

TURKISH PR AGENCIES' POINT OF VIEW ABOUT CORPORATE REPUTATION

R. Ayhan YILMAZ*
İdil KARADEMİRLİDAĞ**

Abstract

Corporate reputation is the overall estimation in which a company is held by its constituents and reputation is a valuable corporate asset that is difficult to achieve, but even more difficult to protect. It's a growing factor in creating and maintaining corporate competitive advantage. Reputation management concept is quite new in Turkey and some managers of well known companies still believe that his companies have reputation sufficiently. Besides the manager's point of view, pr agencies have not a clear definition for this term yet. Another important issue on corporate reputation as important as conceptualization of it is measurement. Methods of measurements about corporate reputation are under debate. Many types of measurements methods about corporate reputation have been using in the world. Research on most-appreciated companies is one of the methods have been using in Turkey. In this study we would like to find out attitudes of PR agencies especially in Turkey towards reputation management and to seek whether reputation management is given among the services of PR agencies or not. And ask the questions, "Why there is such a demand, does this demand comes from the agency or from the company".

Key words: Corporate reputation, measurement of reputation, corporate image.

Öz: Türkiye'de Halkla İlişkiler Şirketlerinin Kurumsal İtibar Kavramına Bakış Açıları

Kurumsal itibar kurumun bütün sosyal paydaşlarının sahip olduğu kuruma yönelik takdirlerinin toplamıdır ve elde edilmesi güç bir kurumsal değerdir. Kurumsal itibarın elde edilmesinin zorluğunu yanında kurumsal itibarı korumak bundan daha zordur. Kurumsal itibar, kurumsal rekabet avantajı yaratmada ve sürdürmede gelişmekte olan bir faktördür. Kurumsal itibar kavramı Türkiye'de oldukça yeni olan bir kavramdır ve iyi bilinen şirketlerin bazı yöneticileri hala kendi şirketlerinin yeteri kadar itibarı olduğuna inanmaktadırlar. Yöneticilerin sahip olduğu bu bakış açısının yanı sıra, halkla ilişkiler şirketleri de henüz kurumsal itibar yönetimi konusunda belli bir tanıma sahip değiller. Kurumsal itibarın kavramsallaştırılması kadar önemli bir diğer konu da kurumsal itibarın ölçümüdür. Kurumsal itibarın ölçülmesi konusu tartışmalıdır. Dünyada kurumsal itibar ölçümü ile ilgili birçok araştırma yöntemi kullanılmaktadır. En beğenilen şirketler araştırması, kurumsal itibar ölçümü konusunda, Türkiye'de kullanılan kurumsal itibar ölçümü yöntemlerinden sadece biridir. Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'de Halkla İlişkiler Ajanslarının Kurumsal İtibara yönelik tutumlarını ortaya çıkarmak ve itibar yönetimine halkla ilişkiler ajanslarının hizmetleri içinde yer verilip verilmediğini ortaya çıkarmak amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışmada özellikle şu soruların yanıtı aranmaktadır: Kurumsal itibara yönelik talebin nedeni nedir ve bu talep halkla ilişkiler ajansından mı gelmektedir yoksa kurumlardan mı gelmektedir?

* Associate Prof. Dr., Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi, rayilmaz@anadolu.edu.tr.

** Assistant Prof. Dr., Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, ikaradem@bahcesehir.edu.tr.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kurumsal itibar, kurumsal itibar ölçümü, kurumsal imaj.

INTRODUCTION

Reputation is a valuable corporate asset that is difficult to achieve, but even more difficult to protect (Goodman, 2002:2). According to the American Heritage Dictionary, reputation is the general estimation in which one is held by the public (Fombrun, 1999). Bennett and Kottasz (2000) trace the development of corporate reputation theory from the 1950's focus on corporate image to the 1970's and 1980's, where identity and communication were to the fore, through to the 1990's and corporate brand management and reputation. The growth in interest in reputation management is in part due to the success of crisis management programs (Argenti, 1997:311). In the current business environment where globalization effects, company performance and a range of other external and internal factors interact, business reputation can account for up to 15 per cent of the share price (Cooper, 1999). Fombrun defines corporate reputation as 'the overall estimation in which a company is held by its constituents' (Fombrun, 1996: 37). Like Fombrun (1996), it is suggested here that developing this intangible asset - corporate reputation - will become increasingly important in the years ahead. A positive reputation creates a strategic advantage or what Fombrun refers to as 'reputational capital'. (Stanley J Kowalczyk, Michael, J.Pawlish, 2002:159)

Corporate Reputation, Corporate Identity, Corporate Culture

Gotsi and Wilson (2001:27) classify the marketing literature on corporate reputation

into the analogous school of thought where reputation is viewed as synonymous with image and the differentiated school of thought where reputation is viewed as different to image.

Corporate reputation management: It is often contained within a corporate communications function; reputation management is about building a sound corporate reputation and maintaining the strength. While some define corporate reputation as "corporate identity" others define it as the "collective opinion of stakeholders toward an organization" based on its past record. It has also been described as a method of building and sustaining of an organization's good name, generating positive feedback from stakeholders that will result in meeting strategic and financial objectives (Kartalia, 1999). PR professionals agree reputation is a mighty thing, worthy of nurture, deserving of praise. And once lost - or even tarnished - incredibly difficult to regain (Winkleman, 1999; Nakra, P.2000: 36)

Corporate image: Hatch and Schultz (1997:357) embrace the interpretation in combining the marketing and organizational interpretation of image:

"Organizational image is a holistic and vivid impression held by an individual or particular group towards an organization and is a result of sense-making by the group and communication by the organization of a fabricated and projected picture of itself." Image is also affected by common interactions between members of the organization and external audiences.

The image constructed by the external audience also draws from the intentions and influences of potentially much wider groups (Dowling, 1993:102).

Corporate identity: Alessandri (2001: 175) identifies a number of different definitions and interpretations of corporate identity, including: "a set of visual clues that makes a firm recognizable and distinguishes it from others" (Abratt, 1989); "the encompassing of the mind, the soul and the voice of the firm" (Balmer and Soenen, 1997); "the consistent and targeted representations of the firm with an emphasis on corporate symbols and logos" (Gioia et al., 2000); Alessandri (2001:178) presents both conceptual and operational definitions of corporate identity as Fills (2003) set is:

The conceptual definition of corporate identity a firm's strategically planned and purposeful presentation of itself in order to gain a positive corporate image in the minds of the public. A corporate identity is established in order to gain a favorable corporate reputation over time. The operational definition of corporate identity [involves] all of the observable and measurable elements of a firm's identity manifest in its comprehensive visual presentation of itself ... Corporate identity also includes the firm's public behavior including - but not limited to - its reception of employees, customers, shareholders and suppliers.

The Needs For Reputation Management

A company can be a leading one in its field becoming the first preference of its workers, source suppliers, its investors and clients with its strong corporate reputation. For example, corporate reputation created in clients' eyes help raise the brand value, raise the worker loyalty, encourage repurchasing and make more profit. Corporate reputation

created in workers' eyes help the company employs more qualified staff, increase the production and the rate of making profit. As the differences among the products and service decrease, reputation is seen to be the most important strategical factor, providing the most competitive advantage to the companies.

According to Nakra (2000:37), there are several factors that affect reputation management. We can list those factors like these: Environmental Factors Demanding Reputation Management, Internal Pressures, Globalization of Business, Customer Expectations, Transparency, Reputation Affects Financial Performance, and Shareholder Value.

Corporate reputation is a growing factor in creating and maintaining corporate competitive advantage due to four trends in the business environment: the global interpenetration of markets, media congestion and fragmentation, the appearance of ever more vocal constituencies, the commoditization of industries and their products (Fombrun, 2005:303).

In order to explain the question why firms pay much attention to this concept especially in recent years, it would be beneficial to present the realities that Fombrun (1996) revealed about what the desired reputation causes an institution to gain. These are higher prices for the products, less work force, lower capital costs, worker dependency of a better quality, freedom in decision taking and providing a common sense buffer in case of a crisis. For this reason, if we accept that reputation might affect commercial performance and if studies reveal this fact, then we can of course draw the conclusion that reputation is something that worths gaining, developing and maintaining.

Theoretical Ecole

Having reviewed the literature within the analogous (The analogous school of thought: corporate reputation as synonymous with corporate image) and differentiated schools (The differentiated school of thought: corporate reputation as different to corporate image) of thought, there seems to be greater support for the differentiated school of thought, showing the concepts of corporate reputation and corporate image as interrelated (Table 1.).

Views within the analogous and differentiated schools of thought that consider corporate image and corporate reputation are as identical. There would seem to be a stronger

argument that there is a dynamic relationship between corporate reputation and corporate image. In this relationship, corporate images that stakeholders form can be influenced by their overall evaluation of the company, i.e. its corporate reputation (second view within the differentiated school of thought) and at the same time a firm's corporate reputation is largely influenced by the corporate images that stakeholders form every day for the organisation (third view within the differentiated school of thought)(Gotsi, Wilson, 2001: 25).

Theoretical Ecole	Relationship Between Corporate Reputation and Corporate Image
Bernays, 1977; Boorstin, 1996; Bouldig, 1973; Budd, 1969; Criss, 1971; Enis, 1967; Martineau, 1958; Gates ve Mc Daniel, 1972; Kennedy, 1977; Schafhauser, 1967; Abrat, 1989; Alvesson, 1998; Bernstein, 1984; Dichter, 1985; Dowling, 1986; Dutton vd., 1994;	Corporate Reputation =Corporate image
Brown ve Cox, 1997; Brown ve Dacin, 1997; Grunig, 1993; O'Sullivan, 1983; Seamons, 1998;	Corporate Reputation ≠ Crporate image
Mason, 1993;	Corporate Reputation » Corporate image
BALmer, 1996,1997; Bromley, 1993; Fombrun 1996; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Gray and Bolmer, 1998; Rindova, 1997; Saxton, 1998;	Corporate Reputation « Corporate Image

Table 1. Relationship between corporate reputation and corporate image.

Corporate Reputation Measurement

Most of the measurements developed for the corporate reputation have focused on the firm rankings. The most enduring reputation survey is the market is probably Fortune's annual list of America's Most Admired Companies. Since 1983, the magazine has asked executives and analysts to rate companies on various attributes of performance.

Such measurements and evaluation criteria are criticized since they do not have any theoretical basis, since they are excessively dependant on financial performance, and since they are only applied to the administrators and analysts, that is, they do not cover the clients and workers. The magazine Fortune later formed the list of the Most-Admired Companies of America. This was rather a more appreciated evaluation. A list of 57 different sectors was prepared, and the participants were asked to evaluate the firms in their own sector with respect to such 8 different criteria as management quality, product and service quality, renovation, long-term investment value, financial health, skills of the workers, use of corporate wealth, social responsibility and general business results. Again the magazine Fortune, for workers, prepared a list of "Top 100 firms to work for". Here, the confidence in management and the proud of working for the firm were evaluated, and the philosophy of the firm and their own reports on their applications, information in booklets for workers and the firm bulletins were included in these evaluations and then interpreted.

Reputation Quotient

Corporate Reputation Quotient of Harris-Fombrun

Charles Fombrun has been working with various colleagues on the development of the RQ (Reputation Quotient) and the launch of the Global RQ Project. The RQ-method is

a standardized measurement instrument designed with the market research firm of Harris Interactivewhose purpose is to track the corporate reputations of business firms. In contrast to most other reputation ranking systems that only focus on the USA or on a specific country somewhere else in the world, the RQ-methodology is the first to be systematically carried out on a global scale (USA, Canada, Australia, South Africa and 12 European countries). The great benefit of such a standardized instrument will be its ability to enable cross-national comparisons. (Fombrun, 2002:298) The Corporate Reputation Quotient of Harris Fombrun is comprehensive measuring method of corporate reputation that was created specially to capture the perceptions of any corporate stakeholder group such as consumers, investors, employees or key influentials. The instrument enables research on the drivers of a company's reputation as well as comparisons of reputation both within and across industries. This business reputation model has the following 6 drivers of corporate reputation with subsequent 20 attributes: Emotional Appeal (Good feeling about the company, admire and respect the company, trust the company), Products and Services (Stands behind products/ services, offer high quality products/services, offers products/services that good value), Vision and Leadership (has excellent leadership, has a clear vision for future, recognizes/ takes advantage of market opportunities), Workplace Environment (is well managed, looks like a good company to work for, looks like it has good employees), Financial performance (record of profitability, looks like a low risk investment, strong prospect for future growth, tends to outperform its competitors) and finally, Social Responsibility (support

good causes, environmentally responsible, treats people well).

(http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_corporate_reputation_quotient.html).

Delahaye

Since 1964, the people behind Delahaye Medialink (www.delahayemedialink.com) have been combining research technique, technology and insight to help companies understand and improve their reputations, plan and evaluate their communications programs and sharpen their competitive edge worldwide. Whether communicating internally or externally, via broadcast, online or print media, Delahaye Medialink provides research to accurately assess communications performance and the advice to execute successful communications programs. Delahaye Medialink, with offices in Norwalk, CT, Portsmouth, NH, and London, England, is a division of Medialink Worldwide Incorporated. (Medialink, 2004),

Types of Measurement Methods in Turkey

'Research on Most-Appreciated Companies in Turkey' is carried out through the participation of top-level professional administrators. The purpose is to reveal, in their respect, 'Most-Appreciated Companies in Turkey' and to measure the evaluations and perceptions of their rivals in their own sector. On the basis of Fombrun's scale, they first evaluate the degree of importance of the 18 criteria that make a company 'appreciated' according to a scale of 1 to 10. Following this, they are asked "which company is the one that they appreciate most in Turkey?". They are requested to reply to this question considering all the companies in Turkey. The companies that state their most-appreciated company are also asked to explain the reasons for their choice. Another important

question of the research asks them to state "the first three companies that you most appreciate and your related justifications". The point in this question is that they should not state their opinions about their own companies. Thus, the thoughts and judgments of the upper-level administrators, briefly the images of their rivals in their eyes, are measured depending on the 18 criteria. Finally, the administrators grade the firms they work for on the basis of the 18 criteria.

SAMPLING AND METHODOLOGY

The Purpose of the Study

Reputation management concept is quite new in Turkey. But its importance is being understood nowadays. Some managers of well known companies still believe that his/her company's has enough reputation. So they do not want to manage this. Even the companies which are aware of the importance of corporate reputation do not get appraised their reputations. Periodical Capital appraises the companies in Turkey and publishes the most liked 500 companies since 1999. If a company takes a place in top 500 it uses this information as an advertisement means. For this reason, the purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of PR agencies especially in Turkey towards reputation management and to find out the answers for the following questions: Is RM expected among the services of PR agencies? Why is there such a demand and does this demand come from the agency or company. However, the answers of such questions like how PR agencies evaluate the benefit that they provide for the company and how they express themselves in order to tell companies which they work in the means of the importance of corporate reputation?

Aim

In order to achieve the goal the answers will be sought to the following questions:

1. How the PR agencies identify the means of reputation management?
2. What kind of services the customers demand form the PR agencies?
3. Do PR agency or business firm demand reputation management?
4. Why the companies demand corporate reputation?
5. What is the reason of not to demand corporate reputation management?
6. Is there any difference between corporate image and corporate reputation?
7. What do PR agencies think about the components of corporate reputations?
8. Which methods are conducted for measuring reputation by the PR agencies?
9. How PR agencies identify and range the benefits of the corporate reputation management?

Sampling

Domain of this study covers 50 CEOs of PR agencies who has a web address and registered in the web site of Turkish PR Society (TÜHİD). A prepared public survey was sent to the domain via e-mail. 20 out of 50 answered the survey and these are used for analysis.

The Model of the Study

An exploratory investigation was used in order to reveal the point of view of PR agencies towards corporate reputation concept. Exploratory studies are suitable for "probing new substantive areas which may rest on still unformalised and unintegrated theoretical, hypothetical and methodological argu-

ments" and where relatively little is known about an issue.

Data collected with the method of surveying, which is often used for data collection in descriptive researches. 13 questions were asked in the questionnaire. The statements used in the questionnaire were based on corporate reputation management. The draft questionnaire was pre-tested via discussions with academic experts in the PR department in Anadolu University and PR fields. After deciding that the questionnaire can be used it is sent to CEOs of 50 PR agencies who are the members of TÜHİD. Questionnaire was made of four parts. In the first part there were statements like what kind of services were expected from PR agencies and are there RM among them ,from whom comes the RM demand ,the reasons of not to demand RM and concurrent statements that justify RM realization were made. In the second part likert type scale were used in order to scale the statements that clarify their thoughts about corporate reputation schools and why the companies demand corporate reputation. It was evaluated like "Absolutely agree is 1 and absolutely disagree is 5". In the third part there were statement about the concurrents that form RM and the benefits of RM to the company. In the fourth part it was asked if the PR agency that they work for as the CEO, has any customer that they serve RM service; do they apply any method to measure their corporate reputation; if they apply which measurement method do they use? The data collected from this research interpreted by using frequency distribution technique in SPSS program.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

It was asked CEOs their statements to their customers how do they tell the importance of RM, how do they define RM, and what do

they understand from RM? Among 20 participants only 8 PR agencies which give RM service to their customers defined RM concept. These statements were grouped basically in these major themes; emotional value, corporate spirit, social responsibility comprehension, future value, continuity. The answers of the CEOs to an open ended question were;

1. "Corporate reputation is a major contribution for social partners to evaluate a company. The companies with high reputation can sell their products with a higher profit than the ones with low reputation. A company may have plenty of images but may have only one reputation. Continuity of reputation is very important for a company. The basics of reputation are core values like responsibility, honesty and reliability. To lose the reputation is the worst thing behalf bankruptcy."
2. "We are trying to give positive messages for corporate identity and responsibility while giving PR service and meantime we are improving our corporate responsibility perception. So we are communicating with the companies with the regional scale and corporate scale about PR."
3. "Future and continuity."
4. "The respect adapted to your company that you wish to see personally."
5. "Does he/she want to carry the company to the future? Can he be the one who is least effected from the crisis? Do they listen to him in the sector?"
6. "Corporate Reputation method in PR"
7. "The emotional value that will make you different and form your future and protect you. The products and services that you provide represent only the rational benefit; but the reputation defines your company's identity. If you make an analogy between a

company and a person, rational benefit is the body and the reputation is the soul."
8. "I tell its benefits"

Within the context of our pre-research out of the services that clients expect from a public relation firm, relations with media come first. MPR come the next and than the third service is again MPR.

When the answers given to who demands the RM management are examined, those who are addressed the questions stated with the percentage of 65% that this decision is made by both clients and public relation firms collectively. The client demand is ranked in the second order with the percentage of 30%. A further finding shows that administer of the public relation firms think that clients are not aware of the importance of corporate reputation with the percentage of 65% and this is the main reason of the clients not demanding corporate reputation.

	Benefit 1	Benefit 2	Benefit 3
	Count	Count	Count
Less damage in crisis	9	4	5
Price advantage	0	0	1
Acquiring investor	0	1	6
Trade volume	0	1	1
Future value	7	7	2
Stoke value	0	1	1
Employee loyalty	0	2	0
High quality in labor force	0	0	4
Acceptance in global markets	1	4	0
Saving market share	3	0	0
Total	20	20	20

Table1: The benefits that the corporate reputation brings

The first three benefits provided by corporate reputation in Table 4 have been determined by administrators as follows: The first one is that corporate reputation helps find the way out in crisis with the least loss; the second is that corporate reputation creates values for its future; the third one is that it help win the supports of investors.

The rate for the firms to strongly agree with the ideas about the reasons for the firms to demand for corporate reputation, as can be

seen in Table 5, is as follows, the rate for the rapid change of the market is 35%, for the effect of media is 10%, for development of social responsibility is 45%, for the changes in consumer structure is 20%, for the changes in consumer demand is 45%, for the similarity between product-service is 40%, for the rising of stake holder's expectations is 60%, for globalization is 50%, for the similarity of competing criteria is 50%, for the changes in satisfaction criteria is 30%.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
Rapid changes in market environment	35,0	50,0	15,0	-	-
Effects of media	10,0	65,0	5,0	20,0	-
Developing social responsibility	45,0	40,0	10,0	5,0	-
Changes in consumer structure	20,0	75,0	5,0	-	-
Changes in consumer demand	45,0	50,0	5,0	-	-
Similarity between product-services	40,0	50,0	10,0	-	-
Rising stake holder's expectations	60,0	35,0	5,0	-	-
Globalization	50,0	50,0	-	-	-
Similarity of competing criteria	50,0	45,0	-	5,0	-
Changes in admiring criteria	30,0	60,0	10,0	-	-

Table 2: The reasons for the firms to demand for corporate reputation.

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly isagree %
Corporate reputation is different from corporate image	45,0	45,0	-	10,0	-
Corporate reputation is synonymous with corporate image	-	20,0	-	40,0	40,0
Image affects reputation	45,0	50,0	5,0	-	-
Reputation affects image	20,0	60,0	10,0	5,0	5,0

Table 3: Views about the corporate reputation considerations.

Administrators have stated that they have strongly agreed with the four considerations about corporate reputation, (corporate reputation and corporate image are different from one another; corporate reputation is synonymous with corporate image; corporate image affects the reputation; corporate reputation affect cor-

porate image) suggesting that reputation and image are different with the percentage of 45%, corporate reputation affects corporate image with the percentage of 45%, reputation affects image with the percentage of 20%.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	,00	12	60,0	60,0	60,0
	1,00	1	5,0	5,0	65,0
	2,00	1	5,0	5,0	70,0
	3,00	1	5,0	5,0	75,0
	4,00	3	15,0	15,0	90,0
	10,00	2	10,0	10,0	100,0
	Total	20	100,0	100,0	

Table 4: The number of firms managing their corporate reputations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	40,0	40,0	40,0
	No	12	60,0	60,0	100,0
	Total	20	100,0	100,0	

Table 5: Using of measuring methods

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	,00	1	5,0	5,0	5,0
	Fombrun	2	10,0	10,0	15,0
	Capital	2	10,0	10,0	25,0
	Non of them	10	50,0	50,0	75,0
	Others	4	20,0	20,0	95,0
	More than one	1	5,0	5,0	100,0
	Total	20	100,0	100,0	
Tötal		20	100,0		

Table 6: Types of measuring methods

Out of 20 Administrators of public relation firms, 8 administrators have stated that they have clients for whom they managed their corporate reputations. The number indicating the clients, for whom corporate reputation has been managed, as can also be seen in Table 4, varies between 1 and 10.

It is seen in Table 5 that 40% of the interviewed administrators have used measuring methods for reputation.

50% of the administrators subject to the study do not use any of the methods stated on the questionnaire, including Formbrun corporate reputation measure, Fortune magazine evaluation criteria, capital magazine mostly admired 500 firms questionnaire, Rotterdam corporate identification test, and Delahave Index.. 20% of them has stated the choice of "others" but they did not clarify which measuring method they meant specifically.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the first part of the study, the administrators of the public relation firms were asked how they explained the concept of reputation management to their clients. When the basic answers are examined, corporate reputation is perceived as the biggest threat after the bankruptcy of the firm. In the core of the reputation, there lies responsibility, honesty and reliability. Continuity is very important in corporate reputation. Corporate reputation is the basic support to the stakeholders in the evaluation of the firm. It provides a competitive advantage over the others. They are the means for the firms to be present in the future. They carry the institutions to

the future. It's an adopted version of respect and acceptance people need for their personality to firms. It helps find the way out in crisis with the least loss possible. They are emotional values making corporate differ from one another. When an analogy is done between person and firm, rational benefit is the definition of body, and reputation is the definition of spirit. Corporate identity, corporate image and other PR services seem to help reputation for better. This case reveals that the definitions of the administrators of the public relation firms about the term of reputation management in Turkey are quite general. Another important point here is that only 8 out of the 20 administrators subject to the study have a definition for the term of reputation management. This may reveal that the administrators of the public relation firms in Turkey have not formed a clear definition for this term yet. Also in the first part of the study, the statements about which services are expected from public relation firms and its reputation management is one of these services, who demanded the RM, the reasons for not demanding RM, foundation of RM and the benefits that it supplies and the elements helping found RM. The administrators of public relation firms have agreed on the fact that the first service expected from public relation firms is media relation service. The ground for the public relation firms in Turkey is based on media relations. Even today, publicity, a classical service of public relation firms, is expected. Marketing public relations is found to be the second and the third services expected from public relations. This demonstrates that public relations in Turkey are still perceived as a means of ad-

vertising rather than being a managing philosophy. When the question "who demanded for corporate reputation" is addressed, it stated that it is formed with a collective decision between PR firm and clients. The demand for corporate reputation is mostly from clients; however it is not a decision which can be made by the PR firm on its own.

The most basic cause of the fact that corporate reputation is not demanded can be justified with the fact that business world has not been sufficiently absorbed the importance of RM management yet. Another threatening issue is that unfortunately some firms believe that they have already had corporate reputation. As a consequence of this, they do not think that RM is the public relation services to be managed.

As a benefit that corporate reputation supplies for the firm, the fact that it helps find the way out with the least loss in case of a crisis is presented when it is considered from public relation firms' point of view. It is believed that a corporate having good reputation can easily find its way out in a possible crisis with the help of its good reputation. In the second rank comes the fact that corporate reputation creates values for future, in the third rank comes the fact that it help win the support of investors.

In the second part of the study, globalization, one of the reasons for demanding corporate reputation, is the most supported view among the public relations administrators. Other important effects are; the changes in consumer structure, changes in consumer demand and the expectations of the stakeholders.

While administrators of public relation firms consider corporate reputation as to be different from corporate image, there are still those who do not regard the two concepts as to be different. There are also those who view the concepts of reputation and image to be similar to each other. The respondents think that image affects reputation rather than reputation management influences image.

According to the findings presented in the last part of the study, unfortunately, many public relation firms, in their portfolios, still do not have clients whose corporate reputation they manage. More than half of the administrators of public relations that have reputation management clients do not use any measurement method for measuring reputation management. Those who state that they use a measurement method do not use any of the measurement methods that already exist in literature and do not provide any explanation about what the method they use is.

In terms of both the administrators of public relation firms and the firms which these administrators work for, it is seen that they do not have in-depth knowledge about reputation management, its components and measurement methods.

Neither the public relation firms nor the clients of these firms have enough knowledge about the planning, application and evaluation of the concept of reputation management. What is pleasing here is that they are aware of the importance of RM. The respondent 20 public relation firms in this study are not examined in terms of their turnovers nor of whether they are global firms or not.

REFERENCES

- Alessandri S.W. (2001). Modeling corporate identity a concept explication and theoretical explanation, *Corporate Communication*, 4,173-183.
- Argenti, P., A. (1997). Reputation: Realizing Value From the Corporate Image, *Management Communication Quarterly MCQ*, 2, 310-314.
- van Riel, C.B. M & Fombrun C. J. (2002). Which company is most visible in your country? An Introduction to the special issue on the global RQ project nominations, *Corporate Reputation Review*, 4, 296-303.
- Dowling, G.R. (1993). Developing your corporate image into a corporate asset, *Long Range Planning*, 26,2,101-110.
- Fombrun, C. J. (1998). Indices of Corporate Reputation: An Analysis of Media Rankings and Social Monitors', *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1, 4, 327-340.
- Fombrun, Charles , J. (2003). Corporate reputations can be measured and managed, *Communicating CRS*, 15.
- Fombrun. C. J. (2005). The Global Reputation Quotient Project: First Steps Towards a cross-nationally valid measure of corporate reputation, *Corporate Reputation Review*, 4,.4, 303-309.
- Fombrun, C.J. & Shanley, M. (1990). 'What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy', *Academy of Management Journal*, 33,2,233-258.
- Fombrun, C. J. & van Riel, C.B. M (1997). The Reputational Landscape, *Corporate Reputation Review*,1, 1-2, 5-13.
- Goodman, M. B. (2002). Corporate Reputation Management and the Impact of Corporate Citizenship Activities, *NIRI The New World of Corporate Responsibility: How Investor Relations can Maintain and Enhance Your Company's Reputation in Today's Demanding Market Environment*, USA.
- Gotsi, M., &Wilson, A.M (2001). Corporate Reputation: Seeking a Defination., *Journal of Corporate Reputation*, 6,1, 24-30.
- Hatch, M.J &Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between Organizational Culture, Identity and Image, *European Journal of Marketing*, 4, 4, 356-365.
- Nakra, P. (2000).Corporate reputation management: "CRM" with a strategic twist?, *Public Relations Quarterly*, 45, 2, 35-43.
- Corporate Reputation Quotient, Mart 25, 2004,

http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_corporate_reputation_quotient.html

Delahaye Medialink Announces Results of the Media Reputation Index 2001 Benchmark Study, Mart 27, 2004, <http://www.medialink.com/pressreleases2003/082603.htm>