**Doing ‘Reputation’ in the Indian Context: An Employee Perspective**

**Abstract**

Corporate reputation has been studied as an aggregate of stakeholder perceptions with some emphasis on distinguishing between the perceptions of different stakeholder groups. This study focuses on the perceptions of employees, a critical group of stakeholders, within the Indian context and examines factors and attributes that inform an understanding of reputation from an employee perspective and shares consequences of the same. Building on existing research conducted in the developed countries, the study reveals similarities and dissimilarities with existing reputation models. Results reveal three new factors namely stakeholder connect, customer centricity, and company ethos which are critical to an understanding of reputation from the perspective of Indian employees. Based on factors and attributes emerging from employee perceptions, the study proposes the LEEC Model (Loyalty, Engagement, Emotional Connect and Commitment) that highlights the consequences of a good reputation in the Indian context.
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**Introduction**

Corporate reputation (CR) is defined by perceptions of a wide array of stakeholders such as shareholders and investors, customers and consumers, employees, and members of the community. In other words, reputation is a

“collective representation of a firm’s past actions and results that describes a

firm’s ability to deliver valued outcomes to multiple stakeholders. It gauges

a firm’s relative standing both internally and externally with its stakeholders,

in both its competitive and institutional environments.” (Fombrun & van Reil, 1997,

p. 10).

Scholars have suggested frameworks and models that define reputation from the perspective of developing strategy and building stakeholder community with concepts as ‘integrated marketing communications’ (Kitchen & Schultz, 1999), ‘corporate identity management’(van Riel & Balmer, 1997), ‘reputation management’ (Fombrun, 1996), ‘stakeholder communications’ (Christensen & Cheney, 1994) and ‘excellent public relations’

(Grunig & Grunig, 1998). CR has also been viewed as a source for providing competitive advantage and value with consequences as consistent and superior market performance.

Numerous studies have probed this strategic relationship and conducted research on the antecedents and consequences of CR (Chun, 2005; Walker, 2010) and asserted that companies with a good reputation are linked with sound financial performance (Roberts & Dowling, 2002), and higher stakeholder satisfaction as, customers (Walsh & Beatty, 2007), employees (Chun & Davies, 2010) etc. The findings of these studies though, have been subject to dispute in the CR literature (e.g., Chun, 2005; Fombrun & Shanley, 1990). Considering the fact that CR accords a competitive advantage to a company, further research on the antecedents and consequences is important (Ali *et al.,* 2015). Of primary importance are the following three points in this research domain: the country of study, the type of stakeholder group assessing the reputation, and the research methods adopted for the study (Ali *et al.,* 2015).

  A majority of extant studies on corporate reputation have been conducted in developed or industrialized countries such as UK (e.g., Chung *et al.,*1999), USA (e.g., Fombrun *et al.,* 2000; Gardberg, 2006), Germany (e.g., Helm, 2005; Schwaiger, 2004), The Netherlands (e.g., Groenland, 2002) and Italy (e.g., Gabbioneta *et al.*, 2007).  In the literature, the issues examined by scholars emphasize level of income, industrialization, development of economy (e.g., Terblanche, 2014) and differing culture (Groenland, 2002). These factors have contributed significantly in developing perceptions of reputation in differing geographies as Asia and the West (Wang & Shen, 2000). In the past decade, scholarly attention to reputation perceptions in emerging markets has been on the rise (Vancheswar *et al.,* 2015) in non-western cultures (e.g., Laverde *et al.,* 2022;  Ozdora-Aksak, 2005; Ozdora-Aksak& Duman, 2016; Walsh & Wiedmann, 2004**)**and with individual stakeholder groups such as customers, employees etc. (Fombrun *et al.,* 2015; Ponzi *et al.,* 2011).

Thus, it is important to examine the applicability of (validated) frameworks/models and reputation measures from the Western contexts to emerging markets (Amabile & Khaire, 2008) for, “… the market realities in emerging markets such as India impose unique challenges for organizations striving to present their intent.” (Vancheswar *et al.,* 2015, p. 262). With the opening of Indian markets and exposure of stakeholders to foreign direct investments, CR becomes a decisive factor in ascertaining trust and goodwill. The paper contributes to existing scholarship by investigating perceptions of employees on reputation drivers in the Indian context and examining the consequences, therein which lead to supportive behavior.

A second argument underpinning our research is the need to focus on the employee perspective. CR research has conventionally focused more heavily on customer perception (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001). Employees and their role in developing CR has, however, gained more currency in recent times (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001; Dowling, 1993) predicated on the argument that employees are the “conduit through which reputation is managed” (Cravens & Oliver, 2006, p. 297). Researchers posit that employees can drive organizational reputation (Shamma & Hassan, 2009), build public trust (Melewar, 2008), increase commitment and enhance performance (Bauman & Skitka, 2012), and have power and internal legitimacy to influence the company (Lee *et al.*, 2013). An organization with a good CR secures supportive behaviour from the employees by helping them meet their goals, identifying with the organization, and creating a sense of ownership and responsibility. While there is general agreement on the benefits of positive employee perceptions of the company, the same has not been extensively examined or deliberated upon (Cravens & Oliver, 2006). Our study fills the two aforementioned gaps by empirically testing factors and attributes that define reputation from the employee perspective in emerging markets, with specific reference to India.

Guided by the aforementioned considerations, this study examines drivers of reputation and outcomes from an employee perspective. Specifically, we ask: what are the defining factors of reputation in emerging economies, with specific focus on India?  In what ways do these compare with existing understanding of reputation in developed countries? What are the consequences of a good reputation for employees in the Indian context? These questions warrant investigation for a number of reasons outlined below.

The paper is structured as follows: We begin by unpacking key factors in corporate reputation and their attributes, followed by an understanding of stakeholder (employee) perceptions, the country of study (India), the methodology, and the findings. Based on the findings we propose the benefits of positive reputation from the employee perspective which leads to supportive behavior. In addition, delineating similarities and differences between our results and extant scholarship, we propose managerial and theoretical implications.

**Literature Review**

CR has prominently featured in the management research since 1990s (Rindova *et al.*, 2010) with researchers considering it as overall appeal (Fombrun, 1996), fame and esteem (Hall, 1992), a signal of key characteristics (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990). It has also been viewed as a valuable intangible asset (e.g., Deephouse 2000) that may contribute to providing competitive advantage (Hall 1992) to different stakeholder groups ( Schwaiger & Raithel, 2014) and to superior financial performance (Roberts & Dowling, 2002). Kartalia (2000) has viewed reputation from the perspective of a winning organization’s strategy. Strategic management theory postulates that a favourable and positive CR can provide competitive advantage (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001b) independent of other issues (Bennett & Gabriel, 2001b) which affects corporate performance (Fombrun & Rindova, 1996; Rindova & Fombrun, 1995) and provides corporate success (Fombrun, 1996).

Differing viewpoints on what constitutes CR generated an interest in measuring the construct which resulted in a plethora of models and criteria (Balmer, 2001; Gotsi & Wilson, 2001), varying considerably in their sampling frames, items and length (Ponzi *et al.,* 2011) and in their field application across contexts. Most of these scales measure performance instead of attitude towards a company (Bromley, 2002; Fombrun *et al.,* 2000; Ponzi *et al.,* 2011). Some of the dimensions in these instruments lack cross-cultural validity which would allow for international comparability (Feldman *et al.,* 2014).

The first measurement instrument proposed was the Reputation Quotient (RQ) constructed out of 20 attributes (Fombrun *et al.*, 2000). Four out of these 20 variables were selected to compose the RepTrak® Pulse measure in 2005. The reliability and validity of this measure of reputation was demonstrated by Ponzi *et al.* (2011) and since then has been extensively used. The scale conceptualized corporate reputation as “a collective construct that describes the aggregate perceptions of multiple stakeholders about a company’s performance” (p. 242). This scale measured items drawn from previous research (Fombrun *et al.*, 2000; Gardberg, 2006) and were drawn from qualitative research on multiple stakeholder groups. The same was validated by prior research (Fombrun *et al.,* 2015) and measures on four core areas as trust, esteem, admire and good feeling (Chan *et al.,* 2018). The scale has been developed in the Western context and this paper explores the relevance/applicability of the proposed dimensions in the Indian context.

***Contextual understandings of corporate reputation (CR)***

As a socially constructed concept (Rindova & Martins, 2012), CR is based on the types of goals and objectives pursued by a company (Soleimani *et al.,* 2014) within a particular geography or economy. A similar orientation in identification and understanding reputation perceptions from an employee perspective is required in emerging economies with increasing competition and entry of multi-national firms. Building and managing CR for sustainable growth has proven to be one such important milestone in the corporate journey.

Though the focus on reputation over the last two years has been on the increase there is little consensus on understanding the concept across markets and economies. For instance, Zyglidopoulos and Reid (2006) asserted that differences in “ethical reasoning” and decision-making between developed and developing economies (Lam *et al.,* 2008) create varied stakeholder perceptions (Zhang, 2009).Market realities and country-specific issues of governance, regulatory frameworks and transparency in emerging markets are found to affect perceptions of corporate reputation as different stakeholder groups base their assessment of reputation on outcomes based on their relationships with firms (Carter & Deephouse, 1999). In other words, the significance of CR can be understood by comprehending the antecedents and consequences of the same which are complex, context specific and stakeholder dependent (Ali *et al.,* 2015; Ruiz *et al.,* 2016).

Studies on perceptual differences between employees in developed and emerging economies have emphasized that the objectives of managing reputation in developed (Western) countries are intangible, whereas in many emerging economies in the Asia region, tangible aspects are more important. For instance, Lines (2004) suggested that Asian employees favor transparency (53%), the ability to innovate (47%), and adaptability to change (46%). He further postulated that employees in Asian countries are unable to move beyond the immediate business benefits which clearly signaled their focus on customers and shareholders. In sharp contrast, European and North American employees preferred internal communication (66%) and treatment of employees (52%) (Lines, 2004) to be critical variables in managing and building positive reputation

***Stakeholder (Employee) Perceptions***

Although the classic understanding of reputation as an aggregate of perceptions of all stakeholders is firmly established in management scholarship, scholars have challenged this view (e.g., Flanagan & O’ Shaughnessy, 2005) arguing that an organization can have multiple reputations, contingent on perceptions of different stakeholder groups (Ang & Wight, 2009). Walker (2010) argued that it is difficult to expect all stakeholder groups to conform to aggregate perceptions or to expect individual groups to overlook their perceptions and maintain conformity to the collective, summary analysis of overall reputation.

Indeed, different stakeholders may have differing views of the same firm’s reputation because they use their own needs, economic, social and personal background (Fombrun,1996; Zinkhan *et al.,* 2001) and their individual relationships with the firm (Dowling, 2001) to arrive at an assessment of the firm’s reputation. Owing to this variation in the experience of people (Fombrun, 1996), a firm can have multiple reputations which may vary across stakeholder groups (Wartick, 2002) with each group using different evaluation criteria for measurement.

Within the ambit of existing scholarship on corporate reputation, employees have been found to be the most significant group of stakeholders for reputation is internally founded in “the sensemaking experiences of employees” (van Riel & Fombrun, 2007, p. 57) which drives positive perceptions of an organization (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001). Pragmatically as well, understanding employee perception and engagement (Martin, 2009) facilitates reputation management by creating a good fit between company image and stakeholder (aka employee) values. This ‘fit’, leads to “high levels of confidence, trust and support among stakeholders” (Dowling, 2001, p. 23). Additionally, companies stand to gain from a positive reputational perception of employees. Good and qualified workers are attracted to reputable companies which creates “mutually beneficial relationships between the organization and its employees” (Men & Bowen, 2017, p. 12) and has a positive cascading effect on the existing reputation of the company.

***The Indian Context***

As part of the cohort of emerging economies, India has, over the last couple of decades, begun focusing on reputation management. Expectations of tangible returns have governed operational strategies in terms of attracting foreign investments and multinational corporations. The key driver to success, in the Indian context, has been the attempt to beat market competition through procurement of resources and creation of unique products which may be difficult to replicate in other markets. While Indian companies have realized the importance of reputation, the conceptualization of what constitutes reputation from the employee perspective or what are the consequences of a good CR from the employee perspective still need to be investigated. Multiple corporate scandals and scams and loss of investor faith have made firms shift focus on the intangibles in managing reputation which could be built by managing credibility in the Indian and international markets (Zyglidopoulos & Reid, 2006).

Research confirms this shift. However, there is no comparative data which would help justify reasons for the differences in factors and attributes of reputation across societies. In the absence of these data, we argue that while the core purpose of stakeholder connect is societal, it is also instrumental in terms of the tangible aspects (Witzel, 2010). There is therefore a need to measure and understand the attitudes and perceptions of practitioners (read employees) who are important stakeholders. This can be done with respect to the core attributes that could contribute to CR building in emerging market contexts such as India for practitioners base their reputation evaluations on the differing set of outcomes stemming from their relationship with the organization (Carter & Deephouse, 1999).

With this background, this paper examines employee perceptions on reputation in the Indian context by addressing the gap between theory and empirical investigations, and builds upon the RepTrak TM model to do so. It therefore assesses the need to either restructure or replicate the model (Walsh & Wiedmann, 2004) in a culturally diverse setting.

As such, we ask the following research questions:

RQ1) From an employee perspective, what are the defining factors of reputation in emerging economies, with specific focus on India?

RQ2) In what ways do these compare with existing understanding of reputation in developed countries?

RQ3) What are the consequences of a good reputation for employees in the Indian context?

**Research Methodology**

We followed a two-step process as used by Harrison Poll for the Reputation Quotient and various other studies attempting to develop a new scale or purify an existing one for measuring CR (Balan & Burlea, 2017; Helm, 2007a; Walsh & Beatty, 2007). In the first stage, attributes considered important for good CR were identified, followed by an evaluation of these attributes as dimensions contributing to a contextual understanding of CR.

*Questionnaire development and design*

In step one of the data collection process, a sample of 140 executive management students were administered an open-ended questionnaire to identify the top five attributes of a company with good reputation. These students were participants of an executive management program at Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India and had work experience ranging from two to 10 years, making them suitable as respondents (Walsh & Beatty, 2007). The resulting attributes were analyzed and the most frequently recurring ones were grouped into factors.

The factors arrived at were used for the second stage of the data collection process. While the corporate reputation scale of Fombrun *et al.* (2000) was formulated for use across constituencies and company types (Groenland, 2002; Walsh & Wiedmann, 2004), it is important to note that our focus was only on employees in the Indian context. However, given its wide acceptance, in line with Walsh and Beatty (2007), we chose to use the RepTrakTM items in our study. Accordingly, our modified scale included the seven RepTrakTM factors (products and services, innovation, workplace, governance, citizenship, leadership and performance), along with three new factors each with their own set of attributes (stakeholder connect, customer centricity and company ethos) that were developed from qualitative responses received from our first questionnaire (see Table 1).

*Table 1: Factors and Attributes for Corporate Reputation derived from Questionnaire 1*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sr. No.** | **Factor** | **Attributes** |
| 1 | Products and Services | Offers good quality/reliable products and services |
| Offers a variety of products and services |
| Offers user friendly products and services |
| Offers pocket friendly products and services |
| 2. | Creativity & Innovation | Promotes innovation |
| Creative ideas |
| Adapts to emerging trends |
| Is unique |
| 3. | Workplace Culture | Has a good working environment |
| Compensates employees well |
| Has well-defined hierarchy |
| Has an employee friendly work culture |
| Provides sufficient information |
| 4. | Governance | Pursues ends ethically |
| Has a strong value system |
| Is transparent and trustworthy |
| 5. | Citizenship | Is a socially responsible company |
| Engages in sustainable and citizenship activities |
| Contributes to nation's development |
| 6. | Leadership | Has a clear long-term vision |
| Has opportunities for learning |
| Has a visionary leader |
| 7. | Performance | Is financially sound |
| Has a good track record of financial performance |
| Shows good prospects for future growth |
| 8. | Stakeholder Connect | Builds emotional connect with customers |
| Is fair in its dealings with stakeholders |
| Aims to prevent disadvantage to stakeholders and society |
| Does not violate social, moral or legal codes of behavior |
| 9. | Customer Centricity | Has strong customer engagement |
| Takes customer feedback and works on reviews |
| Communicates clearly and often |
| 10. | Company Ethos | Is constantly evolving |
| Is convincing |
| Knows the market very well |
| Is consistent in its approach |
| Appears genuine |

In the second stage of the data collection process, a structured questionnaire with 40 statements based on attributes identified in the first stage was administered to middle management employees. The level of agreement on significance of a particular attribute for company reputation, was measured on a five-point Likert scale with the intervals, ‘strongly agree’ (5), ‘agree’ (4), ‘neutral’ (3), ‘disagree (2), and ‘strongly disagree’ (1). The purpose of this questionnaire was to quantitatively measure the factors and test the constructs that had emerged from the first stage of analysis.

*Pilot Study*

The reliability of the questionnaire was checked through a pilot survey administered to a small sample of 30 middle level employees from Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE), India 500 companies from the authors’ networks between November and December 2017. This study did not report any remarkable deviations. The Cronbach Alpha values for the items of each construct were greater than 0.7, demonstrating the questionnaire’s reliability and suitability for the final survey (Hair *et al.,* 2010). Following the pilot study, three academic experts in the area of research methodology were consulted and suggested changes were incorporated in the questionnaire.

*Administration of instrument*

Following the pilot, the questionnaire was sent to two mid-level employees from each of the BSE India 500 companies, leading to a sample size of 1000. Questionnaires were administered both personally to companies located in the state of Gujarat in India, by a field research associate, and through email to companies outside Gujarat state (Smith, 1997) between January and March 2018 (see Annexure for a sample questionnaire). 400 responses were received leading to a 40 per cent response rate. Respondents were promised a copy of the published paper in return for their participation. Table 2 shows the demographic profile of these respondents.

*Table 2: Demographic Profile of Respondents*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Average total work experience | 7.3 years |
| Average age | 30 years |
| Average annual salary | INR 16,15,080 (USD 19,595.60) |
| International exposure in work and education | 24.2% |
| Women students | 22.14% |
| Industries represented | 22 |

**Data Analysis**

Exploratory factor analysis was employed to uncover the factors underlying the responses to the second questionnaire.

*Exploratory factor analysis*

Eight factors were extracted using the principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax Rotation to arrive at the most significant factor solution. Six iterations of factor analysis were performed till a clear, interpretable and meaningful factor solution was arrived at. The two major criteria for factor extraction were: (i) Kaiser’s criterion for identifying factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 (Kaiser, 1960), and (ii) Minimum loading value of 0.50 for any factor to be included in the final structure of constructs (Hair *et al.,* 2010).

Factor structures for the study were identified on the basis of significance and clarity of the factor loadings and the interpretability and meaningfulness of the factors within the theoretical framework. This resulted in some factors being excluded as they did not fit well with other items in the structure and also in the change of name of some factors due to the grouping of factors thrown up by the analysis. The final model comprised eight factors with 27 attributes in all, as shown in Table 3.

*Table 3: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis: Constructs and their Reliability and Validity Indicators*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Factor | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| **Factor 1 - Products and Services (Cronbach Alpha = .63)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Offers a variety of products and services | .09 | .32 | .01 | -.08 | .13 | -.02 | | **.71** | .17 | .01 |
| 2 | Offers pocket friendly products and services | .15 | -.11 | .14 | .11 | .25 | .31 | | **.61** | .05 | -.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 2 - Creativity and Innovation (Cronbach Alpha = .71)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Displays creative ideas | .14 | .09 | .06 | .17 | .23 | **.64** | | .23 | -.03 | .35 |
| 2 | Is constantly evolving | .17 | .41 | .11 | .07 | .04 | **.60** | | -.09 | .11 | .21 |
| 3 | Knows the market very well | .22 | .14 | .12 | -.09 | .18 | **.47** | | -.10 | .39 | .24 |
| 4 | Is unique | .13 | .24 | .07 | .16 | -.03 | **.58** | | .20 | .33 | -.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 3 - Workplace Culture (Cronbach Alpha = .83)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Compensates employees well | **.66** | .12 | .12 | .10 | .20 | .01 | | .16 | -.06 | .15 |
| 2 | Shows good prospects for future growth | **.63** | .02 | .17 | .12 | .11 | .14 | | .15 | .11 | .16 |
| 3 | Has a good working environment | **.53** | .23 | .25 | .50 | .09 | .12 | | -.03 | -.05 | .17 |
| 4 | Has an employee friendly work culture | **.69** | .27 | .13 | .19 | .05 | .20 | | .07 | .11 | .10 |
| 5 | Provides sufficient information | **.59** | .25 | .13 | .17 | .19 | .25 | | .07 | .28 | -.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 4 - Citizenship (Cronbach Alpha = .82)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Promotes innovation | .31 | **.58** | -.10 | .06 | .04 | .07 | | .02 | .09 | .27 |
| 2 | Drives positive societal change | .01 | **.63** | .32 | .19 | .20 | .25 | | .22 | -.10 | .02 |
| 3 | Pursues ends ethically | .22 | **.53** | .26 | .16 | .07 | .12 | | .02 | .01 | .34 |
| 4 | Has a strong value system | .24 | **.54** | .27 | .21 | .25 | .20 | | -.11 | .16 | .13 |
| 5 | Contributes to the nation's development | .13 | **.57** | .25 | .09 | .20 | .25 | | .08 | .25 | -.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 5 - Financial Performance (Cronbach Alpha = .76)** | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1 | Is financially sound | -.04 | .19 | -.04 | .27 | .04 | .15 | | .08 | **.76** | .03 |
| 2 | Has a good track record of financial performance | .23 | .02 | .11 | .10 | .08 | .06 | | .26 | **.76** | .03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 6 -Stakeholder Connect (Cronbach Alpha = .72)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Builds emotional connect with customers | .02 | .10 | **.66** | .11 | -.04 | .25 | | .15 | .13 | .18 |
| 2 | Is fair in its dealings with stakeholders | .37 | .14 | **.47** | .10 | .25 | .04 | | -.07 | -.06 | .28 |
| 3 | Aims to prevent disadvantage to stakeholders and society | .27 | .08 | **.64** | .23 | .08 | -.05 | | .13 | .03 | .05 |
| 4 | Does not violate social, moral or legal codes of behavior | .22 | .30 | **.59** | .17 | .26 | .02 | | -.04 | .07 | .24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 7 - Customer Centricity (Cronbach Alpha = .68)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Has strong customer engagement | .19 | .05 | .25 | .19 | **.54** | .15 | | -.10 | .13 | .21 |
| 2 | Offers user friendly products and services | .14 | .19 | .04 | .15 | **.69** | .01 | | .30 | .19 | -.03 |
| 3 | Communicates clearly and often | .13 | .13 | .08 | .15 | **.70** | .15 | | .13 | -.06 | .22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Factor 8 - Company Ethos (Cronbach Alpha = .75)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Adapts to emerging trends | .26 | .24 | .18 | **.56** | .10 | .08 | | .05 | .13 | .27 |
| 2 | Is consistent in its approach | .14 | -.02 | .19 | **.71** | .26 | .04 | | .05 | .26 | .08 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. | | | | | | | | |

*Table 4: Constructs and their Reliability and Validity Indicators*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **SCR** | **AVE** | **Cronbach's Alpha** |
| Factor 1: Workplace Culture | 0.760 | 0.830 | 0.825 |
| Factor 2: Citizenship | 0.736 | 0.649 | 0.817 |
| Factor 3: Stakeholder Connect | 0.683 | 0.786 | 0.724 |
| Factor 4: Company Ethos | 0.652 | 0.702 | 0.752 |
| Factor 5: Customer Centricity | 0.681 | 0.710 | 0.677 |
| Factor 6: Creativity and Innovation | 0.661 | 0.736 | 0.708 |
| Factor 6: Products and Services | 0.671 | 0.739 | 0.632 |
| Factor 8: Financial Performance | 0.731 | 1.149 | 0.764 |

Table 4 shows scale composite reliability (SCR), average variance extracted (AVE) and Cronbach Alpha reliability for each factor. The values of SCR were found to be greater than 0.6 for all the factors. AVE for the eight factors was greater than 0.5, which is acceptable for discriminant validity. The Cronbach Alpha for each factor was greater than 0.6. This indicates convergent validity of the factors (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). To determine discriminant validity, inter-factor correlation matrix was derived and modified. As Table 5 shows, the squares of correlation coefficients between any two factors were not greater than the individual AVEs of the two factors, suggesting that each factor had internal (extracted) variance greater than the variance shared between the factors and had adequate discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

*Table 5: Discriminant Validity*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Factor** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
| 1 | Workplace Culture | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Citizenship | 0.67 | 0.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Stakeholder Connect | 0.59 | 0.57 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Company Ethos | 0.60 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Customer Centricity | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.84 |  |  |  |
| 6 | Creativity and Innovation | 0.53 | 0.63 | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 7 | Products and Services | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.37 | 0.86 |  |
| 8 | Financial Performance | 0.34 | 0.36 | 0.23 | 0.41 | 0.26 | 0.40 | 0.36 | 1.01 |

Thus, it can be inferred that the constructs of the model presented in the paper possess both convergent and discriminant validity (Singh *et al.,* 2015).

**Findings**

All factors showed a significant factor loading and no blurred loading across factors was observed. All eight factors had attributes that were interpretable and groupable according to the theoretical framework. Consequently, the results were considered viable and factor nomenclature was assigned on the basis of the groups of factors.

This section includes two key findings that build on the existing RepTrakTM Model and merit further investigation in developing economies and emerging markets. First, there was limited support for two factors, governance and leadership, which have featured in Western models of reputation. Governance was excluded for there were no significant loadings on the attributes that could be grouped together to form this factor. Under leadership, only one attribute, ‘long term vision’ emerged as significant and hence, it was dropped from the list of factors. The factor name ‘Performance’ was changed to ‘Financial Performance’ as the constituent attributes were more descriptive of financial than overall firm performance. The factor name ‘Customer Orientation’ was changed to ‘Customer Centricity’ to better suit the underlying attributes.

Second, the study found three additional factors: *stakeholder connect,* *customer centricity,* and *company ethos* as critical in determining reputation from the employee perspective. With these two findings our model comprised eight factors of CR: Workplace Culture, Citizenship, Stakeholder Connect, Company Ethos, Customer Centricity, Creativity and Innovation, Products and Services and Financial Performance. Notably, even when there are similarities, our results indicate variations in the attributes associated with these drivers (Table 6)

*Table 6: Similarities (italicized) and Dissimilarities in Attributes between the proposed model and RepTrakTM*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Proposed model** | **RepTrakTM** |
| **Factor 1 - Products and Services** | | |
| 1 | Offers a variety of products and services | High quality |
| 2 | Offers pocket friendly products and services | Value for money |
| 3 |  | Stands behind its products |
| 4 |  | Customer needs |
| **Factor 2 - Creativity and Innovation** | | |
| 1 | *Displays creative ideas* | Innovative |
| 2 | *Is constantly evolving* | First to market |
| 3 | Knows the market very well | Adapts quickly |
| 4 | *Is unique* |  |
| **Factor 3 - Workplace Culture** | | |
| 1 | *Compensates employees well* | Rewards fairly |
| 2 | *Shows good prospects for future growth* | Concern for employees |
| 3 | Has a good working environment | Equal opportunities |
| 4 | Has an employee friendly work culture |  |
| 5 | Provides sufficient information |  |
| **Factor 4 - Citizenship** | | |
| 1 | Promotes innovation | Environmentally responsible |
| 2 | *Drives positive societal change* | Supports good causes |
| 3 | Pursues ends ethically | Positive influence on society |
| 4 | Has a strong value system |  |
| 5 | Contributes to the nation's development |  |
| **Factor 5 - Financial Performance** | | |
| 1 | *Is financially sound* | Profitable |
| 2 | *Has a good track record of financial performance* | Better results |
| 3 |  | Future growth |
| **Factor 6 -Stakeholder Connect** | | |
| 1 | Builds emotional connect with customers |  |
| 2 | Is fair in its dealings with stakeholders |  |
| 3 | Aims to prevent disadvantage to stakeholders and society |  |
| 4 | Does not violate social, moral or legal codes of behavior |  |
| **Factor 7 - Customer Centricity** | | |
| 1 | Has strong customer engagement |  |
| 2 | Offers user friendly products and services |  |
| 3 | Communicates clearly and often |  |
| **Factor 8 - Company Ethos** | | |
| 1 | Adapts to emerging trends |  |
| 2 | Is consistent in its approach |  |
| **Factor 9 - Governance** | | |
| 1 |  | Open and Transparent |
| 2 |  | Ethical |
| 3 |  | Fair |
| **Factor 10 - Leadership** | | |

*Factor Dissimilarity*

Of the new factors that emerged, *stakeholder connect* was identified as building emotional connect, fairness in dealing with stakeholders, preventing disadvantage to stakeholders and society and being ethical in social, moral and legal codes of behavior. While the only stakeholder group mentioned under RepTrakTM was customers, our study demonstrated the respondents’ sensitivity towards all stakeholder groups.

The results suggest that the bias towards building stakeholder connect in understanding reputation rests on the perception of a dyadic and reciprocal relationship with stakeholders “in terms of harms and benefits as well as rights and duties” (Freeman, 1997, p.69). This suggests that organizations in developing countries are cognizant of and dependent on stakeholders.

Another factor which was unique to the study was *company ethos*, which related to company personality. The personification of a company facilitates linking and understanding of the target concept with another notion or concept with which there is more or greater familiarity (Morgan, 1983). Similar to the personification metaphor approach for CR sugested by Aaker (1997), company ethos was construed as including factors related to the personality of the company as sincerity, and competence. Sincerity emphasizes honesty, genuineness and good cheer (Aaker, 1997). Competency, with emphasis on reliability, responsibility, dependability and conscientiousness (Aaker, 1997), has been considered as important from the corporate and product branding perspective. Enterprise in literature would define a company as innovative and exciting. There were some surprises though, in the detailing of attributes under these factors. The attributes in the study for company ethos emerged as, adapting to emerging trends (sincerity in business) and being competent (responsible and conscientious).

On the link between company ethos and reputation there have been differences of opinion. Though several authors (Dowling, 2001; Roberts & Dowling, 2002) have discussed trust and confidence in the future acts of the organization as part of CR, the link to date, has not been empirically established (Walsh *et al.,* 2009). However, we can agree on the criticality of the relationship between ethos and company reputation from the managerial perspective as it directly impacts the top line of a company and makes it more appealing to customers.

The present study validates the link and stresses the need to comprehend the importance of the relationship between company ethos and reputation. In developing markets where trust in organizations, financial performance and communication is yet to be established, sincerity and consistency in approach become the pivot on which relationships are built and cemented. Awareness of the intrinsic as well as extrinsic benefits of communicating company ethos may prompt positive customer behavior and action and thus, rebuild customer and organizational contract.

*Customer centricity* demonstrating engagement with customers was also unique to the model. Based on attendant attributes, the study defines customer centricity in terms of product offering (customer centric), customer engagement, and communication. With increasing competition, organizations are compelled to understand target buyers, continuously create superior value for them (Narver & Slater, 1990) and convert them to loyalists through products, interactions and corporate activities (Walsh & Beatty, 2007).

*Governance* was excluded for there were no significant loadings on the attributes that could be grouped together to form this factor. Under *leadership,* only one attribute, ‘long term vision’ emerged as significant and hence, it was dropped from the list of factors. Though the country has faced a governance and leadership crisis over the last few years, the absence of these two factors from the employee perspective demonstrates their comparatively lower importance for employees. One possible explanation for the same could be the un-involvement of mid-level employees in issues related to governance and leadership. As these two factors pertain mostly to the senior leadership team, the absence of the same in the study is not surprising. These findings suggest that despite globalization, a one size fits all understanding of reputation cannot be attempted.

We further deliberated upon the consequences of positive reputation perception of employees which generates supportive behavior. We propose the LEEC model and suggest that the attributes and factors create positive perceptions leading to supportive behavior in the form of loyalty, engagement, emotional connect and commitment. Vancheswar *et al.* (2015) observed that in the Indian context,ethics and values are perceived as intrinsically important for building corporate reputation. This is often seen in the form of a significant thrust given to ethical values and practices for building the reputation of an organization. Not surprisingly, these eight drivers led to positive perceptions of fairness, integrity and trust among employees.

As this was an exploratory study, with little work done in the Indian context, we decided to first examine the eight dimensions/attributes of corporate reputation from the perspective of the employees. This was followed by a qualitative analysis of the drivers which led to four outcomes/supportive behaviors: Loyalty, Engagement, Emotional Connect and Commitment (Figure 1). Scholarship is divided in its understanding of these outcomes as attitudes or behaviors. The paper affirms the second stream of scholarship (Bruce &Wilcox, 2000; Kiesler 1971; Murphy et al., 2000; Sheng, 2019) which defines these outcomes as behaviors.

Figure 1: LEEC –Supportive Behavior of Employees



Loyalty stems from perception of organization’s attempt at maximizing support to different constituencies, enhancing organizational culture and promoting societal ties. Building on knowledge and information and adapting to emerging trends for provision of good services to multiple constituencies leads to engagement with the employees. Maximizing of stakeholder value through satiation of intrinsic needs naturally creates an emotional connect with the employees who feel committed on perceiving organizational adherence to the process of understanding and responsibly managing consumer needs together with furtherance of organization goals.

We present below (Table 7) the attributes which lead to supportive behavior of employees or are the consequences of employee perceptions of positive reputation.

Table 7: Attributes leading to Supportive Behavior

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Supportive Behavior** | **Attributes** |
| Loyalty | *Is fair in its dealings with stakeholders*  *Aims to prevent disadvantage to stakeholders and society*  *Has a strong value system*  *Contributes to nation’s development*  *Has an employee friendly employee culture*  *Shows good prospects for future growth*  *Drives positive societal change* |
| Engagement | *Has strong customer engagement*  *Is constantly evolving*  *Knows the market very well*  *Provides sufficient information*  *Has a good working environment*  *Adapts to emerging trends* |
| Emotional Connect | *Builds emotional connect with customers*  *Has an employee friendly work culture*  *Compensates employees well* |
| Commitment | *Does not violate social, moral or legal codes of behavior*  *Communicates clearly and often*  *Is consistent in approach*  *Is unique*  *Is financially sound*  *Has a good track record of financial performance*  *Displays creative ideas*  *Promotes innovation*  *Offers a variety of products and services*  *Offers pocket friendly products and services* |

Our results suggest that positive perception of corporate reputation can generate supportive employee behavior in the form of higher loyalty, engagement, emotional connect and commitment (LEEC). The link between the two is validated through the social identity theory which explains why good employees are attracted to organizations ranking high on the reputation parameter. These star performers classify and categorize themselves on group membership within organizations. These social categories impact the individual’s self-concept (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) for individual perceptions and categorizations as values, fair treatment of all employees, vision, future growth prospects build loyalty within employees. Loyalty thus, is an affirmation of company vision and values through behavioral dispositions as non-attrition, positive word of mouth and adherence to organizational policies and procedures.

Second, engagement is a long-term commitment which is reflective of psychological empowerment, and job engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Also referred to as ‘‘an amalgamation of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership’’ (Wellins & Concelman, 2005a, p. 1), employee engagement stems from close association with employees, emotional connect, job satisfaction, work relationships, organizational communication etc. (Stairs *et al.,* 2006). A promise of the future, knowledge and awareness of the market, conducive work environment, ability to adapt and adopt, builds an emotional connect with the organization which engages employees and psychologically binds them. Engagement can be viewed as a connect with the organization which underscores a desire to be part of the processes.

Third, employees with a higher commitment “have higher morale, lower turnover, increased job satisfaction and increased productivity” (Mowday *et al.,* 1982) which inevitably leads to affect based trust and builds on emotional connect. Sociological literature emphasizes the importance of trust comprising cognition based and affect based trust. While the former is based on logic and thinking, the second focuses on the emotional bonds between and among individuals. An emotional connect with all stakeholders, a happy work environment with good compensation forms the base for building emotional connect through affect based trust. The emotional connect is a bridge which unites the employee to the organization with feelings. This may be a result of the organizational personification or organizational disposition.

Fourth, commitment is an unspoken and unwritten identification with the organization which spells out the belief and trust in the goals of the organization and emphasizes a willingness to remain a member of the organization (Mowday *et al.,* 1982). The strength of the commitment is visible in the relationship between the individual and the organization (Mowday *et al.,*1979) and the process by which employees/individuals link themselves to the organization. Consistency in approach, promise of being different, good financial performance linked to uniqueness in product offering provides comfort and reflects in committed behaviour. Commitment can be understood as an (un)spoken decision or cognition that binds an individual to an organization

LEEC validates the psychological contract between the employees and the organization resulting in loyalty, emotional connect, affective commitment (Helm, 2011), engagement of employees and their resultant positive behavior and performance (Men, [2012](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00208825.2017.1318023)). As organizations and employees are inextricably linked, perceptions of good organizational reputation and supportive behavior from employees can help organizations secure competitive advantage, profitability and impact CR (Harris & De Chernatony, [2001](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00208825.2017.1318023)).

**Conclusion**

CR is the key differentiator which provides the company competitive advantage in the market place (Vilanova *et al.,* 2009; Odriozola *et al.*, 2015). The understanding of the concept varies with both, stakeholder groups and country of origin (Ali *et al.,* 2015). Building on existing research, the present study underscores the need to understand and measure CR with a specific stakeholder group in a differing cultural context (India) instead of relying on a generalized representation (Fombrum *et al.,* 2015). The measurement and assessment of reputation in emerging economies still remains an under-researched area for most of the CR research has focused on developed countries (Salem *et al.,* 2012). Employees, a critical group of stakeholders, and their perception have been underplayed in the reputation literature (Greenwood, 2007; Kaler, 2009). The study covers this gap in literature by investigating attributes and factors linked to employee perceptions of CR in India. The same, it is postulated, can be extrapolated to other emerging economies.

The role of employees in managing CR is critical for they have internal legitimacy (Lee *et al.,* 2013), facilitate reputation building (Shamma & Hassan,2009) and help in creating competitive advantage and enhancing financial performance (Cravens & Oliver, 2006) . Capturing the perceptions of this key stakeholder group (Gill, 2015) facilitates an understanding of the manner in which employees relate with the organization. This thus, leads to personal fulfilment, identification with the organization, creation of a sense of responsibility and confidence in interaction with external stakeholders and development of a positive approach which helps the organization meet its objective (Almeida & Coelho, 2018) It therefore becomes important to study drivers/attributes that create positive reputation perceptions and lead to supportive behaviors/outcomes.

The responses of corporate employees in India reveal their considerations of some of the factors and attributes of reputation and the outcomes as different from their contemporaries in developed countries. Five of the factors in the present study are similar (i.e., workplace culture, citizenship, creativity and innovation, products and services, and financial performance) and three were dissimilar (stakeholder connect, customer centricity and company ethos) to the existing RepTrakTM. Two factors (i.e, leadership and governance), which have a prominent positioning in RepTrakTM do not emerge as critical reputational factors from the employee perspective. Notably, even when there are similarities, our results indicate variations in the attributes associated with these drivers.

Further, building on the dissimilarities between existing and proposed model of reputation, the differences stem both from the country of operations and the type of stakeholders. The relationship between employees and stakeholders in a developing economy is dynamic for stakeholder expectations of organizations are evolving and changing with time (Hanson & Stuart, 2001) thus, making it natural for organizations and their representatives to emphasize stakeholder connects. Another possible explanation is the expectation of the stakeholders who compare and contrast organizational services provided by global and Indian employees. Improved engagement (Gardberg, 2001; Helm, 2007a), can create positive perceptions of organizations.

In a developing business environment, care, compassion and concern for customers are predominantly essential for creating a positive climate. Focus on the customers would require sharing organizational information (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990) and creating an emotional bond between the organization and the customer by catering to their interests (Brown *et al.,* 2002) and developing trusting relationships (MacMillan *et al.*, 2004; Waddock, 2003), which have been suggested as prerequisites to good reputation.

In the present study, sincerity and competency (Aaker, 1997) were critical factors in defining company ethos. Reputation has found to be synonymous with competence, effectiveness and trustworthiness (Wong & Boh, 2010). Research acknowledges that good and reputed organizations often use their employees to inculcate and promote public trust (Melewar, 2008). These above mentioned drivers create positive perceptions which lead to the following consequences/supportive behaviours as loyalty, engagement, emotional connect and commitment which can provide the organization a competitive edge and also act as a safeguard against risks and crisis.

Studies assert that organizations can improve their competitiveness though individual loyalties of employees (Othman *et al.*, 2014). One of the key drivers of success within organizations is employee empowerment (Hanaysha & Hussain, 2018) or employee engagement which motivates employees to be involved and committed to organizational goals (Falola *et al.,* 2018). Employees with awareness of CR of the company would be emotionally connected to the organization for there would be a desire to be associated with a company with a good reputation (Olmedo-Cifuentes & Martı´nez-Leo´n, 2014).

Overall, this paper has put forward a model that enables measurement of CR for a particular stakeholder group (employees) in a specific cultural context (India), thus attempting to address the gap in existing literature. Increasing competition in the global market has forced managers to evaluate and realign strategies for achieving better results. The starting point in this endeavor is human resource management which should be ramped up to enhance people growth, engagement, loyalty and commitment to their tasks for greater productivity and higher returns.

*Theoretical and Practical Implications*

The study provides several implications for practitioners in managing corporate reputation through employees. It is argued that in practice, corporate managers should cognize beyond the tangible resources and focus on the intangibles that lead to supportive behavior from a critical stakeholder group, viz. employees. This would hold true for any action taken by the company post an understanding of critical dimensions from employee perspective which positively impacts image and sales and secures customer approval.

This research contributes to existing literature on corporate reputation by proposing three new factors of reputation in the Indian context – stakeholder connect, customer centricity and company ethos – indicating the difference in reputation perceptions of stakeholders across countries. Further, it contributes to the field by introducing the LEEC (Loyalty, Engagement, Emotional Connect and Commitment) model as supportive behaviour/consequences of positive reputation in emerging markets.

For the field of employee engagement, the study helps in securing an in-depth understanding of the factors that contribute to employee perceptions of organizational reputation and how they can impact attrition and retention by enhancing a sense of integrity, fairness and trust. Likewise, the study provides inputs to the senior leadership team for inculcating and strengthening a culture which addresses the key concerns of the employees.

Additionally, this paper, contributes to business practitioners in the following ways. First, by underscoring the importance of factors of reputation for creating positive employee perceptions which will impact the overall performance of the company. Second, importance accorded to CR and its implementation can be used as a key differentiator, creating an advantage in the hiring process. Third, building relationships with a group of key stakeholders, viz., employees can facilitate in both reputation enhancement and legitimation process. Lastly, focusing on sincerity in business and consistency towards values in all communications with employees can help highlight the company ethos.

*Limitations and directions for future research*

This study is not without limitations. The understanding of corporate reputation in the paper relied on a sample of 400 employees from Indian companies in the BSE 500 list. The survey was based on employee perceptions on reputational dimensions. Though the responses provide an understanding of employee perceptions critical to building corporate reputation, future studies can expand the scope of the analysis by including employer perspective on CR which can then be tested empirically. Further, the validity of these findings can be examined across industries and across countries.

Despite these limitations, the study offers promising avenues for future research. Future research may employ a comparative analysis of stakeholders (e.g., employees and consumers or employees and investors) with an aim to understanding different perceptions and convergent similarities. As this was an exploratory study we attempted to identify attributes and factors which lead to positive reputation perceptions through a qualitative assessment of attributes. Quantitative methodologies can be used to study the effect of the attributes on the four outcomes, viz., loyalty, engagement, emotional connect and commitment. Another level of investigation may be added to the analysis which quantitatively studies the impact of the eight proposed factors on the four outcomes.
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**ANNEXURE: QUESTIONNAIRE**

A study on corporate reputation

This study aims to understand your perception of what makes up corporate reputation. Given

below are some statements indicating certain characteristics of companies.

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements in terms of whether the respective characteristic is important for the company to have a good corporate reputation or not.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sr.  No. | Statement | Strongly  Agree | Agree | Neither Agree  Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly  Disagree |
| 1 | Offers good quality/ reliable products and services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Promotes Innovation |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Has a well – defined hierarchy |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Is a socially responsible company |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Offers a variety of products and services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Has a visionary leader |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Has strong customer engagement |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Offers user friendly products and services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Communicates clearly and often |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Welcomes open discussion |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Drives positive societal change |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Offers pocket friendly products and services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Displays creative ideas |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Pursues ends ethically |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Has a clear long-term vision |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Builds emotional connect with customers |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Is fair in its dealings with stakeholders |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Compensates employees well |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Engages in sustainable and citizenship activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Shows good prospects for future growth |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Aims to prevent disadvantage to stakeholders and society |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Has a good working environment |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Adapts to emerging trends |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Is convincing |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Is consistent in its approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Is transparent and trustworthy |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Is financially sound |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Has a good track record of financial performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Has an employee friendly work culture |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Takes customer feedback and work on reviews |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Appears genuine |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Does not violate social, moral or legal codes of behaviour |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Has a strong value system |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | Contributes to the nation’s development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Has opportunities for learning |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Is constantly evolving |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Knows the market very well |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Is unique |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Provides sufficient information |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | Avoids corruption and bribery |  |  |  |  |  |