

CONTRIBUTIONS
TO MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

Christine Falkenreck

Reputation Transfer to Enter New B-to-B Markets

Measuring and Modelling
Approaches



Physica-Verlag
A Springer Company

Contributions to Management Science

For further volumes:
<http://www.springer.com/series/1505>

Christine Falkenreck

Reputation Transfer to Enter New B-to-B Markets

Measuring and Modelling Approaches



Physica-Verlag

Dr. Christine Falkenreck
University of Kassel
Head of International Marketing Research
Mönchebergstr. 17
34125 Kassel
Germany
christine.falkenreck@t-online.de

Dissertation “Impact on Reputation and Reputation Transfer in International Direct Marketing - Empirical Research in Five B-to-B Markets” at the University of Kassel, Germany. Department of Economics, Place of Disputation: Kassel, Date of Disputation, March 6, 2009

ISSN 1431-1941
ISBN 978-3-7908-2356-1 e-ISBN 978-3-7908-2357-8
DOI 10.1007/978-3-7908-2357-8
Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009932424

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2010

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Cover design: SPi Publishing Services

Printed on acid-free paper

Physica-Verlag is a brand of Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg
Springer-Verlag is a part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

An increasing number of products and services are not differentiated by inherent features, but by the vendors, particularly their reputation and marketing communication. Consequently, a positive reputation provides competing vendors with a virtually inimitable competitive advantage.

Contemporary research concerning antecedents and consequences of reputation in the domain of marketing is dominated by branding and line extension issues. Organizations' communication efforts and the relation of reputation and the communication media are not fully understood; nor have they been challenged up to now. Moreover, customers' perception of reputation is clearly embedded in their cultural context.

However, contemporary marketing research restricts both conceptual and empirical considerations to Western-type cultures. Frequently, even the differences in Western-type cultures are neglected.

Considering these shortcomings in contemporary marketing research, Dr. Christine Falkenreck investigates the opportunities and limits, and also the potential benefits and dangers of transferring a vendor's positive reputation to product categories never produced or offered by the considered vendor.

Embedding the empirical investigation of both reputation management and reputation transfer in a coherent theoretical framework, which is grounded in the Commitment-Trust theory, is her merit. She derives and validates an integrated model that appears to be valid in all cultures considered in her study. The results of this analysis contribute substantially to our understanding of reputation measuring and managing. These results are not restricted to academic interests and they provided practitioners with a variety of new insights. Thus, this thesis will hopefully be widely discussed in both academia and management practice.

Working with Dr. Falkenreck is an outstanding experience. Hopefully she will continue to engage in scientific marketing research.

Bielefeld, 17 May 2009

Ralf Wagner

Acknowledgements

Like a new product, a thesis follows a development process before its launch. A successful outcome is largely determined by the development process and the people who contribute to it. For this reason, there are a number of persons I would particularly like to thank for their input, help and support during my doctoral research.

First and foremost, this Ph.D. dissertation may never have been written without the encouragement of two key people: Professor Dr. Ralf Wagner, my supervisor at the University of Kassel, and Dr. Annette Speitling, my helpful mentor at the Strategic Marketing Department. I appreciate very much Professor Wagner's insightful advice on the way to conduct research. Many of our discussions not only directly contributed to improving the quality of my thesis, but also greatly motivated me and developed my interest and skills in academic research. In addition, I would like to thank Professor Dr. Marcel Paulssen for devoting his time as a second reader for my thesis.

I am grateful to the German medical devices and pharmaceuticals company that financially supported this thesis, and TforG, the Belgian market research agency, which was involved in the international CATI survey. My particular appreciation goes to my colleagues Lilijana Sesar, Christel Wagener and Theodor Kikenberg, for their friendly help and support during my stay at the Strategic Marketing Department. Special thanks are also due to Jean Cropper, who turned my clumsy language into readable English.

While I was writing this Ph.D. thesis, a vast number of people helped me in various ways. Thanks to my non-marketing researcher friends, Barbara, Eric, and Selli, for reminding me that however important and world-changing I think my work is, in the grand scheme of things, there are many other important things to do.

Last but not the least, I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my dear parents, Uwe and Christel Moll, my little sister Sabine, and my husband, Andreas, for their support during the last 2 years.

I dedicate this work to the best daughters in the world, Thora and Celia, of whom I am very proud.

Christine Falkenreck

Contents

1	Definition of Research Problem	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Structure of Work	4
1.3	Objective Targets of Thesis	6
1.3.1	Scientific Objectives	6
1.3.2	Managerial Objectives	7
2	Theoretical Framework	9
2.1	Commitment-Trust Theory and the Nature of Commitment	11
2.2	Resource-Based and Knowledge-Based View	13
2.3	Reputation as a Resource, an Intangible Asset and a Barrier	17
3	Perspectives on Corporate Reputation and Reputation Transfer	21
3.1	Perspectives of Relationship Marketing	24
3.1.1	Organizational Buying Behavior and the Impact of Reputation	26
3.1.2	Commitment and Trust in Organizational Buying Behavior	28
3.2	Defining Corporate Reputation in B-to-B Relationships	29
3.2.1	Reputation, Corporate Identity and Image	31
3.2.2	Reputation vs. Brand Identity, Brand Imagery and Brand Equity	34
3.3	A Standard Construct of Reputation—Useful and Appropriate?	36
3.3.1	League Tables	38
3.3.2	The Reputation Quotient	39
3.3.3	Measuring RQ in Different Cultures	42
3.3.4	Relationship-Driven Measurement Approaches	44
3.3.5	The Need for Valid and Cross-Culturally Practicable Measures of CR	45

3.4	The Concept of Reputation Transfer	48
3.4.1	Reputation Transfer vs. Brand Transfer: Chances and Risks	50
3.4.2	Levels of Reputation and their Transferability	52
3.5	The Relevance of Direct Marketing Media to Build CR	53
3.6	Defining and Quantifying Culture	55
3.6.1	Cultural Frameworks—an Overview	57
3.6.2	Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions	59
3.6.3	Hofstede’s Cultural Characteristics of Countries under Consideration	61
4	Development of Constructs and Related Hypotheses	65
4.1	The C-OAR-SE Procedure for Scale Development	65
4.2	Formative Versus Reflective Measurement Models	67
4.2.1	Reflective Measures	68
4.2.2	Formative Measures	69
4.2.3	Single Item Indicators	70
4.2.4	Overview on Theoretical and Empirical Considerations	70
4.3	Moderating and Mediating Effects in Causal Models	72
4.4	Applying the Bonferroni-Holm’s Procedure	75
4.5	Development of Constructs	76
4.5.1	Overview of Measurement and Formation of Constructs	79
4.5.2	Corporate Reputation	81
4.5.3	Perceived Innovativeness	83
4.5.4	Perceived Fit	84
4.5.5	Purchase Decision Involvement	85
4.5.6	The Moderating Impact of Culture	87
4.5.7	Reputation Transfer	87
4.5.8	Word of Mouth	88
4.5.9	Relationship Quality	89
4.5.10	Media-enabled and Personal Direct Marketing	90
4.5.11	E-Readiness	92
4.6	Related Hypotheses	92
4.6.1	Perceived Innovativeness	93
4.6.2	Purchase Decision Involvement	94
4.6.3	Relationship Quality	95
4.6.4	Word of Mouth	96
4.6.5	Perceived Fit	96
4.6.6	Personal and Media-enabled Direct Marketing	98
4.6.7	Reputation Transfer	99
4.6.8	E-Readiness	99
4.6.9	Reputation	100

- 4.6.10 Culture 100
- 4.6.11 Overview 103
- 4.7 Structural Model of Reputation and Reputation Transfer 103
- 5 Empirical Survey 107**
 - 5.1 Markets Under Consideration 107
 - 5.1.1 Selection of Countries and Definition of Target Groups 108
 - 5.1.2 Data 110
 - 5.1.3 Development of Standardized Questionnaire 111
 - 5.2 The Measurement Model 112
 - 5.2.1 Formal Elements 113
 - 5.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for Indicators and Constructs 114
 - 5.2.3 Creation of SmartPLS Structural Model 116
 - 5.2.4 Treatment of Missing Values 116
 - 5.2.5 Content Validity of Reflective Constructs 116
- 6 Results and Findings 119**
 - 6.1 Synopsis of Measurement Criteria 119
 - 6.2 Model Validation 119
 - 6.2.1 Examination of Sample Size 121
 - 6.2.2 Moderating Effects on Reputation Transfer 121
 - 6.2.3 Moderating Effects on Reputation 122
 - 6.2.4 Mediating Effects 123
 - 6.2.5 Reliability and Content Validity of Reflective Constructs 124
 - 6.2.6 R-Square and Q² Predictive Relevance of Structural Model 127
 - 6.2.7 Cross Loadings 129
 - 6.2.8 Fornell–Larcker Criterion 131
 - 6.2.9 Reliability and Content Validity of Formative Constructs 133
 - 6.2.10 Multicollinearity 134
 - 6.2.11 Summary of Content Adequacy of Formative Constructs 137
 - 6.2.12 Structural Model, Evaluated by Country and Stakeholder Groups 138
 - 6.3 Assessment of Research Hypotheses 151
 - 6.4 Findings related to Countries and Stakeholder Groups 166
 - 6.4.1 Findings Related to all Countries 169
 - 6.4.2 Australia 170
 - 6.4.3 Finland 171
 - 6.4.4 Germany 172
 - 6.4.5 Russia 174
 - 6.4.6 Spain 175
 - 6.4.7 Purchasers 176
 - 6.4.8 Pharmacists 177
 - 6.4.9 Doctors and Nurses 178
 - 6.5 Discussion of Research Questions 178

- 7 Conclusions, Implications and Research Suggestions** 183
 - 7.1 Scientific Implications 186
 - 7.2 Managerial Implications 187
 - 7.3 Conclusions and Outlook 188

- Annex** 191

- References** 207

- Index** 227

Abbreviations

AMAC	America's most admired companies
B-to-B	Business-to-business
B-to-C	Business-to-consumer
CC	Corporate communications
CR	Corporate reputation
e.g.	(<i>exempli gratia</i>) for example
IDV	Individualism
i.e.	(<i>id est</i>) that is
KBV	Knowledge-based view
LV	Latent variable
MAS	Masculinity
WOM	Word of mouth
n.a.	Not applicable
n.s.	Not significant
NWOM	Negative word of mouth
SEM	Structural equation model
SET	Social exchange theory
SR	Sales representatives
PWOM	Positive word of mouth
PDI	Power distance index
RBV	Resource-based view
RM	Relationship marketing
RQ	Reputation quotient
UAI	Uncertainty avoidance index

Formula Symbols

η	Vector of the dependent (endogenous) latent variables
ζ	The unexplained variance
ξ	Vector of an exogenous latent variable
R^2	Variance explained
Q^2	Stone–Geissers cross-validated R^2
f^2	Effect size
γ_i	Coefficient capturing effect of indicator x_i
z	Test value
VAF	Variance inflation factor
r_i	Regression coefficient

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Structure of work 5

Figure 2.1 National culture’s influence on resources, based on Griffith et al. (2006) 16

Figure 2.2 Theoretical framework, formation of intangible assets and competitive advantages 18

Figure 3.1 Differences between B-to-B and B-to-C markets, Enlargement based on Backhaus/Voeth (2007) and Plinke (1999) 27

Figure 3.2 Different clusters of definitions of image and reputation 32

Figure 3.3 Linking identity, image, culture, buying behavior and reputation .. 33

Figure 3.4 Linking influencing elements of stakeholders perception 36

Figure 3.5 Different components forming corporate reputations based on Fombrun et al. 2000 40

Figure 3.6 Types of reputation- or brand transfers 50

Figure 4.1 Reputation: A formative or a reflective construct? 67

Figure 4.2 Reflective measurement model
Source: Edwards and Bagozzi (2000) 68

Figure 4.3 Formative measurement model
Source: Diamantopoulos et al. (2008) 69

Figure 4.4 Measure development of formative constructs, based on Diamantopoulos (1999) 70

Figure 4.5 Moderator model
Source: Eggert et al. (2005) 73

Figure 4.6 Modeling moderating effects in PLS using reflective constructs
Source: Eggert et al. (2005) 73

Figure 4.7 Modeling moderating effects in PLS, using formative constructs
Source: Eggert et al. (2005) p. 113 74

Figure 4.8 Mediator model
Source: Eggert et al. (2005) 75

Figure 4.9 Stakeholder-specific concepts of corporate reputation,
modified from Meffert and Bierwirth (2002); Helm (2006) 78

Figure 4.10 Development of the construct “reputation” based
on implications of Griffith et al. (2006) 82

Figure 4.11 Structural model of reputation and reputation transfer 104

Figure 5.1 PLS Two-block model, based on Chin (1998) 114

Figure 5.2 SmartPLS structural model 118

Figure 6.1 PLS structural model including moderating effects
on reputation 122

Figure 6.2 Mediator model 123

Figure 6.3 All countries, significant paths 140

Figure 6.4 Australia, significant paths 141

Figure 6.5 Finland, significant paths 142

Figure 6.6 Germany, significant paths 144

Figure 6.7 Spain, significant paths 146

Figure 6.8 Russia, significant paths 147

Figure 6.9 Purchasers, significant paths 149

Figure 6.10 Pharmacists, significant paths 150

Figure 6.11 Doctors and nurses, significant paths 152

Figure 6.12 Decisiveness of a trustful relationship to the supplier 164

Figure 6.13 Importance of trust in the recommendations of sales
representatives 164

Figure 6.14 Importance of a suppliers’ positive reputation 165

Figure 6.15 Decisiveness of a good reputation of the supplier 166

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Social exchange theory vs. commitment trust theory 10

Table 3.1 Categorization of reputation. Enhancement based on Fombrun and van Riel (1997) 23

Table 3.2 Items and components of the reputation quotient 41

Table 3.3 Measurement concepts of corporate reputation: An overview 47

Table 3.4 Chances and risks of brand extension. Based on Aaker (2003) 52

Table 3.5 Hofstede’s scores regarding the five countries included in the survey Based on <http://www.geert-hofstede.com> 61

Table 4.1 Applying the C-OAR-SE procedure 67

Table 4.2 Theoretical framework for assessing reflective and formative models *Source*: compiled from Coltman et al. (2008) 71

Table 4.3 Empirical framework for assessing reflective and formative models *Source*: Compiled from Coltman et al. (2008) 72

Table 4.4 List of manifest variables used with reflective constructs 80

Table 4.5 List of manifest variables used with formative constructs 80

Table 4.6 List of manifest variables used with single Item constructs 80

Table 4.7 E-readiness ranking and scores 99

Table 4.8 Overview of hypotheses 102

Table 5.1 Hofstede’s scores in the selected countries 109

Table 5.2 Evaluation criteria of PLS structural model based on: Krafft et al. 2005, p. 85; Fornell and Larcker 1981; Chin 1998) 114

Table 5.3 Evaluation criteria of reflective constructs 115

Table 5.4 Evaluation criteria of formative constructs 116

Table 5.5 Validation criteria of PLS models 117

Table 6.1	Evaluation criteria of reflective and formative constructs and structural model	120
Table 6.2	Moderating effects on reputation transfer	121
Table 6.3	VAF-values of mediating effects	123
Table 6.4	List of evaluated mediator effects on reputation transfer and reputation	124
Table 6.5	Outer loadings of reflective constructs	125
Table 6.6	Overview, quality criteria reputation	125
Table 6.7	Overview, quality criteria of reputation transfer	126
Table 6.8	Overview, quality criteria of perceived innovativeness	126
Table 6.9	Overview, quality criteria of WOM	127
Table 6.10	R^2 and Q^2 values of different countries and stakeholder groups	128
Table 6.11	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: All countries	129
Table 6.12	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: Australia	129
Table 6.13	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: Finland	130
Table 6.14	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: Germany	130
Table 6.15	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: Russia	131
Table 6.16	Cross-loadings of reflective constructs: Spain	131
Table 6.17	Fornell–Larcker criterion, data of all countries	132
Table. 6.18	Fornell–Larcker criterion, data of Australia	132
Table 6.19	Fornell–Larcker criterion, data of Finland	132
Table 6.20	Fornell–Larcker Criterion, data of Germany	133
Table 6.21	Fornell–Larcker criterion, data of Spain	133
Table 6.22	Fornell–Larcker criterion, data of Russia	133
Table 6.23	Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data, “all countries”	135
Table 6.24	Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data “Germany”	135
Table 6.25	Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data “Spain”	136

Table 6.26 Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data “Finland” 136

Table 6.27 Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data “Australia” 137

Table 6.28 Quality criteria of formative constructs: evaluation of data “Russia” 137

Table 6.29 All countries, significant paths 139

Table 6.30 Australia, significant paths 142

Table 6.31 Finland, significant paths 143

Table 6.32 Germany, significant paths 145

Table 6.33 Spain, significant paths 146

Table 6.34 Russia, significant paths 148

Table 6.35 Purchasers, significant paths 149

Table 6.36 Pharmacists, significant paths 150

Table 6.37 Doctors and nurses, significant paths 152

Table 6.38 Direct impact of innovativeness on reputation 153

Table 6.39 Direct impact of innovativeness on reputation transfer 154

Table 6.40 Significant paths of innovativeness on WOM 154

Table 6.41 Significant paths of purchase decision involvement on WOM ... 155

Table 6.42 Significant paths of relationship quality on reputation 155

Table 6.43 Significant paths of relationship quality on reputation transfer ... 156

Table 6.44 Significant Paths of Relationship Quality on WOM 156

Table 6.45 Significant paths of WOM on reputation 157

Table 6.46 Significant paths of WOM on reputation transfer 157

Table 6.47 Significant paths of perceived fit on reputation transfer 158

Table 6.48 Use of direct marketing media 158

Table 6.49 Significant paths of media-enabled direct marketing on reputation 160

Table 6.50 Significant paths of personal direct marketing on reputation 160

Table 6.51 Significant paths of personal direct marketing on reputation transfer 161

Table 6.52 Significant paths of media-enabled direct marketing
on reputation transfer 161

Table 6.53 Significant path of reputation on reputation transfer 162

Table 6.54 Significant path of E-readiness on media-enabled DM 162

Table 6.55 Significant path of reputation on perceived fit 163

Table 6.56 Overview on the fulfillment of hypotheses 167

Chapter 1

Definition of Research Problem

In today's world, where ideas are increasingly displacing the physical in the production of economic value, competition for reputation becomes a significant driving force, propelling our economy forward. (Alan Greenspan 1999).

This quotation of Alan Greenspan (1999) summarizes the importance today of corporate reputation (CR). This work is about creating global corporate reputations – using reputation transfer to enter new markets more easily – and focuses on special impact factors on both reputation and reputation transfer in the B-to-B context.

1.1 Introduction

Researchers recognize organizational reputation as a valuable intangible asset that contributes to organizational performance. However, limited attention has been paid to the extent to which CR encompasses different stakeholders' perceptions that may have differential effects on the positive economic outcomes associated with the possession of a favorable reputation (Rindova et al. 2005). Thus, CR has been the focus of much academic research (e.g., Deephouse, 2000; Lewellyn 2002; Longsdon and Wood 2002; Eberl 2006; Helm 2007; Bromley 2002; Fombrun et al. 2000; Walsh and Wiedmann 2004; Fombrun and Shanley 1990; Hall 1992). It captures a combination of social and economic contributions that a firm makes to its various stakeholders (Helm 2007; Bromley 2002). Reputation provides a company with sustainable competitive advantages (Barney 1996) because it influences stakeholders' economic choices vis-à-vis the organization (Deephouse 2000).

In 1997, Doney and Cannon called for more research that investigates the role of national culture on buyer-seller relationships in general. Prior cross-cultural studies in marketing have focused on various issues: advertising (Alden et al. 1993), product development (Nakata and Sivakumar 1996), fairness (Kumar et al. 1995), organizational culture (Deshpandé et al. 2000), innovativeness (Steenkamp et al. 1999) and customer benefits (Homburg et al. 2005). Nevertheless, cross-national

differences in B-to-B marketing management have largely been neglected (Homburg et al. 2005), especially in the field of corporate reputation research (Gardberg 2006; Walsh and Wiedmann 2004). Although there are many studies of relationship marketing, they are mostly based on national data sets (Homburg et al. 2005).

Surprisingly, the factors “reputation” and “national culture” are discussed separately in recent research: Walsh and Beatty (2007) investigate the impact of customer-based CR on service firms’ performance, while Hewett et al. (2006) evaluate the influence of national culture and industrial buyer-seller relationship in the US and Latin America and Griffith et al. (2006) investigate culture’s influence on relationship and knowledge resources between the US and Japan. Very few empirical studies apply the America-based measurement concept “Reputation Quotient” (RQ) of Fombrun et al. (2000) outside the US (Gardberg 2006; Walsh and Wiedmann 2004; Aperia et al. 2004) – the aim was not to learn about cultural differences, but to test RQ measures internationally. Moreover, the studies concerned with reputation management and related fields of image transfer, as well as brand extensions, make up a continuum of the basic entity under consideration (Bromley 2002).

According to Fombrun (1996), a company’s reputation is determined by four main elements: its values, actions it takes, open-minded and honest communication, and general company image. Völckner and Sattler (2006) as well as Doney and Cannon (1997) define a company’s reputation as the extent to which firms and people in the industry believe a company is honest and concerned about its customers. Unfortunately, what is defined as “honest and concerned” varies significantly across cultures and, therefore, leads to different perceptions of CR on the one hand and different possibilities of reputation transfer on the other.

It is also true that a company can have a negative CR (Bromley 2002). What about a definition of CR if at least a certain stakeholder group believes a company is “devious” and “unconcerned”? Whether all types of stakeholders base their perceptions of CR on the same fundamental set of dimensions or on specific expectations, is still discussed controversially (Bromley 2002; Fombrun et al. 2000; Gatewood et al. 1993), leading to a variety of research questions such as:

- Do companies have one reputation or many? (Fombrun and Shanley 1990; Bromley 2002).
- Reputation for whom or for what purpose? (Lewellyn 2002).
- Do stakeholder groups use different criteria to evaluate a company’s reputation? (Meffert and Bierwirth 2002; Helm 2007).
- If the criteria to evaluate CR are different, is there also a difference between CR in the context of B-to-B and B-to-C, and what about a cross-cultural impact on CR?

Popular measurement approaches of the “most visible companies” (Fortune 500-index) or so-called “reputation rankings of most admired companies” can hardly be applied to the “most invisible companies” in the field of Business-to-Business (B-to-B) relationships, companies just known by their own limited range of products, employees, competitors, suppliers and customers. Fortune magazine’s *America’s Most Admired Company* (AMAC) survey, as well as a similar study by Britain’s *Sunday Times*, use determinants on CR like advertising or

visibility in the media. Even charitable contribution (Fombrun 1996) is difficult to evaluate if applied to companies working in the field of B-to-B. The Harris-Fombrun Reputation Quotient (RQ), the Financial Times/Price WaterhouseCooper *World's Most Respected Companies*, the Hill and Knowlton/ Economist Intelligence Unit *Corporate Reputation Watch* are all focused on decisive determinants of reputation for companies working in the B-to-C context. How can these millions of perceptions be captured and measured or managed?

Today, companies need to differentiate themselves from their competitors, as products are more and more interchangeable. An overarching reputation in this context is a strategic tool for managing a company's external presence in global markets. To manage these corporate reputations – as they can vary from country to country, from stakeholder to stakeholder, or from decade to decade – they must be measurable (Fombrun 1996; Fombrun and Gardberg 2002; Helm 2007). Unfortunately, neither researchers nor practitioners have yet found a cross-nationally valid instrument to measure reputation (Fombrun and Wiedmann 2001; Fombrun and Gardberg 2002).

Corporate reputation radiates a strong company appeal-it helps companies to obtain good employees, makes customer acquisition easier, increases customer loyalty, can be implemented as a competitive performance factor and is helpful for the procurement of capital (e.g., Wiedmann and Buxel 2005; Helm 2007; Dowling 2001; Little and Little 2000; Eberl and Schwaiger 2005). The literature on reputation in general has been growing in recent years (e.g., Fombrun et al. 2000; Fombrun and van Riel 1997; Dunbar and Schwalbach 2000; MacMillan et al. 2005), although it is still restricted to the B-to-B context.

Interest in CR is growing while the globalization of companies is entering a new phase. Compared with one of the new “global players”, the Chinese computer company, Lenovo, its major competitors, IBM, DELL and Hewlett-Packard, may feel old-fashioned and conservative: Lenovo has no headquarters, venues for meetings of its senior managers rotate among its bases around the world, and its development teams consist of people in several centers around the world, often working together virtually (Bishop 2008). When it became a global brand in 2005, the company located its marketing department in Bangalore and made huge efforts to integrate the different cultures within the company to divert from its image as a “Chinese company”. IBM, instead of selling its PC business to Lenovo, could have used its valuable reputation to position against such newcomers. In times of sharp increases in the number of new companies in emerging markets, there is no weapon more effective than this inimitable resource of corporate reputation as one of the “best known American companies” (Fortune 500).

The study is located in the context of relationship marketing, which comprises the new institutional economic approach, the network approach and the behavioral approach (Kotler and Keller 2006).

- The new institutional economic approach uses modern economic theories to explain the development and breakdown of relationships like transaction cost theory and agency theory.

- The network approach focuses on the interactive character of relationships in the field of B-to-B marketing and takes an inter-organizational perspective.
- The behavioral perspective of relationships refers to relational constructs like trust and satisfaction, the conceptualization and economic evaluation of customer commitment.

Referring to the commitment-trust theory of Morgan and Hunt (1994), as well as to more recent resource-based and knowledge-based views, the concept of corporate reputation in this work is part of the behavioral perspective of relationships. The framework of the commitment-trust theory integrates elements of relationship marketing as a strategic option (Morgan and Hunt 1994). As customer commitment does not necessarily lead to customer loyalty (Fullerton 2003), relationship marketing needs to incorporate further activities (Homburg and Krohmer 2006).

Although widely outlined, the concept of CR today still seems to lack an agreed theoretical basis, and this limits practical applications (Bromley 2002) and the comparison of hypotheses results. With reference to the B-to-B context, little is known about the cross-cultural impact factors on CR: The use of direct marketing media, word-of-mouth communication (WOM), the perceived innovativeness of a company and the importance of trust. Therefore, in this study the author investigates two dimensions that reflect:

- how an organization is perceived in the minds of stakeholders from different countries (corporate reputation) and what influences this perception.
- the extent to which an organization is perceived by its customers as being able to produce a new product range (reputation transfer on pharmaceuticals) which differs significantly from the core products (medical devices).

A structural model of the suggested impact factors on reputation is developed and tested using data from Australia, Finland, Germany, Russia and Spain in the empirical context of organizational buyers.

1.2 Structure of Work

Marketing in the B-to-B context is very different from marketing in the B-to-C context (e.g., Backhaus and Voeth 2007). Are all the above perceptions of reputation in all contexts of equal importance? Can we expect the reputation of a B-to-B company to be influenced and generated by the same factors as in the context B-to-C? Is it really feasible and adequate to have one single measurement construct of corporate reputation, if there are so many different stakeholder groups in different contexts? In order to address the research questions, this work is structured in seven parts: theoretical (Chaps. 1–3), empirical (Chaps. 4–6) and “learning” (Chap. 7). This work introduces and tests a structural model that aims to extend the commitment-trust theory framework (Morgan and Hunt 1994) with respect to a company’s reputation and comprises national culture as a determining variable for both reputation and reputation transfer.