees.
6. Social Responsibility: Stakeholders are aware of the company’s activities as “a good citizen” which includes supporting good causes, environmental responsibility, and taking into account what the local communities might need and providing them with it(Fombrun et. al. 2000)[9].

4.3 Managing Reputation

More and more executives appreciate the positive impact that reputation can have on a company’s success (Heinonen, 2006)[13]. The fact that corporate reputation is one of the most important value creators to a company in today’s markets makes it clear that it should be treated as a valuable asset. Solid management, strategies, and execution are needed to take full advantage of this factor that might be key for sustainable competitive advantage (Smaiziene and Jucevicius, 2009). Managing reputation can be a very hard job since all the stakeholders have to be taken into account and treated well, but at the same time, it is important to know how and when to prioritize who should be treated a little better and when. The same goes for the content of the corporate reputation; which areas should be given more attention and when (Aula and Mantere, 2005).

In essence reputation, management is an active interaction between the real activities and the perceptions that the public has of these activities. Stakeholders are in a leading role here, which is why stakeholders relations should be carefully managed (Aula and Mantere, 2005). In the business world, today business strategies and applying them in everyday business has become essential in governing a company. The companies with good reputations understand the importance of good and clear strategies and the ability to communicate these strategies to the stakeholders. In these companies, they have also succeeded in emphasizing the interaction of the process and made it clear that staff is welcome to participate in the process. Trust and appreciation between the executives and the staff is a thing that reputation leaders have also accomplished in their companies (Heinonen, 2006)[13].

Basically what reputation management requires is ability to recognize changes in the markets and react to them in the correct way; clear vision and strategy; ability to evolve and adapt; understanding the business environment as well as the company’s internal operations, for which the SWOT analysis is a good tool, etc. (Heinonen, 2006, and Aula and Mantere, 2005).

4.4 Reputation Strategies

4.4.1 PEACE

A company is enjoying a peaceful period with a solid and good reputation with no imminent threats. The company can focus on communicating its strategies and messages rather freely and thus make the public and the stakeholders aware of their image and reputation.

4.5 The Good Brother

The Good Brother strategy focuses on networking which mainly happens in cabinets with limited participant lists. Basically, it means maintaining and creating relationships with influential people who are then able to "spread the word" of the company as an appealing target for
investments, etc. This strategy may be applied at times when a company is rather stable reputation-wise. A drawback of this strategy is that it concentrates on a minor portion of the public, in other words, stakeholders, which makes losing even one of these Good Brothers a risk for the company’s reputation. Nevertheless, having influential connections is vital to today’s businesses.

4.6 Defence
If a company’s reputation is threatened they must make sure that the messages they are communicating, inside as well as outside the company, are of positive nature and that the (false) accusations about them are being corrected visibly and transparently as possible as

4.7 Lobbyist
In times of hardship, a company must be able to overrule the conflicting views of others with their own version of things. At the same time, they must focus on being in contact and in good terms with their stakeholders in order to spread their own version of things outside the company. The classic kind of lobbying is not public, within a small portion of influential people, and nobody really knows who is communicating what, to whom, and with what consequences. Typical for a lobbyist is the ability to explain decisions after the things, that they had been lobbying for, have happened as wished. An invisible process is attempted to be made public with briefings to explain the decisions and in private statements. But as has been said in reputation management openness and honesty are keys, so this secretive strategy can sometimes be risky.

4.8 Attack
If a company’s reputation has been damaged, this strategy gives them the tools to fight back: the company must first challenge the unflattering and stubborn issues by being loud and visible in its own views. They have to be able to communicate their message better and more clearly than the other side is doing with the negative messages. One way of doing this is to use considerable amounts of money to improve the company’s Social Responsibility status and make sure that everybody knows about it.

4.9 Riot
With the Shapeshifter strategy, the point is to send out mixed messages in order to form a larger platform for the public to draw up a reputation for a company. It is done by sending out a certain image of the company, and just when the public has started to get the picture of the company they send another, completely different message. This ensures attention.

4.10 Oracle
This strategy is an extreme version of the Shapeshifter: the point is to say one thing but does the other. It is based on a view that everything must look good despite what the reality is. A good example of this strategy is cigarette company Philip Morris International. They promote that people who are worried about their health should stop smoking. The other way round it could be understood as if they were encouraging people who do not pay so much attention to their health to just smoke away. How many other industries, but the cigarette industry, can you think of that can put warning texts on their packaging warning the public from buying their products but still manage to make millions? This is a very bold strategy and cannot be embraced by many companies.

5 THEORITCIAL FRAMEWORK
5.1 Social Identity Theory
Corporate reputation also has one of its roots in social identity theory (SIT). At the individual level, SIT refers to the perception a person develops to identify who he/she is in terms of his/her group membership (Turner, 1984) and stems from several sources such as the categorisation of individuals, and the distinctiveness and prestige (i.e. reputation) of the group (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). It provides a partial answer to the question “Who am I?” (Abrams and Hogg, 1990; Hogg and McGarty, 1990). Social identification normally leads to activities that are consistent with his/her core values and the support for any institutions that embody those values (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Essentially, reputation can be viewed as the estimation of how well one’s behavior fits with “who” one claims to be and is captured by public opinion (Long-Tolbert, 2000). In other words, reputation acts as a reflection of someone’s activities and identity and simultaneously as a source from which a person derives his/her individuality.

7. EMPERICAL FRAMEWORK
Tracey (2014) Conducted a study on Corporate reputation and financial performance: underlying dimensions of corporate reputation and their relation to sustained financial performance the relationship between firms' corporate reputation and their future financial performance. Corporate reputation was represented by measuring the level of senior executives' attention to a number of intangible firm resources (e.g. financial reputation, service culture) within firms' annual reports over a 17 year period. Initial findings suggested there was only a small relationship between reputation and future performance which lead to a reformulation of the problem. Reputation was posited to be a source of corporate resilience that helped firms with stronger reputations to sustain superior financial performance in times of difficulty, as well as allowing them to rebound more quickly from performance decline. Results suggest this interpretation of corporate reputation as well as indicating that industry sectors operate in different reputational ‘domains’ in which the relative importance of financial versus stakeholder aspects of corporate reputation varies.
8. **METHOD AND MATERIAL**

The study was carried out using survey design. Primary data was obtained through the use of interviews, questionnaire and observations while Secondary data were obtained from books, journals, and the internet. The population of the study was 355 drawn from employees of the Union Bank and First Bank Plc, Enugu State, Nigeria. A sample size of 188 was determined from the population using Taro Yamane’s sample size determination method. The instrument used for data collection was questionnaire structured in 5-point Likert scale and validated with the content validity of face to face approach. The reliability test was done using test-retest method. The result gave a reliability coefficient of 0.77, indicating a high degree of consistency. One hundred and eighty-eight copies of the questionnaire were distributed and one hundred and seventy-seven copies were returned. The three hypotheses formulated were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Simple linear regression was used to test hypotheses one and three while hypothesis two was tested using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. A computer aided Microsoft special package for social science (SPSS) was used to aid analysis.

9. **DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

The data obtained from the field were presented and analyzed with descriptive statistics to provide answers to the research questions while the corresponding hypotheses were tested with Pearson’s Correlation and Linear regression at 0.05 alpha level.

1. What is the effect of the quality product on customer satisfaction?

Table 1: Coded Responses on Quality product and customer satisfaction.

| s/no | Questionnaire items | S.Agree /Agree | Disagree /S.Disagree | Total |
|------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| 1    | Quality product retains customers in the organization | 169 (171.5) | 8 (5.5) | 177 |
| 2    | Customer satisfaction can be achieved through product improvement | 174 (171.5) | 3 (5.5) | 177 |
|      | **TOTAL**           | **343 (97%)** | **11 (3%)**          | **354 (100)** |

Table 2: Model Summary

| Model | R     | R Square | Sum of the Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson | t     | F     |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| 1     | .742a | .612     | 143.622           | .707              | .55130                    | .229          | 6.541 | 143.525 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Quality Product
b. Dependent Variable: Customer satisfaction
R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.742, indicates that there is a positive relationship between quality product and customer satisfaction in commercial banks. R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 61.2% of the variation in customer satisfaction of Commercial Bank is explained by the model.

With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low, with a value of about .55130. The Durbin-Watson statistics of 0.229, which is not more than 2, indicates there is no autocorrelation. The quality product coefficient of 0.742 indicates a positive significance between product quality and customer satisfaction in Commercial Bank, Enugu state, which is statistically significant (with t = 6.541). Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted. Thus quality product has a significant effect on customer satisfaction in Commercial Bank, Enugu State.
2. What is the nature of the relationship between the good working condition and productivity of Commercial Bank, in Enugu state?

Table 3: Coded Responses on nature of the relationship between good working condition and productivity.

| s/no | Questionnaire items                                                                 | S.Agree /Agree | Disagree /S.Disagree | Total |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 1    | Friendly environment induces workers to put in their best which increase productivity | 175 (174)      | 2 (3)                 | 177   |
| 2    | High Productivity can be achieved through provision of working facility that enhances performance | 173 (174)      | 4 (3)                 | 177   |
|      | TOTAL                                                                               | 348 (98%)      | 6 (2%)                | 354 (100%) |

Source: fieldwork 2016

Table 3 shows that 348(98%) of the respondents indicated S.agree / agree, while 6(2%) indicated disagree/S.disagree. Based on responds from percentage analysis it was concluded that there is a positive relationship between the good working condition and productivity of Commercial Bank, in Enugu State.

Table 4 : Descriptive Statistics

|                          | Mean    | Std. Deviation | N  |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------|----|
| Good working environment | 1.8261  | 1.16043        | 177|
| productivity             | 1.9065  | 1.26713        | 177|

Table 5 : Correlations

|                      | Good working environment | Productivity |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Good working environment Pearson Correlation | 1 | .955**        |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      |                          | .000         |
| N                    |                          | 177          |
| Productivity Pearson Correlation | .955** | 1            |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .000                     |              |
| N                    | 177                      |              |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table (4) shows the descriptive statistics of the good working via, productivity in Commercial Bank with a mean response of 1.8261 and std. deviation of 1.16043 for the good working environment and a mean response of 1.9065 and std. deviation of 1.26713 for productivity and number of respondents (177). By careful observation of standard deviation values, there is not much difference in terms of the standard deviation scores. This implies that there is about the same variability of data points between the dependent and independent variables.

Table (5) is the Pearson correlation coefficient for the good working environment and productivity in Commercial Bank, Enugu state. The correlation coefficient shows 0.955. This value indicates that correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed) and implies that there is a significant positive relationship between good working environment and productivity in Commercial Bank, in Enugu state. (r = .955). The computed correlations coefficient is greater than the table value of r = .195 with 175 degrees of freedom (df. = n-2) at alpha level for a two-tailed test (r = .955, p < .05). However, since the computed r = .955 is greater than the table value of .195 we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a positive relationship between good working environment and productivity in Commercial Bank, Enugu state (r = .955, P < .05).

3 To what extent does social responsibility affect creativity and innovation in Commercial Bank, in Enugu?
Table 6: Coded Responses on the effect of social responsibility on innovation and creativity.

| s/no | Questionnaire items                                                                 | S.Agree /Agree | Disagree /S.Disagree | Total   |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|
| 1    | social responsibility brings about the project which will promote the image of the organization | 171 (172)      | 6 (5)                 | 177     |
| 2    | Creativity and innovation ensure a current trend in boosting image of the organization to the public as a good will | 173 (172)      | 4 (5)                 | 177     |
|      | TOTAL                                                                               | 344 (97%)      | 10 (3%)               | 354 (100) |

Source: fieldwork 2016

Table 6 shows that 344(97%) of the respondents indicated S.agree / agree, while 10(3%) indicated disagree/S.disagree. Based on responds from percentage analysis it was concluded that social responsibility to larger extent affects innovation and creativity in Commercial Bank.

Table 7 SPSS result of the effect of social responsibility on creativity and innovation

| Particulars | R  | R²  | Adj.R² | DW | Standard Coefficients | F    | Sig. |
|-------------|----|-----|--------|----|-----------------------|------|------|
| schools     | 0.736<sup>(a)</sup> | 0.541 | -0.538 | .206 | 0.736 | 14.362 | 206.279 | 0.000 |

Source: SPSS

NOTE:
R = Correlation Coefficient or Beta
R² = Coefficient of Determination
Adj. R² = Adjusted Coefficient of Determination
DW = Durbin-Watson (d) test statistic
T-value = Student t- test Statistic
F = F- test statistic
Model Equation SR = 0.370 + 0.777CI

The result indicates that social responsibility to larger extent affects creativity and innovation as t = 14.362 and which is above the rule of thumb positivity of 2 and the coefficient of social responsibility is (0.370). The variations from the model are explained by the model as indicated by the coefficient of the determination (r²) value of 54.1%.

Also, the result indicates that there is a positive relationship between social responsibility and creativity and innovation as indicated by r value of 0.736 which is positive as shown by the beta value of 0.736.

11. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that corporate reputation is about a firm’s quality management of its corporate name. A firm’s corporate reputation involves several aspects of a firm: its long-term investment value, its financial soundness, whether it makes a wise use of corporate assets, its quality of management, products and services, its ability to innovate, its ability to attract develop or keep talented people, its communication and environment responsibilities. A corporate reputation is a tool used by firms to attract the best employees, raise capital effectively, become a good community member, or gain and retain loyal customers.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Organizations should live up to expectation to their stakeholder that will serve as a competitive advantage to the organization at large
2. Organizations should periodical embark on corporate social responsibility, that will go a long way to creating a good public image to the organization and the general public
3. Organizations should ensure that their product is of good quality that will serve as competitive tool to win the market, retain new customer and that will enhance productivity and increase profitability
4. Organization should ensure that there is conducive working environment, for both employees and customers such will help them to increase their market share.
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