

The Effect of Perceived Corporate Reputation of a Turkish University on Affective Commitment of Students

Izlem Gozukara

Istanbul Arel University, Türkoba Mahallesi
Erguvan Sokak No: 26 / K 34537, Tepekent - Büyükçekmece
İstanbul/Turkey

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to İzlem Gözükara, Istanbul Arel University

Osman Yildirim

Türkoba Mahallesi, Erguvan Sokak No: 26 / K 34537
Tepekent – Büyükçekmece, İstanbul/Turkey
E-mail: izlemg@arel.edu.tr

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i11/1894>

Published Date: 06 November 2015

Abstract

Enterprises, organizations or groups with a common cause focus on creating affective commitment and sense of trust in their customers, followers or employees by building a strong reputation in order to achieve their goals, gain a competitive advantage and prestige, maintain their position or simply persevere. The present study conducted a survey with 214 students to demonstrate the effect of corporate reputation of a Turkish university on its students and reveal students' affective commitment to their university. The study results showed that the students' perceptions of the corporate reputation of their university were evaluated as partially positive for all dimensions of the scale, and the students' affective commitment to their university was significantly and positively related with all dimensions of the corporate reputation scale.

Keywords: Corporate Reputation, Perceived Corporate Reputation, Commitment, Affective Commitment, Higher Education

1. Introduction

In management context, corporate reputation is an important resource which provides competitive advantage and delivers sustainable performance with value creation (Deephouse 2000).

In the business world, corporations are required to establish specific and diversified resources in order to maintain a competitive advantage due to increasing competition. Today, the success of corporations relies mostly on intangible assets rather than conventional and

economic indicators. Among such intangible assets, corporate reputation is the most significant resource providing consistent competitive advantage. During the past ten years, corporate reputation has been a favorite field of research for academicians and business professionals since it is regarded as a significant asset with a potential influence on stakeholders' evaluations about a corporation (Shapiro 1983; Fombrun and Shanley 1990; Fombrun et al. 2000; Gotsi and Wilson 2001; Rose and Thomsen 2004). An affirmative reputation is believed to attract upscale customers, qualified employees and wealthy investors to the corporation (Fombrun and Shanley 1990). A strong corporate reputation is a valuable construct that is difficult to replicate, which makes it a strategic resource that enables a consistent advantage for the corporate position (Hall 1993).

In corporate context, reputation is a determinant of customers' decisions toward making a purchase, therefore, an affirmative reputation is a direct means of access to the market (Carmeli and Tishler 2005). Reputation is a sign of quality which allows customers to minimize the potential ambiguity before the buying process (Shapiro 1983; Fombrun 1996).

Reputation is a cumulative combination of all historical actions of a corporation, meaning that such actions should be consistent throughout the existence of a corporation (Herbig and Milewicz 1993). Reputation is what the concerned stakeholders of a corporation believe it represents and its affiliations with them, that is, the compiled perceptions of all stakeholders of a corporation, which includes employees, customers, executives, investors and society (Chun 2005).

Briefly, corporate reputation is a permanent, aggregate evaluation about a corporation, which is shaped over a prolonged period of time (Gioia et al. 2000). From the perspective of business professionals, reputation is the primary source of competitiveness, profitability and durability. Recent studies from the management and marketing literatures (Bartikowski et al. 2011; Lafferty and Goldsmith 1999; Veloutsou and Moutinho 2009) support these suggestions by reporting the positive effect of corporate reputation on a number of significant variables including word of mouth, trust, spending and loyalty (Roberts and Dowling 2002; Walsh et al. 2009a; Walsh et al. 2009b).

The second variable of the present study, affective commitment refers to the extent to which employees are willing to continue working at a corporation. This means that employees wish to continue working at their corporation if they are committed affectively. Such employees generally identify themselves with the corporate goals, believe that the corporation is a match for them and feel contentment with their job. Affectively committed employees feel appreciated and work as if they are corporate deputies, which makes them valuable assets for corporations. The degree of affective commitment depends on how much an employee's needs and expectations from the corporation are in line with his/her real experience at that corporation (Storey 1995). Affective commitment is defined by Tetric (1995) as "value rationality-based organizational commitment, which refers to the degree of value congruence between an organizational member and an organization".

There are several studies in the literature, reporting a positive relationship between corporate reputation and affective commitment (Duttin and Dukerich 1991; Riordan et al. 1997; Carmele and Freund 2002). Given this theoretical background, the present study aims to investigate the effect of perceived corporate reputation of universities on the affective commitment of students.

2. Corporate Reputation

Corporate reputation has long been a topic of discussion. The perceptions of other people have always been a curiosity for individuals, corporations and even unofficial associations. With the modern era, corporations' approach to this topic has been changed and become more important. Previous studies showed that corporate reputation enables a sustainable and more profitable corporation with greater performance, employee loyalty and decreased expenditures of transactions (Fombrun et al. 2004; Krueger et al. 2010).

Reputation is the collective assessments of individuals, which are shaped depending on the corporation's influence on society, environment and economics (Ewing et al. 2010). Such assessments are the perceptions toward a corporation developed over time depending on the sustained beliefs and successes of the corporation (Balmer 1998). This makes reputation an image of the corporation in the individuals' minds based on judgment, reliability and appreciation (Dowling 1994). Corporate reputation is essential for value creation because it has an influence on all relevant stakeholders involved in the corporation, including customers, employees, vendors and investors (Bromley 2001).

There is an extensive literature on corporate reputation, leading to a large spectrum of definitions. However, "a global, temporally stable, evaluative judgment about a firm that is shared by multiple constituencies" is the definition most commonly recognized by scholars (Highhouse et al. 2009). Gotsi and Wilson (2011) defines corporate reputation as "a stakeholder's overall evaluation of a company over time". In Marken's (2002) definition, corporate reputation is an asset involving "quality of products and services, ability to innovate, value as long-term investment, financial stability, ability to attract, develop, retain talent; use of corporate assets, and quality of management." For Fombrun (1996), corporate reputation is a group of collective beliefs toward a corporation regarding its competence and eagerness to act in favor of its stakeholders. Such collective perceptions and representations are also pointed out by Walsh and Beatty (2007), who approached this concept by including only the perspective of customers. These authors developed the concept of customer-based reputation, suggesting that multiple reputations can be built by a corporation, all of which include different characteristics toward different groups. This means that individuals can evaluate the friendly approach of a service company to the society and the environment and criticize its quality of service, yet they may approve its method of asset utilization. Therefore, corporate reputation contains various perceptions held by various target groups, and the level of importance placed on different aspects of the corporation or the assessment criteria used can vary according to different target groups.

In a general sense, reputation is believed to be related with the high quality of a corporation's products: "By reputation...we mean expected quality (from the point of view of the customer)" (Shapiro 1983). Fombrun and Shanley (1990), on the other hand, consider reputation as a representation of "the accumulated impression that stakeholders form of the firm resulting from their interactions with and communications received about the firm". According to Fombrun (1996), reputation is "a perceptual representation of a company's past actions and future prospects that describes the firm's overall appeal to all of its key constituents when compared with other leading rivals". Yoon et al. (1993) also refers to reputation as a representation of the consumer expectation regarding the quality of what is supplied by the corporation. According to Helm (2005), corporate reputation is the perception held by a stakeholder regarding the general status of a corporation, again based on its capabilities and eagerness to meet the needs of its stakeholders.

Corporate reputation results from cumulative impressions of business conduct, economic progress and accomplishments of the corporation (Helm 2005; Wartick 1992). It is a collective concept referring to an impression shared socially due to its dependency on the perception of an individual toward the corporate outlook from others' eyes (Helm 2005). The present study discusses corporate reputation as perceived corporate reputation (PCR) because "being part of a well-regarded organization or winning team stimulates human behavior" (Carmeli 2004).

Corporate reputation is derived from the impression obtained by direct and indirect experiences and knowledge (Fombrun and Shanley 1990; Yoon et al. 1993), and the corporation's operations in the past (Weigelt and Camerer 1988). Corporations continually interact with various groups which focus on different attributes of the corporation. Based on the attitudinal definition of Fombrun (1996), corporate reputation reflects a clear emotional response to a corporation with an overall opinion of all its components. These components of overall opinion have been the focus of several corporate definitions in order to establish a reference point, including the familiarity of a corporation that is termed as credible, persuasive, good/bad and reputable (Brown 1995).

Most researchers believe that the reference point of customers for making judgments on the reputation of a corporation is its quality of products and services or their personal experiences with the corporation (Shapiro 1983; Yoon et al. 1993; Helm 2006). These experiences may be the direct interaction of customers with the corporation or the indirect experiences conveyed by other individuals (Fombrun and Shanley 1990). This makes an overall corporate reputation consist of evaluations about various behaviors of a corporation such as labor market and product market operations that primarily apply to a defined group of stakeholders. At the same time, such evaluations can be based on the perceptions and experiences of others.

A customer's perceptions and identification of a corporation result from value creation through products and services offered as well as the reputational image formed in their minds. Such perceived corporate reputation is usually called "Customer-Based Corporate Reputation", which is a concept introduced by Walsh and Beatty (2007). According to these authors, customer-based corporate reputation is "customer's overall evaluation of a firm based on his or her reactions to the firm's goods, services, communication activities, interactions with the firm and/or its representatives or constituencies (such as employees, management, or other customers) and/or known corporate activities".

Customer-based reputation is a construct composed of five dimensions; customer orientation, reliable and financially strong company, good employer, social and environmental responsibility, and product and service quality. *Customer orientation* refers to the perceptions of customers regarding the performance of the corporation and the employees in terms of fulfilling customers' needs and focusing on the customers. *Reliable and financially strong company* refers to the perceptions of customers regarding the corporate competitiveness, profitability and development. *Good employer* refers to the perceptions of customers regarding the corporate behavior and attitudes toward employees, the quality of corporate management and the competency of employees. *Social and environmental responsibility* refers to the perceptions of customers regarding the responsible approach of the corporation to the society and the environment. *Product and service quality* refers to the perceptions of customers regarding the extent to which the corporation provides novel, high-quality products and services (Walsh and Beatty 2007). Customer-based corporate reputation has become a quality assessment, allowing customers to make a favorable choice easily

among many alternatives. A favorable reputation leads to enhanced trust in products and services, but also minimizes cognitive inconsistency by serving as an information alternative (Fombrun and Van Riel 1997).

Based on the review of the literature, customer-based corporate reputation is clearly rooted in the individual experiences and perceptions of customers regarding a corporation. Customer-based corporate reputation is an attitudinal construct derived from the interactions of a customer with a particular corporation, which are generally realized as a result of transactions with that corporation.

From the perspective of the higher education system, students may be classified as customers with their own expectations and personality traits, who aim to choose a reputable university (Belanger et al. 2002). Perceived organizational reputation leads to student loyalty and it has a positive relationship with the capability of a higher education institution to attract prospective students and keep existing ones (Dick and Basu 1994; Henning-Thurau et al. 2001). In a highly competitive educational market, retention of enrolled students is equally significant to the attraction ability, and reputation plays a critical role (Kotler and Fox 1995). The reputation of a university has further significance since a university diploma is related with an affiliation and even a sense of identification lasting for a lifetime, meaning a self-definition for current and former students (Curtis et al. 2009). Students who identify themselves with their university feel the pride of being a part of that organization (Curtis et al. 2009). This may lead them to recommend the university to prospective students, further strengthening its reputation. Besides, students with a stronger affective identification with their major in the university are more likely to build self-confidence in an academic sense and develop commitment to remain at the university (Wessel et al. 2008). Therefore, we expect perceived corporate reputation to have a positive effect on affective commitment of students.

3. Affective Commitment

Organizational commitment literature is highly influenced by the three-component commitment model developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). According to this model, organizational commitment of an employee consists of three concurrent mindsets, affective, normative and continuance commitment. *Affective Commitment* refers to the emotional connection of an employee with a corporation, the main source of which is favorable experiences at work. *Normative Commitment* refers to the perceived obligation towards a corporation, which results from the mutuality norms. *Continuance Commitment* refers to the perceived costs (financial and social) that would be experienced in case of leaving the corporation. Using this commitment model, scholars have estimated significant employee such as job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, missed workdays and delayed workdays (Meyer et al. 2002).

Among these three dimensions of commitment, affective commitment which is described as "positive feelings of identification with, attachment to and involvement in the work organization" is has the strongest relationship with identification (Crameli 2005). It represents the cognitive involvement of a customer in a corporation and the extent of importance placed by a customer on that association. It involves a greater obligation to maintain a successful association with the corporation and keep a reciprocally fulfilling relationship (Gundlach et al. 1995). Commitment is also one of the primary constructs in social-exchange theory (Hennig-Thurau 2002). It is a deep-rooted exchange between the parties in order to continue a beneficial relationship for a prolonged time (Morgan and Hunt

1994). It is likely for this propensity to be rooted in subsidiary benefits of permanent affiliations with service companies such as enhanced trust and reciprocal social interactions (Gwinner et al. 1998).

Affective commitment is the affirmative psychological bond of an employee with a corporation. It is the "desire" element of organizational commitment as expressed by Meyer and Allen (2007). An affectively committed employee has strong identification with corporate goals and wants to continue being a part of that corporation. Several demographic characteristics may affect this commitment such as age, gender, education and tenure; however, such effects cannot be defined as permanent or strong. Meyer and Allen developed this concept primarily based on the commitment concept of Mowday et al. (1982), which in turn was based on the previous work of Kanter (1968).

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) believe commitment to be "a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets". It is believed the employees' experience of this force takes place in three mindsets of affective, normative and continuance, which refer to psychological attachment, perceived liability and perceived attributable costs to a target, respectively (Allen and Meyer 1990). Additionally, commitment includes "behavioral terms" defining the actions implied by commitment according to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001). In a more specific sense, such terms can transform to focal and discretionary behaviors. A focal behavior is considered an integral part of commitment to a given target, such that this behavior can be estimated through all three mindsets. This is the behavior "to which an individual is bound by his or her commitment". For instance, a focal behavior is described as continuing the corporate membership in terms of organizational commitment. On the contrary, a discretionary behavior is optional, meaning there is a degree of flexibility for an employee to determine the behavioral terms of the commitment. These behaviors can be predicted by some mindsets. According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), item wording has to involve behavioral terms varying by the specific behavioral type to be predicted by the investigator. Finally, Meyer et al. (2006) suggests that commitment consists of both cognitive and affective components. The cognitive components refer to behavioral terms, that is, the base of the commitment, while the affective components are the emotions triggered by a specific mindset.

Affective commitment implies the individual and instinctive desire of an employee to work in favor of a corporation (Meyer and Allen 1991). The degree of affective commitment may be decreased by unfavorable emotions and discontent with work environment (Ashford et al. 1989). Since the psychological bond of an employee relies on affirmative evaluation about work and favorable feelings in the work environment, an employee's affective commitment is reduced when the psychological bond to the corporation is weak (Meyer and Allen 1997).

The empirical studies conducted to date have demonstrated that employee performance (Meyer et al. 1989), missed workdays (Sagie 1998), turnover (Tett and Meyer 1993) and organizational citizenship behaviors (Meyer et al. 2002) are predicted better by affective commitment than the other commitment mindsets.

The current literature has determined that corporate reputation has influence on the decisions of stakeholders regarding a corporation. For instance, corporate reputation can shape the decisions of job seekers toward job applications (Gatewood et al. 1993), and the behaviors and attitudes of employees toward their corporations (Dutton and Dukerich 1991). Corporate social responsibility, which is a dimension of customer-based corporate reputation,

also has a positive relationship with organizational affective commitment (Brammer et al. 2007).

According to Zeffanne (1994), "the answer to the question of employee commitment, morale, loyalty and attachment may consist not only in providing motivators, but also to remove demotivators such as styles of management not suited to their context and to contemporary employee aspirations". For developing employee commitment to corporate goals and fulfilling the empowerment need of employees, companies may benefit from a management strategy motivating employee engagement. Gaertner (1999) suggests that "more flexible and participatory management styles can strongly and positively enhance organizational commitment". Corporations should try to direct their management strategies toward promoting employee commitment instead of ensuring compliance (William and Anderson 1991).

The service marketing literature reports that affective commitment is a powerful drive for loyalty in universities during a student's first year at school (Bowden and Wood 2011). Since universities are organizations offering a service, a dynamic experience is occurred and a value is created between academic personnel and students, which lead academic personnel to have a significant influence on the students' attachment to the university. Therefore, academic personnel are significantly involved in building and enhancing the perceived reputation of a university and the affective commitment levels of students. Affective commitment to a university has also great significance due to its influence on student retention, behaviors and attitudes (Tinto 2006). According to Woosley and Miller (2009), commitment to the university may predict retention of students, which is one of the main outcomes for universities (Tinto 1987).

4. Method

4.1. Hypothesis

This study was designed to determine the effect of students' perceived corporate reputation of their university on their affective commitment to the university. The study discussed the effect of students' perceived corporate reputation within the context of customer orientation, good employer, reliable and financially strong company, product and service quality, and social and environmental responsibility, and tried to determine the effect of these corporate reputation dimensions on the extent to which the students feel belonging to their university. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was formulated and testes in this study:

H1: The students' perceived corporate reputation of their university regarding (a) customer orientation, (b) good employer, (c) reliable and financially strong company, (d) product and service quality and (e) social and environmental responsibility has an influence on their affective commitment.

4.2. Participants

The study was conducted with 214 university students who were accessed using convenience sampling method in a foundation university. Of the participants, 51% were male students and 49% were female students with an age range of 18-25 years. The survey was distributed to students from different courses and the surveys were collected from those who participated in the research.

4.3. Data Collection

The study data was compiled from a survey. The students' perceived corporate reputation of their university was measured using a scale developed by Walsh, Beatty and Shiu (2009). This scale measures corporate reputation under five main dimensions:

- *Customer Orientation*: A university which is concerned about its students' needs, caring for them, treating them courteously and equally.
- *Good Employer*: A university which has qualified employees, treats its employees with kindness and is perceived as a good institution to work.
- *Reliable and Financially Strong Company*: A university which has a strong financial status, superiority to its rivals and future growth targets.
- *Product and Service Quality*: A university which offers high-quality products and services to its students and develops innovative services.
- *Social and Environmental Responsibility*: A university which demonstrates responsibility toward the environment and makes efforts to create new job opportunities.

The instrument consists of 27 items (minimum 5 and maximum 7 items on the dimensional basis) which are rated on a five-point Likert scale (5: strongly agree, 1: strongly disagree). A high score from the scale indicates that the student has a positive evaluation about the university regarding the concerned dimension of reputation while a low score indicates the opposite. The Cronbach's alpha calculated for the scale dimensions varied between 0.82 and 0.89. The original Cronbach's alpha of the scale varied between 0.80 and 0.93.

The students' affective commitment to their university was measured using a scale developed by Meyer et al. (1993). This scale measures commitment within the context of three main dimensions; however, only the affective commitment dimension was included in this study. The instrument consists of 5 items (5: strongly agree, 1: strongly disagree) rated on a five-point Likert scale. A high score from the scale indicates that the student feels a sense of belonging to the university and places a great importance to it while a low score indicates the opposite. The Cronbach's alpha calculated for the scale was 0.88.

4.4. Statistical Analyses

The effect of students' perceived corporate reputation on their affective commitment was determined using multiple regression analysis.

4.5. Findings

The analysis of the evaluations on students' perceived corporate reputation of their university revealed that students evaluate their university as partially positive for all dimensions of corporate reputation (mean values of dimensions vary between 2.69 and 3.07).

Based on the results from the analysis performed to investigate the correlation between the students' affective commitment levels and their perception of the corporate reputation of their university, the students' affective commitment is significantly positively correlated with all dimensions of corporate reputation. Among dimensions, only Customer Orientation ($r=0.33$) has a low correlation with Affective Commitment ($r<0.40$), whereas all other dimensions have a moderate correlation with Affective Commitment ($0.40<r<0.70$) (Table 1). Accordingly, a positive change in the students' perceived corporate reputation of their university would have a positive influence on their affective commitment to their university.

Table 1:

Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Corporate Reputation and Affective Commitment Scales and Correlation Analysis Results

Dimensions	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
(1) Customer Orientation	3.07	1.02	1					
(2) Good Employer	2.90	0.79	0.53*	1				
(3) Reliable and Financially Strong Company	2.73	0.85	0.34*	0.61**	1			
(4) Product and Service Quality	2.69	0.91	0.52*	0.68**	0.70*	1		
(5) Social and Environmental Responsibility	2.91	0.87	0.42*	0.64**	0.62*	0.62*	1	
(6) Affective Commitment	2.40	0.87	0.33*	0.53**	0.42*	0.50*	0.40*	1

** p<0.01

The effect of students' perceptions of the corporate reputation of their university on their affective commitment was determined using multiple regression analysis. The analysis produced a significant model ($R^2=0.32$ $F=19.77$ $p=0.00<0.01$) (Table 2). According to the model, the power of students' perceived corporate reputation for explaining the variation in their affective commitment is 32%. It was found that among the dimensions of corporate reputation, only "Good Employer" (Standard Beta=0.34, $p=0.00<0.01$) and "Product and Service Quality" (Standard Beta=0.24, $p=0.01<0.05$) have a significantly positive effect on the students' affective commitment levels (Hypotheses 1b and 1d Affirmed), while the other dimensions do not have any effects (Hypothesis 1a, 1c and 1e Rejected). Of the affirmed dimensions, "Good Employer" has a greater effect on affective commitment than "Product and Service Quality". Accordingly, the degree of students' commitment to their university would be greater when they have an enhanced perception of the university as an institution having qualified employees and offering high-quality products and services to its students.

Table 2:

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis as to the Effect of Corporate Reputation on Affective Commitment

	B	Standard Error	Standard Beta	t	p
(Fixed)	0.55	0.21		2.59	0.01*
Customer Orientation	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.92
Good Employer	0.37	0.10	0.34	3.82	0.00**
Reliable and Financially Strong Company	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.36	0.72
Product and Service Quality	0.22	0.09	0.24	2.47	0.01*
Social and Environmental Responsibility	0.02	0.08	0.02	0.25	0.81

Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment

$R^2=0.32$ $F=19.77$ $p=0.00<0.01$

* $p<0.05$ ** $p<0.01$

5. Discussion

First introduced by Walsh and Beatty (2007), the customer-based reputation concept includes five dimensions as customer orientation, good employer, reliable and financially strong company, product and service quality, and social and environmental responsibility. The study results demonstrated that only “Good Employer” and “Product and Service Quality” dimensions of corporate reputation have a significant and positive effect on students’ affective commitment. Accordingly, it is important for a university to have qualified staff and offer high-standard education in order to make students feel a sense of belonging to their university. As stated by Yoon et al. (1993), corporate reputation reflects what customers expect from the quality of that corporation. In higher educational context, students are considered customers who expect high quality service from their university. Therefore, universities should focus more on the quality and standards of their education and services in order to develop a strong reputation in their students’ minds, thereby enhancing their commitment to the university.

On the other hand, the findings revealed that a strong financial status, sense of environmental or social responsibility and the exhibition of concerned and kind behavior toward students do not have an influence on the students' affective commitment to their university. Accordingly, if universities enhance their customer orientation, reliability and financial status, and social and environmental responsibility, it is likely to expect a stronger correlation between these dimensions and affective commitment of the students.

Affective commitment is the emotional attachment of individuals to an organization, as described by Meyer and Allen (1997) within the context of organizational commitment. In this regard, the correlation analysis of this study revealed that students’ affective commitment levels have a significant and positive relationship with all dimensions of corporate reputation. This suggests that students’ stronger perceptions of their university would have a positive influence on their affective commitment levels. This finding is in agreement with Dutton and Dukerich (1991) who reported the positive effect of corporate reputation on shaping employee attitudes toward organizations. We recommend universities to foster student commitment since affective commitment has significant effects also on student retention (Tinto 2006).

In light of these findings, we recommend universities to strengthen their academic staff and treat their employees with kindness in order to be perceived as a good employer. We also suggest that universities should offer high-quality education service considering their students’ needs and expectations, and they should be more involved in providing innovative services to develop student commitment. Furthermore, universities may conduct communication studies oriented at students for enhancing their perceptions of university, thereby promoting student commitment.

6. Study Limitations and Future Research

This study provides a valuable insight for higher education institutions to the commitment levels of their students; however, it has some limitations to mention. First, the data was collected using a questionnaire that was self-reported by university students. As is known, self-reported questionnaires may reflect optimum or socially accepted responses

rather than reality in some cases. Therefore, we recommend future research to consider different methods to collect data such as face-to-face interviews in combination with surveys in order to confirm responses and minimize this limitation.

Second, the sample of this study included 214 participants from a single university. We recommend future studies to include a larger number of participants for generalization of the results. Additionally, similar studies may be conducted in multiple universities from Turkey to determine whether the findings are consistent, and even the findings can be compared between public and foundation universities. From this point of view, we believe that evaluation of various higher education institutions from different countries would provide information on perceptions of students from different countries and cultures toward their universities and their emotional attachment to those universities.

References

- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Ashford, S.J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: a theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803–829.
- Balmer, J.M.T. (1998). Corporate identity and the advent of corporate marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14(2), 963-96.
- Bartikowski, B., Walsh, G., & Beatty, S.E. (2011). Culture and age as moderators in the corporate reputation and loyalty relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 966-972.
- Belanger, C., Mount, J., & Wilson, M. (2002). Institutional image and retention. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(3), 217–230.
- Biel, A.L., & Bridgwater, C.A. (1990). Attributes of likeable television commercials. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 30(3), 38–44.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organisational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10): 1701-1719.
- Bowden, J., & Wood, L. (2011). Sex doesn't matter: the role of gender in the formation of student-university relationships. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 21(2), 133-156.
- Bromley, D.B. (2001). Relationships between personal and corporate reputation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(3), 316-34.
- Brown S.P. (1995). The moderating effects of insuppliers/outsuppliers status on organizational buyer attitudes. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23:170–81.
- Carmeli A., & Freund A. (2002). The relationship between work and workplace attitudes and perceived external prestige. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(1): 51-68.
- Carmeli A. (2004). The link between organizational elements, perceived external prestige and performance. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6:314–31.
- Carmeli, A., & Tishler, A. (2005). Perceived organizational reputation and organizational performance: an empirical investigation of industrial enterprises. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(1), 13–30.
- Carmeli, A. (2005). Perceived external prestige, affective commitment and citizenship behaviours. *Organizational Studies*, 26(3), 443-464.
- Chun, R. (2005). Corporate reputation: meaning and measurement. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(2):91-109.

- Curtis, T., Abratt, R., & Minor, W. (2009) Corporate brand management in higher education: The case of ERAU. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(6), 404–413.
- Deephouse, D. L. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: an integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of Management*, 26(6), 1091–1112.
- Dick, A., & Basu, K. (1994) Customer loyalty: towards an integrated framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22, 99–113.
- Dowling, G.R. (1994). *Corporate reputations: strategies for developing the corporate brand*. Kogan Page, London.
- Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3): 517-554.
- Ewing, M. T, Windisch, L., & Newton, F. J. (2010). Corporate reputation in the People's Republic of China: A B2B perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39, 728–736.
- Fombrun, C., & Shanley M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(2): 233-58.
- Fombrun, C. (1996). *Reputation: realizing value from the corporate image*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fombrun, C. J., & Van Riel, C. (1997). The reputational landscape. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(1), 5-14.
- Fombrun, C. J., Gardberg N. A., & Sever, J. W. (2000). The reputation quotient: A multi-stakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 7(4): 241-255.
- Fombrun, C., & Van Riel, C. (2004). *Fame and fortune: How successful companies build winning reputations*. Financial Times/ Prentice-Hall, New York, NY.
- Gaertner, S. (1999). Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4): 479- 93.
- Gatewood, R. D., Gowan, M. A., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (1993). Corporate image recruitment image and initial job choice decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(2): 414-427.
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 1, 63-81.
- Gotsi, M., & Wilson, A. M. (2001). Corporate reputation: Seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications*, 6, 24-30.
- Gundlach, G. T., Achrol, R. S., & Mentzer, J. T. (1995). The structure of commitment in exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (January), 78-92.
- Gwinner, K. P., Gremler, D. D., & Bitner, M. J. (1998). Relationship benefits in service industries: the customer's perspective. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 26(2). 101-114.
- Hall, R. (1993). A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(8): 607-618.
- Helm, S. (2005). Designing a formative measure for corporate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(2), 95–109.
- Helm, S. (2006). Exploring the impact of corporate reputation on consumer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 5(1), 59–80.
- Henning-Thurau, T., Langer, M. F., & Hansen, U. (2001). Modelling and managing student loyalty: an approach based on the concept of relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(1), 331–344.

- Henning-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., & Gremler, D. D. (2002). Understanding Relationship marketing outcomes: An integration of relational benefits and relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(3): 230–247.
- Herbig P., & Milewicz J. (1993). The relationship of reputation and credibility to brand success. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 10(1): 5-10.
- Highhouse S, Broadfoot A, Yugo, J. E., & Devendorf, S. A. (2009). Examining corporate reputation judgments with generalizability theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3):782–9.
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and Social Organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4): 499.
- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. A. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Krueger, T. M, Wrolstad, M. A., & Dalsem, S. V. (2010). Contemporaneous relationship between corporate reputation and return. *Managerial Finance*, 36(6), 482-490.
- Lafferty, B. A., & Goldsmith R. E. (1999). Corporate credibility's role in consumers' attitudes and purchase intentions when a high versus a low credibility endorser is used. *Journal of Business Research*, 44, 2, 109-116.
- Marken, G. A. (2002). One-minute corporate reputation management. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47, 4, 21-23.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 152–156.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 64–98.
- Meyer, J. P, Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Meyer, J., Becker, T., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social Identities and commitments at work: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 665-683.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The Commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20-38.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Bill, J. B. (1997). Corporate image: Employee reactions and implications for managing corporate social performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 401-411.
- Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 12, 1077-1093.
- Rose C., & Thomsen, S. (2004). The impact of corporate reputation on performance: Some Danish evidence. *European Management Journal*, 22(2): 201-210.

- Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52, 156-171.
- Shapiro, C. (1983). Premiums for high-quality products as returns to reputations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 98(4): 659- 681.
- Storey, J. (1995). Human resource management: Still marching on or marching out? In: Storey, J. (eds.) *Human resource management: A critical text*. Routledge, London.
- Tetrick, L. E. (1995). Developing and maintaining union commitment: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16 (Special Issue: Union Commitment), 583-595.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (2006). Research and practice of student retention: What next? *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Veloutsou, C., & Moutinho, L. (2009) Brand relationships through brand reputation and brand tribalism. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 3, 314-322.
- Walsh, G., & Beatty, S. E. (2007). Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 127- 143.
- Walsh, G., Beatty, S. E., & Shiu, E. (2009a). The customer-based corporate reputation scale: replication and short form. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 10, 924-930.
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V. W., Jackson, P., & Beatty, S. E. (2009b). Examining the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: A customer perspective. *British Journal Management*, 19, 187-203.
- Wartick, S. L. (1992). The Relationship between intense media exposure and change in corporate reputation. *Business & Society*, 31:33–49.
- Weigelt, K., & Camerer, C. (1988). Reputation and corporate strategy: A review of recent theory and applications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9:443–54.
- Wessel, J. L., Ryan, A. M., & Oswald, F. L. (2008). The relationship between objective and perceived fit with academic major, adaptability, and major-related outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 363-376.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Woosley, S. A., & Miller, A. L. (2009). Integration and institutional commitment as predictors of college student transition: Are third week indicators significant? *College Student Journal*, 43(4), 1260-127.
- Yoon, E., Guffey, H., & Kijewski, V. (1993). The effects of information and company reputation on intentions to buy a business service. *Journal of Business Research*, 27 (3), 215–228.
- Zeffane, R. (1994). Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style - A comparison of public and private-sector employees. *Human Relations*, 47(8): 977-1010.