Financial Impacts of Corporate Reputation

Esther de Quevedo Puente, Juan B. Delgado García, and Juan M. de la Fuente Sabaté

Introduction

The last decades have witnessed a surge of interest among practitioners and scholars in corporate reputation. Managers have characterized corporate reputation as the most relevant asset of the firm (Hall 1992, 1993), and scholars have made a growing effort to find theoretical and empirical support for these managerial perceptions, by specifying what advantages well-reputed firms may enjoy. Reputation signals the underlying quality of products and thus affects the customer's choice among competing products (Akerlof 1970). This translates into increased sales, higher customer retention (Caminity 1992; Selnes 1994), and a premium price (Shapiro 1983; Klein and Lefler 1981; Milgrom and Roberts 1986; Obloj and Obloj 2006; Graham and Bansal 2007). And corporate reputation influences not only incomes but also operation and financial cost (Podony 1993). A good corporate reputation makes the firm an employer of choice (Fombun and van Riel 2004) that may choose employees with higher productivity (Stigler 1962; Williamson 1985), and also leads to lower contracting and monitoring costs because suppliers and partners are less concerned about contractual hazards (Milgrom and Roberts 1992).

All these advantages of corporate reputation in relations with diverse stakeholders should increase, via cost or revenue, the firm's cash flows. Furthermore, corporate reputation also supports new product introductions and recovery strategies in the event of crisis (Dowling 2001) and, therefore, reduces the firm's risk. The increased cash flows and the reduced risk should finally increase the firm's value.

This chapter reviews the empirical research on the financial impacts of corporate reputation in order to test managerial perceptions about the interest of corporate reputation. For this chapter, we focus our review on studies published in academic journals that analyze explicitly or implicitly the influence of a measure of corporate reputation on firm performance. Some papers (Dunbar and Schwalbach 2000; Rose and Thomsen 2004; Inglis et al. 2006) have researched the two-way interaction

S. Helm et al. (eds.), *Reputation Management*, Management for Professionals,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-19266-1_15,

between corporate reputation and financial performance, but we have covered only their analysis of the corporate reputation effect. The relationship among firm profitability, risk, and market value has led us to organize the chapter as follows. In the next section, we review the papers that analyze the influence of corporate reputation on profitability. The third section summarizes the efforts to explore the impact of corporate reputation on risk. The fourth section surveys articles that have tried to validate the effect of corporate reputation on firm value. We conclude with a discussion of the evidence and possible causes of inconsistent findings, as well as directions for future research.

Impacts of Corporate Reputation on Profitability

It is true that the multiple benefits of corporate reputation should affect profitability first. The improvement of stakeholders' attitudes towards the firm derived from corporate reputation should translate into higher cash flow, via reduced cost or increased revenue, and should have its most immediate impact on accounting data.

McGuire et al. (1990) and Nanda et al. (1996) examine the formation of corporate reputation and its effects on financial performance in USA and UK, respectively. After controlling the effect of prior on subsequent financial performance,[1] both papers find little correlation between corporate reputation and financial performance for US and UK firms (Fig. 1).

However, Roberts and Dowling (1997) reach fairly contrary conclusions. Their results from a proportional hazard regression – where the dependent variable is the likelihood that, given a specific position of performance at time *t*, the firm enters (or leaves) a higher (or lower) financial performance position – verify that firms with better reputation not only have an easier time attaining superior performance (the lead indicator effect) but also can sustain superior performance outcomes for longer periods of time (the carry over effect). In later work, Roberts and Dowling (2002) enlarge their sample period and decompose overall reputation into financial and residual reputation to ensure that their findings are not manifestations of a financial halo.[2] Their autoregressive profit models and proportional hazard regression models consistently verify that well-reputed firms are better able to sustain superior profits over time. These results hold for both components of corporate reputation. A firm's residual and financial reputation has an impact on profit persistence.

[1]To solve the problems derived from the high correlation between prior and subsequent financial performance, they define their dependent variables as the residuals obtained in a regression in which they used prior or subsequent financial performance to explain corporate reputation.

[2]Fryxell and Wang (1994) challenged most of the corporate reputation measurements because they are based primarily or exclusively on the perceptions of executives and industry analysts, whose strong interest in firm performance leads them to issue evaluations of qualitative items greatly influenced by financial data. Thus, began the debate surrounding the so-called financial halo (Brown and Perry 1994; Logsdon and Wartick 1995; Szwajkowski and Figlewicz 1997; Capraro and Srivastava 1997), still argued even today.

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
McGuire, Schne-eweiss and Branch (1990)	Residuals of the regression of prior performance on average firm *Fortune* rating --- Residuals of the regression of subsequent performance on average firm *Fortune* rating	ROA Operation income growth Assets growth Sales growth	Correlation analysis Regression analysis	Beta Average assets Alpha Residuals Debt/ Assets	131 firms pre-survey (1977-1982) survey (1983) post–survey (1982-1984) USA	Multiple industries	Reputation measurement (1983) Subsequent performance (1982-1984) --- Prior performance (1977-1982) Reputation measurement (1983)	ns

ns=non significant

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Metho-dology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Nanda Schne-eweiss and Branch (1996)	Residuals of the regression of prior performance on average firm *The Economist* rating --- Residuals of the regression of subsequent performance on average firm *The Economist* rating	ROA Average of cash flow/average assets Growth in net income Growth in revenue Return on stock Three year growth rate of EPS	Correlation analysis Regression analysis	Beta Average assets Alpha Residuals Debt/ Assets	85 firms pre-survey (1985-1987) survey (1989) post-survey (1989-1991) UK	Multiple industries	Reputation measurement (1989) Subsequent performance (1989-1991) --- Prior performance (1985-1987) Reputation measurement (1989)	Growth in revenue (+) --- Three year growth rate of EPS (+)
Roberts and Dowling (1997)	*Fortune*	Probability of exiting a superior performance position at time *t* given that an exit has not ocurred prior to time *t* --- Probability of exiting a below-average performance position at time *t* given that an exit has not occurred prior to time *t*	Proportional hazard regression	Company size Market value vs. Book val ue Episode duration Calendar time	Events= 334 (1984-1995) USA --- Events= 338 (1984-1995) USA	Standardizes the depended variable to industry average	0 --- 0	- --- +

ns=non significant

Fig. 1 (continued)

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Deep-house (1997)	Media reputation: *The Minneapolis Star Tribune* and *The Saints Paul Pioneer Press* Financial reputation: Capital adequacy and assets quality. General evaluation of a company´s financial prospects made by financial rating industry. This financial rating industry consists of private, non-profit and government agencies	Relative ROA: return on assets relative to annual average for all industry	Correlation analysis. Regression analysis	Market share. Re-relative ROA_{t-1}	265 firms (1988-1992) Minneapolis-St. Paul (USA) metropolitan area	Commercial banking	0	+ +
Dunbar and Schwalbach (2000)	*Manager Magazin*	Financial performance = mix (accounting measures + market performance measures)	Pooled regression analysis	Annual time dummies	N=105 (1992, 1994, 1996) Germany	Multiple industries	1	+
			Cross-sectional regression analysis	-	N=35 (1992) Germany			ns
				-	N=35 (1996) Germany			ns
				-	N=35 (1994) Germany			ns

ns=non significant

Fig. 1 (continued)

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Roberts and Dowling (2002)	$Reputation_{t-1}$	Probability of exiting a superior performance position at time *t* given that an exit has not occurred prior to that time	Proportional hazard regression	Market to $book_{t-1}$ $Sales_{t-1}$ ROA_{t-1}	Superior profitability sample N=1630 Events=457 (1984–1998) USA	Variables normalized to industry average	1	-
	Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$				Superior profitability sample N=941 Events=286 (1984-1998) USA			-
	$Reputation_{t-1}$	Probability of exiting a below average performance position at time *t* given that an exit has not occurred prior to that time			Below average profitability sample N=1528 Events=428 (1984-1998) USA			+
	Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$				Below average profitability sample N=908 Events=268 (1984-1998) USA			+ +
	$Reputation_{t-1}$ $Reputation_{t-1}$ $*roa_{t-1}$	ROA_{it}: firms *i*´s normalized profit rate at the time *t* normalized being realized profitability less an indicator of normal profits	Autoregressive profit models	Market to $book_{t-1}$ ROA_{t-1} $Sales_{t-1}$ Market to $book_{t-1}$ $*ROA_{t-1}$ ROA_{t-1} $*sales_{t-1}$	N=3141 (1984-1998) USA	Variables normalized to industry average	1	+ +
	Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$ Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ $*ROA_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$ $*ROA_{t-1}$				N=1849 (1984-1998) USA		1	+ + + +
	Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$ Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ $*ROA_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$ $*ROA_{t-1}$				Superior performance sample N=941 (1984-1998) USA		1	ns - + +
	Financial $reputation_{t-1}$ Residual $reputation_{t-1}$ Financial				Below-average performance sample N=908		1	+ + ns ns

Fig. 1 (continued)

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
	reputation$_{t-1}$ *ROA$_{t-1}$ Residual reputation$_{t-1}$ *ROA$_{t-1}$				(1984-1998) USA			
Rose and Thomsen (2002)	Factorial analysis of the ratings from *Borens Nyhedsmagasin (now Berling ske Nyhedsmagasin)*	Market-to-book value (also checked with ROA)	Correlation analysis Regression analysis	Market-to-book$_{t-1}$	N=188 (1996-2001) Denmark	Multiple industries	0	ns
	Factorial analysis of the ratings from *Borens Nyhedsmagasin (now Berling ske Nyhedsmagasin)* one year lagged				N=165 (1996-2001) Denmark		1	ns
Inglis, Morley and Sammut (2006)	*RepuTex*	Market-to-book value	Correlation analysis Regression analysis	Market-to-book$_{t-1}$	N=63 (2004) Australia	Multiple industries	0	ns
		ROA		ROA$_{t-1}$	N=63 (2004) Australia		0	ns
		ROE		ROE$_{t-1}$	N=63 (2004) Australia		0	ns
		ROIC		ROIC$_{t-1}$	N=63 (2004) Australia		0	ns

ns=non significant

Fig. 1 (continued)

Authors	Measure of Corporate Reputation	Measure of Performance	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Eberl and Schwaiger (2005)	(Authors conducted survey) Financial affective component of reputation ("[company] is a company that I can better identify with than with other companies"; "[company] is a company I would more regret not having if it no longer existed than I would other companies"; and "I regard [company] as a likeable company") Financial cognitive component of reputation ("[company] is a top competitor in its market"; "As far as I know, [company] is recognized world-wide"; and "I believe that [company] performs at a premium level") Idiosyncratic cognitive component of reputation Idiosyncratic affective component of reputation	Net income	Regression analysis	Total $sales_{t-1}$ Market-to-$book_{t-1}$	N=20 (2002) Germany	Multiple industries	1	+ - + +
Fernández and Luna (2007)	MERCO (Spanish Monitor of Corporate Reputation)	ROA	Regression analysis	-	N=77 (2004) Spain	Multiple industries	0	+
		Gross operation margin			N=78 (2004) Spain			+
		Economic return differential			N=27 (2004) Spain			+
		Margin differential			N=46 (2004) Spain			+

ns=non significant

Fig. 1 Impacts of corporate reputation on profitability

Therefore, these findings suggest a self-reinforcing dynamic. Profitability improvement enhances reputation. This reputation, in turn, makes it easier for firms to sustain superior performance outcomes over time.

Dunbar and Schwalbach (2000), Rose and Thomsen (2004), and Inglis et al. (2006) have analyzed this self-reinforcing dynamic in different country contexts. For Germany, Dunbar and Schwalbach (2000) find support for the prior performance effect on future corporate reputation and for the prior reputation effect on future performance. However, for a Danish case, Rose and Thomsen (2004) show that performance affects reputation but reject the hypothesis that reputation improves performance. They explain these surprising results by arguing that the effects of corporate reputation would presumably show up only in the long run and are not fully captured in accounting profitability measures. Although Inglis et al. (2006) apply the same model used by Rose and Thomsen (2004) to Australian data, their results are inconsistent. This study fails to establish any relationship between corporate reputation and profitability.

Eberl and Schwaiger (2005) and Fernández and Luna (2007) focus on the influence of corporate reputation on firm performance. For the largest German firms, Eberl and Schwaiger (2005) disentangle four components of corporate reputation that may have different effects on future financial performance. Their results show that reputation's cognitive component has a positive impact on future financial performance, while they find strong evidence that its affective component has a negative impact. Fernández and Luna (2007) argue that the poor results obtained in previous studies could have been caused by a nonlinear relationship between corporate reputation and financial profitability that suggests the existence of a maximum beyond which improvements in corporate reputation fail to be accompanied by improvements in financial results. This paper finds support for a nonlinear relationship for the Spanish case.

Deephouse (1997) proposes media reputation as a useful measure of overall reputation because media provide a forum where reputations can be debated and affirmed. Media reputation avoids the possible financial bias of *Fortune* ratings and can be applied outside the large companies that are evaluated by reputation rankings. The results confirm that media reputation also influences performance, even when financial reputation is controlled.

Annualized profitability sums up only short-term effects, but corporate reputation has a long-term effect on the firm, so the use of accounting profitability could lead observers to underestimate the value of corporate reputation. Even though annual accounting data clearly do not fully capture the influence of corporate reputation on firm performance, these data should allow isolating its real effect on operative performance. However, all the papers reviewed here, using diverse data, samples, methodologies, and institutional contexts, still do not wholly converge in finding support for the impact of corporate reputation on profitability. These inconclusive findings call for explanation and for further efforts to find new evidence that will allow more reliable conclusions.

Impacts of Corporate Reputation on Risk

Theoretically, corporate reputation should not only enhance performance, but also increase the likelihood of maintaining superior performance over time (Roberts and Dowling 2002), and should induce a positive frame for interpreting events related to the firm (Dowling 2001). Therefore, it seems that corporate reputation should reduce the company's risk. Some initial research seems to confirm this assumption (Fig. 2).

In a descriptive paper, Gregory (1998) compares the evolution of stock prices of companies on the New York Stock Exchange following the market crash of 1997. He finds that companies with higher corporate reputation weathered the market drop better than those with weaker reputations.

Jones et al. (2000) reach similar conclusions analyzing the volatility of shares during the New York Stock Exchange crashes of 1987 and 1989. Results show no significant differences between companies with higher and lower reputations in 1987, when the market dropped over 20% in 1 day and investor panic precluded rational investment decision making. However, when the market took a less sudden, expected downturn in 1989, corporate reputation provided a reservoir of goodwill that buffered companies from market decline.

In accord with these results, Srivastava et al. (1997) find support for a positive relation between corporate reputation and Beta (a widely recognized variable that is used to measure the expected change in a particular company's stock price relative to changes in the market as a whole). That is, the higher the firm's reputation, the more willing investors will be to accept risk (measured as increasing Beta). This result confirms that corporate reputation reduces the risk perceived by current and potential shareholders.

In sum, these studies very consistently find that corporate reputation influences risk. But the scarcity of studies and the focus exclusively on market measures call for more research effort, not only using market measures but also other variables like variance of return, to try to get more robust conclusions about the risk reduction effect of corporate reputation.

Impacts of Corporate Reputation on Firm Market Value

The effect of corporate reputation on profitability and on risk should translate into firm value. From a financial point of view, investors discount the net cash flow of the firm at the rate of return appropriate to its riskiness. So the higher cash flows and lower risk of well-reputed companies should raise firm value. This relation has been analyzed with reference to either short-term stock return or long-term stock price (Fig. 3).

Among scholars who have analyzed the impact of reputation rankings on stock returns, Vergin and Qoronfleh (1998) compare average stock returns of the ten

Authors	Reputation Measure	Financial Performance Measure	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Srivastava, McInish, Wood and Capraro (1997)	*Fortune*	Beta: calculated taking as a basis the standard market model of daily data from 1988–1990 and the *S&P 500* index as a market proxy	Regression analysis	-	Ten portfolio s consisting of firms listed in the 1990 *Fortune* Magazine Most Admired Corporations Survey USA	Multiple industries	0	+
Gregory (1998)	Every year *Corporate Branding Partnership* conducts a mail survey that measures familiarity, overall reputation, perception of management and investment potential of 700 publicly trade companies	Average percentage change in share price	Descriptive analysis of the stock price reaction in a volatile three-days period of 24–28 October 1997	-	Four sample groups of 20 companies with different brand image performance USA	Multiple industries	-	+
Jones, Jones and Little (2000)	*Fortune*	One-day change in stock price following a crisis	Regression analysis	Beta Size Share price prior to market fall	N=400 (1987 and 1989) USA	Multiple industries	-	ns
				Beta Size Share price before to market fall Dummy variable year Dummy variable year* reputation	N=400 (1987 and 1989) USA			ns (1987) and - (1989)

ns=non significant

Fig. 2 Impacts of corporate reputation on risk

corporations at the top, the ten at the bottom of the *Fortune* list, and the S&P500 in the year following the publication of the ranking. Their results show that future stock performance is positively related to corporate reputation. However, Chung

Author	Reputation Measure	Financial Performance Measure	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Vergin and Qoronfleh (1998)	*Fortune*	Average return	Analysis of average return T-test	-	Top ten Bottom S&P 500 (1984-1996) USA	Multiple industries	1	+
Cordeiro and Sambharya (1997)	Reputation with shareholders: 3 *financial halo-adjusted* attribute from *Fortune*: long term investments value, financial soundness and widely used assets	Security analysts´ five-years earning growth forecasts	Regressions analysis	Company size Return on assets Market value vs. Book value Number of analysts	N=303 (1994 and 1995) USA	All variables except firm size are adjusted for industry effects by deducting the corresponding industry mean	0	+
	Reputation with stakeholders: the 5 remaining financial halo-adjusted attribute from *Fortune*				N=303 (1994 and 1995) USA			+
	Overall reputation: the 8 remaining financial halo-adjusted attribute from *Fortune*				N=303 (1994 and 1995) USA			+
Black, Carnes and Richardson (2000)	*Fortune*	Market value of common equity	Regression analysis.	Book value Net income Total asets *Anual year dummy*	N=2769 (1982-1996) USA	Multiple industries	1	+
	Financial component of corporate reputation							+
	Nonfinancial component of corporate reputation							+
	Financial component of corporate reputation Nonfinancial component of corporate reputation							+ +

ns=non significant

Fig. 3 (continued)

Author	Reputation Measure	Financial Performance Measure	Methodology	Other Independent Variables	Sample	Industries	Lags	Results
Chung, Schneeweis and Eneroh (1999)	*The Economist*	Average monthly equity returns	Analysis of portfolio return Correlation analysis	-	67 firms FTSE (1990-1999) UK	Multiple industries	1	+
				Size	67 firms FTSE 100; 250 and small cap indices (1990-1999) UK			ns
		Average monthly adjusted equity returns		Size			1	ns
	Fortune	Average monthly equity returns		-	Top ten and bottom ten in reputation ratings 100 firms S&P 5000 (1990-1999) USA		1	+
				Size	Top ten and bottom ten in reputation ratings 100 firms Frank Russell 100, 250, 2000 (1990-1999) USA		1	ns
		Average monthly adjusted equity return		Size			1	ns
Brammer, Brooks and Pavelin (2004)	*Management Today*	One year stock returns	Event window	-		Multiple industries	21 days	+ and -
			Analysis of portfolio return	Value Size Beta Momentum	1994–2003 451 firms push the All Share Index itself	Multiple industries	1	ns

ns=non significant

Fig. 3 Impacts of corporate reputation on firm value

et al. (2003) and Brammer et al. (2004) reach somewhat contrary conclusions. Chung et al. (2003) show that the outperformance, on a basis of total equity return, of "firms highly ranked in reputation" over "firms lowly ranked in reputation" after

the publication date of reputation rankings may be due solely to firm size differentials. In fact, after adjustment for relative risk, the actual performance of high-ranked and low-ranked portfolios is not significantly different. These results suggest that *The Economist* (UK) and *Fortune* (US) do not offer additional investor information. Consistently, Brammer et al. (2004) find that around the time of the reputation ranking announcement stock prices rise even for firms whose reputation scores have slipped. Similarly, long-run returns on reputationally damaged stocks are on average slightly higher than those of the market index. However, when they allow for the financial characteristics of the firms (value, size, beta, and momentum), the returns of the companies all fall below expectation. So the authors conclude that, when an appropriate benchmark is used, there is no trading profitability in examining the results of the UK's most admired companies.

In contrast, the papers that have analyzed the influence of corporate reputation on market valuation have validated a positive impact (Cordeiro and Sambharya 1997; Black et al. 2000; Dunbar and Schwalbach 2000; Rose and Thomsen 2004; Fernández and Luna 2007) for different contexts. The exception is Inglis et al. (2006), who fail to support this relationship for the Australian case. Cordeiro and Sambharya (1997) and Black et al. (2000) obtain consistent results for the US case. Cordeiro and Sambharya (1997) demonstrate a positive relationship between corporate reputation and security analysts' earnings forecasts. Firms with higher reputations on items that reflect the interest of stockholders and other stakeholders leverage this reputation to generate higher performance expectations among well-informed analysts. Black et al. (2000) also show that corporate reputation contributes to firm value.

The results of Rose and Thomsen (2004) and of Inglis et al. (2006) analyzing the effect corporate reputation on market value are consistent with their respective results concerning the impact of reputation on profitability. However, the two groups of authors somewhat disagree with each other, although both papers apply the same model to different country data. While Rose and Thomsen (2004) find support for the positive effect of corporate reputation on financial performance for the Danish case, Inglis et al. (2006) reject this effect for the Australian data.

For the Spanish case, Fernández and Luna (2007) verify that the relationship between corporate reputation and financial performance is nonlinear, i.e., there is a maximum beyond which the increase in corporate reputation fails to be accompanied by an improvement in financial results. This fact would mean that there is a limit on the profitability of corporate reputation.

In sum, empirical research seems to validate the influence of corporate reputation on firm value, but not to find any impact on stock returns. This difference could result from the fact that corporate reputation has a high degree of persistence over time (Vergin and Qoronfleh 1998; Roberts and Dowling 2002; Schultz et al. 2000), in such a way that well-reputed firms are highly valuated in markets but may not have a high stock return. The not wholly consistent results also highlight that there is still not enough empirical evidence to draw a reliable overall conclusion.

Conclusion

A global view of the empirical research on the financial impacts of corporate reputation seems to confirm, although not unanimously, that the benefits of corporate reputation in the relations of the firm with its different stakeholders translate into a higher profitability and a lower risk that are reflected on firm value.

The lack of consistency in findings may be caused by different measures of corporate reputation and samples. The researchers use concentric but different measures. Besides using diverse measures of corporate reputation, some of them (Cordeiro and Sambharya 1997; Black et al. 2000; Roberts and Dowling 2002; Eberl and Schwaiger 2005) have removed possible financial performance bias from their measurements to avoid suspicion over their results. Although the diversity of measures of corporate reputation could generate inconsistency, the possible financial halo does not do so, because all the researchers with halo-adjusted data do find support for the financial impact of corporate reputation. Another potential source of inconsistency could be sample differences, not only in size, but also in industry composition. The value of corporate reputation may vary from one industry to others. The level of market competition, the dependence on stakeholders, and the degree of uncertainty about the quality of the exchanges (i.e., product quality, employer characteristics, or future stock performance), among other factors, may influence the value of corporate reputation in a particular sector. Researchers have a hard task to uncover new evidence that allows more reliable conclusions and reveals the origin of the current incomplete consistency in results.

Previous literature has analyzed not only the financial impacts of corporate reputation, but also the inverse relationship, namely the influence of financial characteristics on corporate reputation. This points out a possible endogeneity that calls for further analyses with longitudinal methodologies, which may in addition enlarge the samples and thereby gain robustness in the analyses.

The financial impact of corporate reputation is a flourishing line of research. While conventional wisdom and managerial perceptions suggest that corporate reputation matters to performance, findings are not wholly consistent. This indicates that there are factors that have not yet been accounted for, and calls for new research.

References

Akerlof GA (1970) The market for 'lemons': quality under uncertainty and the market mechanism. Q J Econ 84:448–500

Black E, Carnes T, Richardson V (2000) The market valuation of corporate reputation. Corp Reput Rev 3(1):21–31

Brammer S, Brooks C, Pavelin S (2004) Corporate reputation and stock returns: are good firms good for investors? SSRN working paper. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=637122

Brown B, Perry S (1994) Removing the financial performance halo from *Fortune*'s 'most admired companies'. Acad Manag J 37:1346–1359
Caminity S (1992) The payoff from a good reputation. Fortune 125(3):49–53
Capraro AJ, Srivastava RK (1997) Has the influence of financial performance on reputation measures been overstated? Corp Reput Rev 1(1 & 2):86–92
Chung SY, Schneeweis T, Eneroth K (2003) Corporate reputation and investment performance: the UK and US expertise. Res Int Bus Finance 17:273–291
Cordeiro JJ, Sambharya RB (1997) Do corporate reputations influence security analyst earnings forecast? An empirical study. Corp Reput Rev 1(1 & 2):94–97
Deephouse DL (1997) The effect of financial and media reputations on performance. Corp Reput Rev 1(1, 2):68–71
Dowling GR (2001) Creating corporate reputations. Oxford University Press, Oxford
Dunbar RLM, Schwalbach J (2000) Corporate reputation and performance in Germany. Corp Reput Rev 3(2):115–123
Eberl M, Schwaiger M (2005) Corporate reputation: disentangling the effects on financial performance. Eur J Market 39(7/8):838–854
Fernández JL, Luna L (2007) The creation of value through corporate reputation. J Bus Ethics 76:335–346
Fombun CJ, van Riel CBM (2004) Fame and fortune. Financial Times Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ
Fryxell GE, Wang J (1994) The fortune corporate 'reputation' index: reputation for what? J Manag 20:1–14
Graham ME, Bansal P (2007) Consumers' willingness to pay for corporate reputation: the context of airline companies. Corp Reput Rev 10(3):189–200
Gregory JR (1998) Does corporate reputation provide a cushion to companies facing market volatility? Some supportive evidence. Corp Reput Rev 1(3):288–290
Hall R (1992) The strategic analysis of intangible resources. Strat Manag J 13:135–144
Hall R (1993) A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable competitive advantage. Strat Manag J 14:607–618
Inglis R, Morley C, Sammut P (2006) Corporate reputation and organisational performance: an Australian study. Manag Audit J 21(9):934–947
Jones G, Jones B, Little P (2000) Reputation as a reservoir: buffering against loss in times of economic crisis. Corp Reput Rev 3(1):21–29
Klein B, Lefler K (1981) The role of market forces in assuring contractual performance. J Polit Econ 89:615–641
Logsdon JM, Wartick SL (1995) Theoretically based applications and implications for using the Brown and Perry database. Bus Soc 34(2):222–226
McGuire JB, Schneeweis T, Branch B (1990) Perceptions of firm quality: a cause or result of firm performance. J Manag 16(1):167–180
Milgrom P, Roberts J (1986) Price and advertising signals of product quality. J Polit Econ 94:796–821
Milgrom P, Roberts J (1992) Economics, organization and management. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ
Nanda S, Scheneeweis T, Eneroth K (1996) Corporate performance and firm perception: the British experience. Eur Financ Manag 2(2):197–221
Obloj T, Obloj K (2006) Diminishing returns from reputation: do followers have a competitive advantage? Corp Reput Rev 9(4):213–224
Podony J (1993) A status-based model of market competition. Am J Sociol 98(4):829–872
Roberts PW, Dowling GR (1997) The value of a firm's corporate reputation: how reputation helps attain and sustain superior profitability. Corp Reput Rev 1(1, 2):72–75
Roberts PW, Dowling GR (2002) Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. Strat Manag J 23:1077–1093

Rose C, Thomsen S (2004) The impact of corporate reputation on performance: some Danish evidence. Eur Manag J 22(2):201–210
Schultz M, Mouritsen J, Gabrielsen G, Rasmussen J (2000) Sticky reputation: analyzing a ranking system. Corp Reput Rev 4(1):24–41
Selnes F (1994) An examination of the effect of product performance on brand reputation, satisfaction and loyalty. Eur J Market 27(9):19–36
Shapiro C (1983) Premiums for high quality products as returns to reputations. Q J Econ 98:659–679
Srivastava RK, McInish TH, Wood RA, Capraro AJ (1997) The value of corporate reputation: evidence from equity markets. Corp Reput Rev 1(1, 2):62–67
Stigler GJ (1962) Information in the labor market. J Polit Econ 70:49–73
Szwajkowski E, Figlewicz RE (1997) Of babies and bathwater. An extension of the Business & Society research forum on the Fortune reputation database. Bus Soc 36(4):362–386
Vergin RC, Qoronfleh MW (1998) Corporate reputation and the stock market. Bus Horiz 41 (1):19–26
Williamson OE (1985) The economic institutions of capitalism: firms, markets, relational contracting. The Free Press, New York, NY