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Abstract. In this paper, a reputation measurement scale developed by Daniel M. Cable and Mary E. Graham is used to measure corporate reputation from the perspective of employees through empirical investigation and exploratory factor analysis in the light of corporate employees’ perception of corporate reputation in Chinese environment. The conclusions are as follows: the six indicators that affect the reputation of the corporation are ranked as the products, the corporate construction, the corporate competitiveness, the corporate culture, construction of enterprise, the corporate appeal and the corporate finance according to the influence size. Through research, we can provide an effective measurement tool for employees to evaluate the reputation of the enterprise, so that managers can find problems at the corporate reputation in the enterprise employees, and targeted to develop the company’s strategic plan.

Introduction

Corporate reputation first entered the field of vision in 1983. The study of reputation has been studied since the publication of Fortune’s "The most respected companies” rankings. Good reputation is more commercially than bad reputation, Reputation is a prerequisite for people to cooperate with the company (Sabrina Helm, 2011), and the only can provide is reputation for service (Miu Rong, 2013). Good corporate reputation can help companies gain a sustainable competitive advantage over their competitors in the market for product services and ideas (Xu Jinfa, 2010). With the development of global enterprises, scholars have studied more and more from tangible assets to intangible assets, the reputation of enterprises is becoming more and more valued by scholars. At present, domestic and foreign scholars on corporate reputation research focused on the definition of corporate reputation, meaning, role and measurement, the choice of perspective from the general public and consumers, and from the staff perspective research rarely. Employees are different from the consumer, There is a mutual relationship between employees and businesses, on the one hand, The reputation of the enterprise can affect employees’ recognition and identification of the enterprise, thus affecting the motivation of employees’ work and attitudes towards enterprises, on the other hand, Employees’ perception and identification of the reputation of the enterprise can affect the employee’s message to external stakeholders, thus affecting the reputation of the enterprise (HeYunqing, 2010).

Good reputation is often the result of long-term accumulation of enterprises, but the loss of reputation often only need a specific event, corporate reputation once damaged, companies will quickly lose its value in a short time. Through the study of corporate reputation, helps managers find weak part of the company’s reputation, so as to adjust the company’s strategic plan, can make the company stable and long-term development. Enterprise employees are direct contact with consumers face to face, through employee behavior feedback, enterprises can understand the role of reputation in the enterprise, to help enterprises through reputation survey adjustment behavior, improve customer satisfaction, the enhancement enterprise competitiveness in the market. Through this study, we can provide an effective measurement tool for the staff to evaluate the reputation of the enterprise, so that managers can find the problems in the corporate reputation and formulate the strategic plan of the company.
Overview

Definitions of Corporate Reputation

At present, reputation has been studied by scholars for a period of time. Different scholars have different definitions and views in different disciplines, so there is no accurate definition of reputation (Mahon, J. F, 2002). Fombrun (1996) thinks corporate reputation is an evaluation of the past behavior and future prospects of a company, and is a key attraction when compared with other competitors. Strategists believe that reputation is a corporate resource, so it is valuable and can be managed, and in some ways gives the market a competitive advantage in goods and services. Social families see reputation as a corporate asset, but it is not clear how they relate to other mainstream studies, such as corporate social responsibility, management issues, and relationships with stakeholders; The marketing scholar combines some of the strategic approaches of literature to look at reputation in order to expand the impact of reputation including product and service brands; Public relations scholars believe that reputation plays a role in crisis management and the development of corporate image (ML Barnet, 2000). Craig E. Carroll (2013) argues that reputation is a sense of admiration, positive, and trusting of another person, organization, industry, and even country. Sanjay Mudnane (2003) believes that corporate reputation is the sum of all stakeholders’ impact on the firm and is an asset that brings value to the business. In the Chinese scholar, Zhang Silong and Zhou Zucheng (2002) define the corporate reputation as the overall evaluation of the firm based on the direct or indirect information and experience that the firm has in place, and the good corporate reputation shows that the firm’s trust and respect. Overall, about the definition of corporate reputation can be divided into two categories, one kind is to emphasize reputation is a kind of evaluation of its stakeholders, another is to emphasize reputation is perception, impression of enterprise stakeholders (Table 1).

Table 1. Definition of corporate reputation.

| Type     | Author(s)                        | Definition                                                                 |
|----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Appraise | Fombrun(1996)                    | Is an assessment of a company’s past behavior and future prospects          |
|          | Fombrun, Gardberg(2000)          | Stakeholders provide a comprehensive assessment of the ability to produce value |
|          | Whetten, Mackey(2002)            | A stakeholder’s judgment of an enterprise’s behavior by the expectation of an enterprise |
|          | Zhang Silong and Zhou Zucheng (2002) | The overall evaluation of the business by the stakeholders based on direct or indirect information and experience |
|          | Miu Rong(2013)                   | A comprehensive evaluation of the company’s internal and external behavior subjects |
|          | Craig E. Carroll                 | A perception of an individual’s admiration, positive, and trusting of another person, organization, industry, and even the country |
|          | Hall(1992)                       | The combination of stakeholders’ rational cognition and perceptual cognition |
| Perception | Saxton(1998)                      | Stakeholders over time they saw or to express the impression of organization |
|          | Tucker, Melewar(2005)            | Stakeholder perception of an organization through its past, present and future actions |
|          | Bai yongxiu, Xu hong(2001)       | The comprehensive reflection of the behavior of the enterprises is the overall impression of the stakeholders in the enterprise activities |
In the early studies, the definition of corporate reputation only focused on a dimension of cognition or emotion, but Manfred (2004) suggested that the corporate reputation was made up of two dimensions of cognition and emotion, which provided a new dimension for the development of reputation direction. Miao Rong (2013) based on the value network of the company’s stakeholders, proposes that the company’s reputation has three dimensions: breadth, intensity and degree of beauty. Table 2 shows the division of scholars on the dimension of corporate reputation. The essence of reputation is the type of cognition formed by the interaction of the behavior subject in the long game (2004).

### Table 2. Dimensions of corporate reputation.

| Dimensions       | Author(s)                                    | Definition                                      |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| one-dimensional  | Fombrun(1996)                                | Affection                                       |
|                  | Grunig(2002)                                  | Cognition                                       |
|                  | Rose, Thomsen(2004)                          |                                                 |
| two-dimensional  | Hall(1992), Schwaiger(2004), Manfred(2004),  | Affection and cognition                         |
|                  | Liu Liang(2004), Kroeber Riel(2003), Liu     |                                                 |
|                  | Yuyu(2009)                                   |                                                 |
| three-dimensional| Miu Rong(2005)                               | Famous, trust, Degree of beauty                 |
|                  | Yu Qin(2001)                                 | Rational cognition, emotional response and      |
|                  | Zhao Jian(2010)                              | behavioral tendency                             |

In summary, the article defines the corporate reputation based on employee perspective, the staff according to the past behavior of enterprises and their expectations of the enterprise and an evaluation of the enterprise.

**The Characteristics of Corporate Reputation**

Corporate reputation as a special intangible asset, the biggest feature is that it takes a long time to form, but it only takes a moment to destroy. In general, consumers’ perception of the reputation of the enterprise comes from the activity or motivation of the enterprise in the past, which is necessarily a long-term behavior, which is the accumulation of enterprise. Different from popularity, enterprises can improve their own popularity in the short term through a large number of public relations means, and reputation must be formed in long-term corporate behavior activities. Higher popularity companies do not necessarily have a good reputation, and raising popularity is only one aspect of the company’s good reputation. Usually a bad behavior of the business impact on the customer than a good behavior more strongly. The good reputation of a business must be gained through daily accumulation, and the damage to corporate reputation may be just because of a bad behavior.

Corporate reputation also has a lag and relativity. Lagging performance in the evaluation of a corporate reputation is determined by the behavior of enterprises in the past, but for the current behavior of the enterprise is very little understanding, so enterprises can through this, in the enterprise crisis, The lag will allow companies to act as a corporate umbrella within a certain period of time (Jing Ye, 2007), companies can have more time to deal with the crisis found. Corporate reputation is the product of competition (Fombrun, 1996), in judging the reputation of an enterprise, consumers often compare the enterprise with its alternative competitive enterprise, thus the reputation of the enterprise has certain relativity.

**Measure**

The measurement of corporate reputation is mainly concentrated in foreign countries. Compared with China, foreign research scales are more mature. Since corporate reputation is an intangible asset and there is no uniform measurement method, the commonly used methods are mainly based
on the qualitative and quantitative methods of reputation ranking (Miao Rong, 2013). Different scholars according to different research main body, the selection of measurements in a different environment and method is different, the most start measuring reputation from fortune magazine in 1983 "the most respected enterprises" selection, and then a large number of researchers continue to use this metric to measure corporate reputation. But this evaluation system is too important for the financial aspect, and the financial data accounts for a large proportion of the results. In 2000, Harris Fombrun proposed that reputation quotient (RQ) would further develop its reputation. Until 2004, Manfred proposed a two-dimensional model, which divided the corporate reputation into two dimensions of emotion and cognition, which put forward a new direction for the research of corporate reputation. There are not many studies on the reputation of enterprises in China. They have followed the overseas scale, combined with the domestic situation, and conducted research on local enterprises.

Gianfranco Walsh (2009) examined the antecedents and consequences of Corporate Reputation, by 511, a German energy company’s customer data as the foundation, USES the structured equation model, to explore the influence of customer satisfaction to the enterprise reputation, and corporate reputation in the influences of customer loyalty, and word-of-mouth behavior. In the measurement of reputation stage, we selected five indicators of customer orientation, employer strength, reliable and strong economic strength, quality of products and services, social and environmental responsibility. G. Dowling’s (2004) survey of 25 journalists identified in the eyes of reporters to corporate reputation six evaluation indexes: social responsibility, enterprise ability, media relations, market performance, corporate personality, and corporate reputation. Kerstin (2011) measures media’s assessment of corporate reputation through the following eight indicators: financial performance, strategic management, industry development, supervision, products and services, shareholders, communication and environment. Daniel Cable (2001) based on job seekers to three stages of corporate reputation measurement, in the first stage, 14 related factors, such as industry, development opportunity and organizational culture, were extracted from oral interviews of college students. In the second stage, five indicators of industry, growth opportunity, organizational culture, profitability and salary were measured, and the third stage was carried out field survey and measurement. At the same time, they compared the differences between the three stages, and found that growth opportunities and organizational culture were related to job seekers’ perceived corporate reputation in the first two stages, but not in the third stage.

**Table 3. Document collating indicators.**

| Measurement standard | The source of the literature |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Product and service quality | AMAC(1983), RQ(2000), Manfred(2004), Gianfranco(2009), Liu Liang(2006), YinSheng(2004), Liu Zhigang(2006) |
| Financial Long-term investment value | AMAC(1983), RQ(2000), Manfred(2004), Liu Liang(2006), YinSheng |
| Social responsibility | AMAC(1983) |
| Talent use | RQ(2000), Manfred(2004), Gianfranco(2009), Liu Liang(2006), YinSheng(2004), Liu Zhigang(2006) |
| Global operating effectiveness | AMAC(1983) |
| Emotional attraction | GMAC(1983), Manfred(2004) |
| Vision and leadership working environment | RQ(2000), Gianfranco(2009), Daniel M. Cablel(2000), Liu Liang(2006) |
| Customer orientation | RQ(2000), Liu Liang(2006) |
| Good employer | Gianfranco(2009) |
| Profitability | Daniel M. Cablel(2000) |
| Salary | Daniel M. Cablel(2000) |
| Market performance | Liu Liang(2006) |
| Enterprise innovation | YinSheng(2004), Liu Zhigang(2006) |
In China, Liu Liang (2005) from the perspective of the general public to study corporate reputation driving factors, different industry of private enterprises in zhejiang area of the general public as investigation object, from the perspective of emotional and cognitive two-dimensional exploration, think the products and services, customer orientation, financial performance, market performance, vision and leadership, working environment, social responsibility index is the enterprise the reputation of the driving factors of seven. Liu zhigang (2004) used the customers of the beverage industry in zhejiang as the investigation object, and the five indicators influencing the reputation measurement of the enterprise were obtained through factor analysis: customer concern factor, product correlation factor, social responsibility factor, innovation factor and management factor. Table 4 summarizes the scholars’ index selection of reputation research.

Method

Employees are important stakeholders in enterprise management. This paper selects employees as research objects. Based on the collation of domestic and foreign literatures, the main reference is Daniel M. Cable (2001) and Miao Rong (2013) to study the domestic practice of RQ in China, and then make appropriate changes to the questionnaire in the domestic environment to determine the influencing factors of employees’ corporate reputation. Daniel M. Cable (2001) based on the survey of the reputation of the enterprise based on the job seeker, the applicant and the employee have similar characteristics. This paper mainly borrows from the measurement in the first stage. This stage, through interviews with college students, came up with the most mentioned options in the interview. RQ (2000) method has been applied to global companies, in different countries, different industry, more and more research has proved the feasibility of the scale, and Miao Rong (2013) study the applicability of the RQ in a domestic environment, combined with the domestic environment of RQ index changes, and this paper reference measurement scale. The detailed measurements are shown in the Table 5. The gender, age, cultural level and annual income of the four control variables were set. The 20 measurement indexes adopted the "0-1" scale, and the problem 6 was set as the reverse index. On this basis, there are two measurement problems from the employee’s perspective of reputation perception, use a scale of five. Then, the questionnaire survey was conducted to collect the data, and the corresponding dimensions were extracted through factor analysis. The specific research framework was shown in figure 1.

Figure 1. Model of corporate reputation.
Table 4. Document collating indicators.

| Indicators      | Number | Measuring item                                                                 |
|-----------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reputation      | Y1     | You think the company has an outstanding reputation                             |
|                 | Y2     | You think the company is well known                                             |
|                 | X1     | You will be proud of the products and services that the company provides to consumers |
|                 | X2     | You are familiar with the products that enterprises provide to consumers       |
|                 | X3     | You think that the enterprises you serve provide consumers with high quality products |
|                 | X4     | You think your company is offering a moderate price for the consumer products   |
|                 | X5     | You think that your company offers many opportunities for training or promotion |
|                 | X6     | You think you are boring to work in this enterprise                            |
|                 | X7     | You think your company has a friendly working atmosphere                       |
|                 | X8     | You think that your company is a very honest enterprise                         |
|                 | X9     | Before you work for the company, do you know anything about the company        |
| Measuring scale | X10    | You know the history of the enterprise you serve                               |
|                 | X11    | You will introduce or recommend your company to other candidates                |
|                 | X12    | You think your company is good for employees                                    |
|                 | X13    | Do you think the size of your enterprise is satisfactory to you                 |
|                 | X14    | You believe that the enterprise of you serve has normative rules and regulations |
|                 | X15    | You think the company you serve has a relatively good foundation               |
|                 | X16    | You think your company is doing a good job in terms of financial profitability  |
|                 | X17    | You believe that there is no discrimination or discrimination in hiring         |
|                 | X18    | You think companies will try to hire different types of people when hiring     |
|                 | X19    | You are satisfied with the location of your company                            |
|                 | X20    | Your annual income is higher than that of other employees in your industry      |
Exploratory Factor Analysis

Pre-survey

First, please ask 10 graduate students of the Department of Business Administration to fill out the questionnaire to discuss whether the statements in the questionnaire are ambiguous, whether the expression is accurate, and the appropriate language changes to the questionnaire to obtain the final questionnaire. On question 19, graduate students believe that foreign literature mainly believes that multinational companies will affect the perception of the reputation of employees, and in the domestic access to the literature found that no scholars from the geographical factors to study the corporate reputation. In the test of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was also found to be significantly improved after the deletion of X19, so the X19 was deleted in the formal investigation phase.

The basic situation of the respondents

This paper choice of fresh agricultural products supermarket as research object, adopt the way of face to face interview, about 200 employees working in fresh agricultural products supermarket as respondents, random 200 respondents according to the content of the questionnaire, the respondents were interviewed, after the completion of the recycling questionnaire number and fill in the questionnaire to analyze the validity of the questionnaire and review, 145 valid questionnaires. The questionnaire data was used to carry out exploratory factor analysis to determine the weight of each index.

The survey respondents were employees in Chengdu and its surrounding large supermarkets (Carrefour, Yonghui, etc.) in the fresh agricultural products. From the questionnaire can be seen, the staff mainly female, accounting for 70.3%, age concentrated in the 19-49 years old, accounting for 90.4%, employees generally not highly educated, high school and below accounted for 86.3% As a result, staff income is generally low, 91.8% of the annual income of employees only less than 40,000. Details are shown in table 6.

Table 6. The basic situation of the respondents.

| Item                      | Options                    | Total | Proportion |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------|------------|
| gender                    | male                       | 43    | 29.7%      |
|                           | female                     | 102   | 70.3%      |
| age                       | 19-29                      | 43    | 29.7%      |
|                           | 30-39                      | 41    | 28.3%      |
|                           | 40-49                      | 47    | 32.4%      |
|                           | 50-59                      | 13    | 9.0%       |
|                           | Over 60                    | 1     | 0.7%       |
| The degree of education   | Primary school and below   | 13    | 9.0%       |
|                           | Junior high school         | 80    | 55.2%      |
|                           | senior high school         | 32    | 22.1%      |
|                           | technical school           | 15    | 10.3%      |
|                           | undergraduate              | 4     | 2.8%       |
|                           | Graduate and above         | 1     | 0.7%       |
| Annual income             | 30, 000 and below          | 110   | 75.9%      |
|                           | 30, 000-40, 000            | 23    | 15.9%      |
|                           | 40, 000-50, 000            | 6     | 4.1%       |
|                           | 50, 000-60, 000            | 1     | 0.7%       |
|                           | 60, 000-70, 000            | 1     | 0.7%       |
|                           | Over 70, 000               | 4     | 2.8%       |
Exploratory Factor Analysis

Cronbach’s α coefficient was used to test the internal consistency before testing the impact of the factors on the reputation impact. The reliability of the questionnaire was found to be 0.752 by SPSS, and Cronbach’s α > 0.6 was considered to be highly reliable. Followed by a KMO measure of the sample and a Bartlett sphere test to determine the suitability factor analysis. The results are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7. KMO and Bartlett.**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .702 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity                  |      |
| Approx. Chi-Square                            | 553.283 |
| df                                            | 171  |
| Sig.                                          | .000 |

Do factor analysis using SPSS to raw data, rotate according to the maximum variance method, according to KMO value of 0.702 is suitable for factor analysis, put forward six factors, the overall variance contribution rate of 58.714%, thus can take 19 indexes are divided into 6 classes were studied (Table 8). And then the weight ratio of the variance contribution rate of each principal factor to the total variance contribution rate is weighted average as the weight, and the proportion of the indicators in the reputation of the enterprise is obtained.

**Table 8. Factor analysis results.**

| F1     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X3     | .763| .279|.047|.068|.096|.055| 2.145              | 11.29                           | 0.192 |
| X2     | .650|.057|.309|.007|.039|.192|                    |                                 |       |
| X1     | .572|.135|.170|.318|.131|.024|                    |                                 |       |
| X4     | .565|.052|.032|.373|.071|.237|                    |                                 |       |

| F2     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X8     | .067| .760|.075|.093|.172|.140| 2.121              | 11.16                           | 0.190 |
| X12    | .417|.702|.088|.015|.008|.019|                    |                                 |       |
| X11    | .045| .642|.143|.083|.111|.128|                    |                                 |       |
| X15    | .171|.550|.054|.037|.115|.403|                    |                                 |       |

| F3     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X9     | .187| .005|.723|.063|.044|.132| 2.008              | 10.57                           | 0.180 |
| X7     | -.020|.025|.698|.031|.262|.063|                    |                                 |       |
| X10    | .060|.317|.620|.097|.001|.036|                    |                                 |       |
| X5     | .130|.062|.531|.097|.199|.501|                    |                                 |       |

| F4     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X13    | .023|.076|.049|.829|.114|.006| 1.726              | 9.08                            | 0.155 |
| X14    | .179|.106|.140|.711|.124|.013|                    |                                 |       |
| X18    | -.121|.155|.126|.016|.751|.338|                    |                                 |       |
| F5     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X17    | .166|.294|.091|.050|.666|.116| 1.583              | 8.33                            | 0.142 |
| X6     | .332|.019|.346|.141|.553|.039|                    |                                 |       |

| F6     | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | Initial Eigenvalues | Variance contribution rate (%) | weight |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| X20    | .198|.028|.010|.307|.037|.695| 1.572              | 8.27                            | 0.141 |
| X16    | .075|.034|.032|.360|.205|.625|                    |                                 |       |
\[ F = 0.192F_1 + 0.190F_2 + 0.180F_3 + 0.155F_4 + 0.142F_5 + 0.141F_6 \]
\[ F_1 = 0.762x_3 + 0.650x_2 + 0.572x_1 + 0.565x_4 \]
\[ F_2 = 0.760x_8 + 0.702x_{12} + 0.642x_{11} + 0.550x_5 \]
\[ F_3 = 0.723x_9 + 0.698x_7 + 0.620x_{10} + 0.531x_5 \]
\[ F_4 = 0.829x_{13} + 0.711x_{14} \]
\[ F_5 = 0.751x_{18} + 0.666x_{17} + 0.553x_6 \]
\[ F_6 = 0.695x_{20} + 0.625x_{16} \] (1)

**Enterprise Product Factor**

From the results of the analysis, dimension 1 includes "You will be proud of the products and services that the company provides to consumers," "You are familiar with the products that enterprises provide to consumers," "You think that the enterprises you serve provide consumers with high quality products" four underlying indicators, the load factor were 0.763, 0.650, 0.572, 0.565, and the load coefficient is larger, the four indexes from the enterprise products to explain the impact on corporate reputation and employees to dimension 1 named "enterprise product factor". Which found that employees think the service the enterprise provides the high quality products for consumers’ perception of reputation is most important, that with the development of economy, enterprises provide products to the attention of a staff is no longer just about the price, is a greater degree of commodity quality, the quality of the pros and cons of more to influence the evaluation of the employees to the enterprise reputation.

**Enterprise Competitiveness Factor**

Dimension 2 corresponds to four items titled "You think that your company is a very honest enterprise", "You think your company is good for employees", "You will introduce or recommend your company to other candidates", "You think the company you serve has a relatively good foundation", the load factor were 0.760, 0.702, 0.642, 0.550, the load factor is large, these factors reflect the different aspects of the enterprise capacity, but the promotion of the competitiveness of enterprises are helpful, so these factors are defined as "Enterprise competitiveness factor.”

**Corporate Culture Factor**

Dimension 3 includes "Before you work for the company, do you know anything about the company", "You think your company has a friendly working atmosphere", "You know the history of the enterprise you serve", "You think that your company offers many opportunities for training or promotion", the load factor were 0.723, 0.698, 0.620, 0.531, the load factor is large, these four indicators mainly from the corporate culture to describe the reputation of employees perception, this article named the factor "corporate culture factor".

**Enterprise Construction Factor**

Dimension 4 includes “Do you think the size of your enterprise is satisfactory to you”, “you believe that the enterprise of you serve has normative rules and regulations”, the load factors are 0.829, 0.711; the load factor is large. These two indexes mainly describe employees’ perception of corporate reputation from the construction of enterprises; this article will be named the "enterprise construction factors.”

**Corporate Appeal Factor**

Dimension 5 includes “You believe that there is no discrimination or discrimination in hiring”, "You think companies will try to hire different types of people when hiring", "You think it is boring to work in this enterprise", the load factor were 0.751, 0.666, 0.553, the load factor is larger. The first two indicators from the recruitment of employees to describe the reputation of employees to
the enterprise, the third indicator of the staff of the company expressed an emotion, to explain the company’s appeal, so this article will be the factor named "corporate appeal factor".

**Corporate Financial Factor**

Dimension 6 includes "You think your company is doing a good job in terms of financial profitability", "Your annual income is higher than that of other employees in your industry", the load factor were 0.695, 0.625, the load factor is larger. These two indicators mainly from the staff to describe the treatment of employees to the reputation of the enterprise, this article will be named the "corporate financial factors."

**Conclusion**

Factor analysis of the KMO value of 0.702, this paper that the questionnaire is basically credible, and applies to factor analysis. According to the results of factor analysis, six factors are extracted and these six factors have positive influence on reputation. According to the degree of influence, they are "enterprise product factor", "enterprise competitiveness factor", "enterprise culture factor", "enterprise construction factor", "corporate appeal factor", "corporate financial factor". Employees are in direct contact with consumers. Employees are usually more willing to work for reputable companies. Reputable companies often attract more outstanding graduates, through the investigation of fresh industry employees behavior, managers can understand the role of corporate reputation in China’s fresh industry, so enterprises in the daily reputation maintenance, the face of the factors of greater regression coefficient should be put into more resources, thereby enhancing the staff’s reputation perception of the enterprise, improve employee loyalty and work efficiency, enhanced Enterprises in the market competitiveness.

In this paper, the reputation measurement of enterprise employees can reflect the reputation of employees in the enterprise to a certain extent. Due to the limitation of research conditions, there are many deficiencies in this study. In addition, due to the reasons of time and energy, it cannot expand the investigation area and the scope of the industry, the survey object is relatively narrow, Due to the lack of domestic research, this paper only locates in the exploration and exploration stage. These problems need to be further improved in the future research.
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