

Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
EDU-2021-09044254

Volume: 9

Issue: 4

Month: September

Year: 2021

P-ISSN: 2320-2653

E-ISSN: 2582-1334

Received: 03.06.2021

Accepted: 15.08.2021

Published: 01.09.2021

Citation:
Akdemir, Öznur Ataş, and
Ahmet Ayık. "Pre-Service
Teachers' Perceptions of
Corporate Reputation."
*Shanlax International
Journal of Education*,
vol. 9, no. 4, 2021,
pp. 114–27.

DOI:
[https://doi.org/10.34293/
education.v9i4.4254](https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9i4.4254)



This work is licensed
under a Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0
International License

Öznur Ataş Akdemir¹

Firat University, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5349-5882>

Ahmet Ayık

Atatürk University, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2885-947X>

Abstract

This study examines various variables that affect pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation and corporate reputation. In the research, a descriptive survey model was applied. 680 students studying in various departments and classes of Atatürk University Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education in the 2011-2012 academic year participated in the study. The research data were collected using the Corporate Reputation Scale developed by Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever (2000) and adapted to Turkish by Altuntaş (2005). In the analysis of the data, frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey test were used. According to the findings obtained from the study, it was observed that the perceptions of the corporate reputation of the pre-service teachers did not differ according to the variables of gender, academic success, age, economic status, department selection decision, and significantly differentiated according to the variables of relationship with teaching staff. Based on the research results, suggestions were made to practitioners and researchers.

Keywords: Corporate reputation, Pre-service teachers.

Introduction

Today's organisations are faced with extraordinary situations that were not encountered in the past. The main reason for this is the rapid social, cultural, technological and economic changes and developments experienced by the world. Organisations need to have a good reputation for being able to increase their efficiency and effectiveness. Now, the power of organisations is not only seen as a material power but also what impression the organisation has by internal and external stakeholders; in other words, its reputation becomes more important day by day (Karaköse, 2006).

Various definitions have been made about the concept of reputation. Reputation is a versatile component that focuses on what is done and how it is done in organisations and is based on perception based on stakeholder experiences (Bennett & Kottasz, 2000). Brisette and Power (1995) define reputation as the whole quality or character of an individual or institution generally judged or seen by people.

The most valuable asset of an institution is its reputation. Reputation is a value that can be managed and developed, and thus it does not come into being by itself. Reputation can be gained due to the consistent behaviour of organisations in their relationships with their stakeholders (Argüden, 2003).

¹ This paper is based on the first author's master's thesis.

Corporate reputation starts within that institution. Companies, non-governmental organisations or public institutions that do not respect their culture and values have difficulties managing their reputation (Kadıbeşegil, 2009, p. 131). Corporate reputation is the most important and valuable capital of an organisation. It is unthinkable for an organisation without reputation to survive (Kadıbeşegil, 2012, p. 135).

Corporate reputation has components such as financial performance, management and employee quality, product and service quality, leadership, credibility, and social responsibility.

1. Financial Performance: In terms of educational institutions, the financial performance dimension is related to the suitability of the physical structure and equipment of the school building, whether the course materials are sufficient to meet the educational needs of the students. One of the reasons why organisations fail to achieve their goals is the lack of resources in terms of technical and physical equipment. Therefore, for educational organisations to be effective and efficient, physical and technical deficiencies must be eliminated (Karaköse, 2006, p. 293).

2. Management and Employee Quality: The quality of management in educational institutions can affect the corporate reputation positively or negatively. Managers are primarily responsible for building and preserving the abstract value of reputation. It can be thought that ensuring the motivation and satisfaction of the employees and managing the corporate reputation effectively in this way will affect the corporate success and thus the reputation (Karaköse, 2006, p. 293).

3. Product and Service Quality: Service quality in educational institutions includes criteria such as the quality of the education and training services provided in schools and the institutional staff being well-equipped individually and professionally. The emotional bond between the social stakeholders who are satisfied with the quality of the education and training service provided by the schools will strengthen and this will contribute to the increase of the prestige of the school in the environment (Karaköse, 2006, p. 292).

4. Leadership: In contemporary management, it is possible to define the duties and responsibilities of leaders in three basic areas. The primary task of leaders is to define the future of the company they lead, to take a picture of it, and to determine the vision of the company. Their second task is to select qualified human resources that will carry the company to the future and to make necessary changes in the company organisation in case of need. Their third task is to manage the reputation of the company. In other words, it is to determine the strategic priorities of the relationship and communication management of all social stakeholders and to lead their implementation (Kadıbeşegil, 2012, p.159).

5. Credibility: Reputation plays two different roles in human relationships that require trust. Its primary role is for information purposes and makes people more reliable when positive information about business partners is given. Its second role is to control dishonest and dishonest behaviour. This aspect of reputation enables targeted behaviours to occur in a more reliable way (Keser, 2003).

6. Social Responsibility: An organisation should continuously increase the quality of its products and services as a requirement of its social responsibility understanding. In addition, it must be sensitive to the problems of its society and contribute to the solution of these problems. If organisations act in accordance with the principle of social responsibility, the reputation of that organisation by the society will increase. When the social responsibility dimension is evaluated in terms of educational institutions, this dimension is related to the observance of the principle of public benefit in schools and the education of students as citizens beneficial to themselves and the society (Karaköse, 2006, p. 294).

The concept of corporate reputation, whether for profit or not, consists of the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders of the organisation that include positive or negative values about the institution and these perceptions are valuable for all organisations. (İcil, 2008, p.2). Corporate reputation in educational institutions is built and strengthened with all individuals in the institution. In addition to these individuals, external stakeholders such as other non-governmental organisations and pressure groups that are not affiliated with the

administration also contribute to the building of reputation. In other words, corporate reputation in educational institutions is a value that the institution has in the eyes of its stakeholders and expresses it in their thoughts, words and actions. The reputation perceptions of students, who are among the most important educational institutions, towards the institution are also important.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that various studies (Adams, 1983; Altıntaş, 2005; Avcı, 2019; Braddock & Hua, 2006; Çillioğlu, 2010; Grunig, 1997; Işık, 2011; İcil, 2008; Karaköse, 2006; Montilla, 2004; Namal, 2011; Özalp, Tonus & Geylan, 2010; Schoenherr, 2009; Sung & Yang, 2009; Tüystüzoğulları, 2010) examine the institutional reputation in educational institutions. This study also examines the corporate reputation perception in higher education.

Corporate reputation management efforts are often related to commercial businesses with profit-making. Considering that non-profit institutions also attach importance to their reputation, there is a need for studies on this subject in educational institutions, one of these institutions. Considering the corporate reputation in terms of educational institutions, it can be said that a good reputation affects gaining the sympathy of internal and external stakeholders and on the business results of the school. A school with a good reputation will primarily increase its prestige in the society. Later, it will become preferred and praised institution. In this context, this study aims to examine pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation in terms of various variables. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What is the level of pre-service teachers' perception of corporate reputation?
2. Do pre-service teachers' corporate reputation perceptions differ significantly according to the variables of gender, class, academic achievement, age, economic status, department selection decision, and relationship with instructors?

Method

Population and Sample

The population of this research consists of the students studying at Atatürk University Kazım

Karabekir Faculty of Education in the 2011-2012 academic year.

The stratified sampling method was used in this study. Stratified sampling is a sampling method that aims to identify subgroups in the universe and represent them with their ratio within the size of the universe (Büyüköztürk et al., 2011, p.85). The sample of this research consists of 680 students studying in various departments and classes of Atatürk University Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education.

428 (62.9%) of the participants in the study are female students and 252 (37.1%) are male students. In terms of the department, the percentages of the participants were as follows: 31 (4.6%) in the physical education and sports department, 32 (4.7%) in the computer and instructional technologies education department, 32 (4.7%) in the educational sciences department, 30 (4.4%) in the department of fine arts education, 223 (32.8%) in the primary education department, 35 (5.1%) in the primary education department of religious culture and moral knowledge, 52 (7.6%) in the secondary education department of science and mathematics education, 65 (9.6%) in the secondary education department of social fields, 98 (14.4%) in the Turkish education department, and 82 (12.1%) in foreign languages. 175 of the pre-service teachers (25.7%) were in the first grade, 120 (17.6%) in the second grade, 272 (40%) in the third grade, 62 (9.1%) in the fourth grade and 51 (7.5%) are studying in the fifth grade. When the findings regarding the grade point averages (GPA) of the students participating in the study are examined, it is seen that 6.8% of the students have GPAs in the range of 1.00-2.00, 63.1% between 2.01-3.00 and 30.1% in the range of 3.01-4.00. In addition, 50.9% of the students are in the age range of 17-21, 46.9% 22-26, and 2.2% 27 and over.

Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form and Corporate Reputation Scale were used as data collection tools in the study. The features of these tools are described below. The personal information form created by the researcher was developed to collect information about the students' gender, class, grade point average, age, economic status, the decision to

choose the department, their relationship with the instructors.

In the study, the Corporate Reputation Scale, which was developed by Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever in 2000 and whose reliability coefficient was determined as 0.910, was used in the Turkish version by Altıntaş (2005). The questionnaire used in the master’s thesis of Altıntaş (2005) titled “Corporate Reputation and Anadolu University Faculty of Business Sample”. Before the questionnaire was applied, necessary permissions were obtained from the researcher who adapted the questionnaire via e-mail.

The questionnaire consists of 25 items and seven dimensions: Information about the Institution (Items of 1 and 2), Management Quality (Items of 3, 4, 5 and 6), Products and Services (Items of 7, 8 and 9), Leadership (Items of 10, 11, 12 and 13), Distinctiveness (Items of 14, 15, 16 and 17), Credibility (Items of 18, 19, 20 and 21) and Social Responsibility (Items of 22, 23, 24 and 25).

The reliability study of the Corporate Reputation Scale was re-conducted by the researcher. As a result of the analysis, the overall Cronbach Alpha Internal Consistency Coefficient of the data collection tool was calculated as 0.822.

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis of the data obtained in the study was made in a computer environment with the SPSS 16.0 (Statistical Package for Social Science) package program. The Corporate Reputation Monitoring Survey used within the scope of the research has a 5-Likert rating. The 5-Likert scale used is an evaluation scale from 1 to 5, divided into

five equal parts and the score ranges corresponding to each option are also determined.

Standard deviation, arithmetic mean, frequency and percentage operations from descriptive statistical methods were used to solve the data collected through the questionnaire. In addition, parametric analysis techniques were used for normally distributed distributions within groups. In this context:

- Independent groups t-test was used to determine whether the scores of the students in the sample group differed according to the variables of gender and department selection decision.
- One-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether the scores of the students in the sample group differ according to the variables of class, academic achievement, age, economic status and relationship with teaching staff.
- When a difference was found between the groups due to the one-way Analysis of Variance, the Tukey test was conducted to determine the source of the differences (among which groups).
- In testing the differences between mean group scores, 0.05 significance level was taken as a basis.

Findings

In this section, findings on whether pre-service teachers’ perceptions of corporate reputation and corporate reputation differ according to various variables are included.

The findings regarding the corporate reputation perceptions and sub-dimensions perception levels of the pre-service teachers participating in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis of Corporate Reputation and its Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	N	M	Sd
Corporate reputation	680	3.46	0.44
Information about the institution	680	3.33	0.70
Management quality	680	3.76	0.56
Products and services	680	2.63	1.06
Leadership	680	3.70	0.49
Distinctiveness	680	3.39	0.61
Credibility	680	3.58	0.64
Social responsibility	680	3.57	0.64

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the institutional reputation perceptions of the pre-service teachers who participated in the study are at the level of very agree (M= 3.46). In other words, the participants of the research have a very positive perception of the institutional reputation of the faculty they study at. The findings in Table 1 show that pre-service teachers' perceptions of the sub-dimensions

of corporate reputation are at different levels. Pre-service teachers have the highest management quality (M= 3.76) and the lowest perception of corporate reputation in products and services (M= 2.63).

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in gender are given in Table 2.

Table 2: t-test Results that Present the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Gender

Dimensions	Female N=428		Male N=252		t	p
	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Corporate reputation	3.45	0.43	3.47	0.46	.604	.801
Information about the institution	3.28	0.68	3.42	0.72	2.506	.288
Management quality	3.76	0.55	3.74	0.57	.577	.894
Products and services	2.65	1.05	2.60	1.09	.637	.455
Leadership	3.69	0.48	3.73	0.50	.979	.930
Distinctiveness	3.37	0.60	3.44	0.63	1.510	.275
Credibility	3.58	0.64	3.57	0.66	.111	.880
Social responsibility	3.56	0.62	3.58	0.68	.467	.110

*p<.05, df:678

Examining Table 2, pre-service teachers' corporate reputation [t(678)=.604, p=.801], information about the institution [t(678)=2.506, p=.288], management quality [t(678)=.577, p=.894], products and services [t(678)=.637, p=.455], leadership [t(678)=.979, p=.930], distinctiveness [t(678)=1.510, p=.275], credibility [t(678)=.111,

p=.880] and social responsibility [t(678)=.467, p=.110] perceptions do not differ significantly according to the gender variable.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in class are given in Table 3.

Table 3: ANOVA Results that Illustrate the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Class

Dimensions	Class	N	M	Sd	Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Difference
Corporate reputation	1.	175	3.54	0.49	B. G.	3.190	4	.798	4.149	.003*	1-3, 2-3
	2.	120	3.53	0.49	W. G.	129.737	675	.192			
	3.	272	3.39	0.41							
	4.	62	3.40	0.38							
	5.	51	3.44	0.35							
Information about the institution	1.	175	3.30	0.67	B. G.	1.717	4	.429	.881	.475	-
	2.	120	3.42	0.83	W. G.	328.753	675	.487			
	3.	272	3.31	0.68							
	4.	62	3.29	0.67							
	5.	51	3.41	0.55							

Management quality	1.	175	3.85	0.71	B. G.	3.294	4	.824	2.680	.031*	1-5
	2.	120	3.77	0.57	W. G.	207.438	675	.307			
	3.	272	3.74	0.49							
	4.	62	3.65	0.47							
	5.	51	3.62	0.58							
Productsandservices	1.	175	2.87	1.05	B. G.	19.539	4	4.885	4.420	.002*	1-3, 1-4
	2.	120	2.69	1.09	W. G.	746.010	675	1.105			
	3.	272	2.48	1.06							
	4.	62	2.44	0.97							
	5.	51	2.71	1.02							
Leadership	1.	175	3.79	0.58	B. G.	2.921	4	.730	3.074	.016*	1-3
	2.	120	3.69	0.49	W. G.	160.400	675	.238			
	3.	272	3.65	0.44							
	4.	62	3.63	0.43							
	5.	51	3.80	0.45							
Distinctiveness	1.	175	3.36	0.69	B. G.	2.398	4	.600	1.610	.170	-
	2.	120	3.51	0.68	W. G.	251.372	675	.372			
	3.	272	3.35	0.55							
	4.	62	3.40	0.60							
	5.	51	3.45	0.45							
Credibility	1.	175	3.67	0.68	B. G.	6.927	4	1.732	4.266	.002*	1-3, 2-3, 2-5
	2.	120	3.70	0.68	W. G.	273.998	675	.406			
	3.	272	3.49	0.60							
	4.	62	3.58	0.61							
	5.	51	3.40	0.60							
Socialresponsibility	1.	175	3.66	0.67	B. G.	5.975	4	1.494	3.707	.005*	1-3, 2-3
	2.	120	3.70	0.71	W. G.	271.971	675	.403			
	3.	272	3.49	0.60							
	4.	62	3.50	0.62							
	5.	51	3.48	0.50							

*p<.05

When Table 3 is examined, it was determined that the general knowledge of the pre-service teachers about the institution and their perception of the difference do not differ according to the class variable. It is seen that pre-service teachers' corporate reputation and management quality, products and services, leadership, credibility and social responsibility perceptions differ significantly according to the class variable ($p < .05$). According to

the results of the Tukey test conducted to determine among which groups this differentiation was, it was found that the perceptions of institutional reputation of students studying in the first grade were more positive than those studying in other classes.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in terms of academic success are given in the Table 4.

Table 4: ANOVA Results that Illustrates the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Academic Success

Dimensions	GPA	N	M	Sd	Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corporate reputation	1	46	3.33	0.35	B. G.	.944	2	.798	2.421	.090
	2	429	3.48	0.46	W. G.	131.983	677	.192		
	3	205	3.45	0.41						
Information about the institution	1	46	3.32	0.58	B. G.	.843	2	.429	.865	.421
	2	429	3.36	0.73	W. G.	329.628	677	.487		
	3	205	3.28	0.64						
Management quality	1	46	3.68	0.51	B. G.	.605	2	.824	.975	.378
	2	429	3.78	0.57	W. G.	210.127	677	.307		
	3	205	3.73	0.54						
Products and services	1	46	2.46	1.04	B. G.	1.663	2	4.885	.737	.479
	2	429	2.66	1.09	W. G.	763.887	677	1.105		
	3	205	2.61	1.01						
Leadership	1	46	3.63	0.52	B. G.	.371	2	.730	.770	.463
	2	429	3.72	0.50	W. G.	162.951	677	.238		
	3	205	3.69	0.46						
Distinctiveness	1	46	3.26	0.58	B. G.	1.679	2	.600	2.254	.106
	2	429	3.43	0.63	W. G.	252.092	677	.372		
	3	205	3.35	0.57						
Credibility	1	46	3.36	0.65	B. G.	2.295	2	1.732	2.788	.062
	2	429	3.58	0.65	W. G.	278.630	677	.406		
	3	205	3.61	0.62						
Social responsibility	1	46	3.39	0.55	B. G.	1.522	2	1.494	1.901	.150
	2	429	3.58	0.66	W. G.	276.393	677	.403		
	3	205	3.59	0.61						

1: 1.00-2.00, 2: 2.01-3.00, 3: 3.01-4.00

*p<.05

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, information about the institution, management quality, products and services, leadership, distinctiveness, credibility and social

responsibility do not differ significantly according to the academic success variable.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in terms of age are given in the Table 5.

Table 5: ANOVA Results that Illustrates the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Age

Dimensions	Age	N	M	Sd	Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Difference
Corporate reputation	1	346	3.49	0.46	B. G.	.740	2	.370	1.894	.151	-
	2	319	3.43	0.42	W. G.	132.187	677	.195			
	3	15	3.54	0.56							

Information about the institution	1	346	3.31	0.67	B. G.	3.949	2	1.975	4.094	.017*	1-3, 2-3
	2	319	3.33	0.70	W. G.	326.521	677	.482			
	3	15	3.83	0.99							
Management quality	1	346	3.78	0.58	B. G.	.607	2	.304	.978	.376	-
	2	319	3.72	0.53	W. G.	210.125	677	.310			
	3	15	3.78	0.67							
Products and services	1	346	2.76	1.04	B. G.	12.494	2	6.247	5.616	.004*	1-2
	2	319	2.49	1.06	W. G.	753.056	677	1.112			
	3	15	2.67	1.19							
Leadership	1	346	3.72	0.52	B. G.	.239	2	.119	.496	.609	-
	2	319	3.69	0.45	W. G.	163.083	677	.241			
	3	15	3.63	0.67							
Distinctiveness	1	346	3.37	0.63	B. G.	1.361	2	.680	1.825	.162	-
	2	319	3.41	0.59	W. G.	252.409	677	.373			
	3	15	3.67	0.66							
Credibility	1	346	3.63	0.64	B. G.	2.202	2	1.101	2.675	.070	-
	2	319	3.51	0.64	W. G.	278.723	677	.412			
	3	15	3.58	0.72							
Social responsibility	1	346	3.58	0.65	B. G.	.099	2	.050	.121	.886	-
	2	319	3.56	0.63	W. G.	277.846	677	.410			
	3	15	3.55	.73							

1: 17-21, 2: 22-26, 3: 27 and over

*p<.05

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, management quality, leadership, distinctiveness, credibility and social responsibility perceptions do not differ significantly according to the age variable. It is seen that pre-service teachers' information about the institution and their perception of products and services differ significantly according to the age variable ($p<.05$). According to the results of the Tukey test conducted to determine among which groups this differentiation is, it was determined that

the general knowledge of the students in the age group 27 and over about the institution was more positive compared to the 17-21 and 22-26 age groups. In addition, it was determined that the perceptions of the pre-service teachers in the 17-21 age group about products and services were more positive than those in the 22-26 age group.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in terms of economic situation are given in the Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA Results that Illustrates the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Economic Status

Dimensions	Variable	N	M	Sd	Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corporate reputation	1	19	3.55	0.51	B. G.	.422	3	.141	2.421	.541
	2	139	3.43	0.40	W. G.	132.505	676	.196		
	3	505	3.47	0.45						
	4	17	3.40	0.47						

Information about the institution	1	19	3.29	0.65	B. G.	1.413	3	.471	.865	.407
	2	139	3.36	0.69	W. G.	329.057	676	.487		
	3	505	3.33	0.71						
	4	17	3.06	0.43						
Management quality	1	19	3.87	0.61	B. G.	1.266	3	.422	1.362	.253
	2	139	3.68	0.55	W. G.	209.466	676	.310		
	3	505	3.77	0.56						
	4	17	3.79	0.54						
Products and services	1	19	2.72	1.23	B. G.	7.016	3	2.339	2.084	.101
	2	139	2.58	0.98	W. G.	758.534	676	1.122		
	3	505	2.66	1.07						
	4	17	2.04	1.24						
Leadership	1	19	3.86	0.58	B. G.	.468	3	.156	.648	.585
	2	139	3.70	0.45	W. G.	162.854	676	.241		
	3	505	3.69	0.49						
	4	17	3.72	0.65						
Distinctiveness	1	19	3.62	0.78	B. G.	1.712	3	.571	1.531	.205
	2	139	3.37	0.62	W. G.	252.058	676	.373		
	3	505	3.38	0.59						
	4	17	3.59	0.83						
Credibility	1	19	3.43	0.85	B. G.	.755	3	.252	.607	.610
	2	139	3.55	0.61	W. G.	280.170	676	.414		
	3	505	3.59	0.64						
	4	17	3.49	0.66						
Social responsibility	1	19	3.74	0.75	B. G.	.980	3	.327	.797	.496
	2	139	3.51	0.61	W. G.	276.975	676	.410		
	3	505	3.58	0.64						
	4		3.57	0.83						

1: Verygood, 2: Good, 3: Average, 4: Poor

*p<.05

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, information about the institution, management quality, products and services, leadership, distinctiveness, credibility and social responsibility perceptions do not differ significantly according to the economic status

variable.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in terms of decision of choosing a department are given in the Table 7.

Table 7: t-test Results that Presents the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Decision to Choose the Department

Dimensions	Self decision N=523		Influence of others N=157		t	p
	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Corporate reputation	3.48	0.45	3.41	0.40	1.733	.051
Information about the institution	3.33	0.71	3.32	0.65	.204	.148

Management quality	3.78	0.57	3.69	0.52	1.768	.126
Products and services	2.64	1.06	2.61	1.08	.340	.964
Leadership	3.70	0.49	3.70	0.48	.138	.354
Distinctiveness	3.40	0.64	3.36	0.52	.820	.003*
Credibility	3.61	0.65	3.46	0.62	2.561	.072
Social responsibility	3.59	0.65	3.48	0.60	1.958	.073

*p<.05, Sd:678

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, information about the institution, management quality, products and services, leadership, credibility, and social responsibility do not differ significantly according to the variable of decision to choose the department. However, it is seen that the corporate reputation perceptions of pre-service teachers in the sub-dimension of difference differ significantly according to the variable of

decision to choose the department. Accordingly, it was determined that the students who chose their department voluntarily had more positive perception of corporate reputation in terms of difference compared to those who chose their department due to the influence of others.

Findings that show whether pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation differ in terms of level of relationship with instructors are given in the Table 8.

Table 8: ANOVA Results that Illustrates the Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Corporate Reputation in Terms of Level of Relationship with Instructors

Dimensions	Variable	N	M	Sd	Sources of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Difference
Corporate reputation	1	121	3.64	0.51	B. G.	6.058	2	3.029	16.662	.000*	1-2, 1-3, 2-3
	2	412	3.45	0.43	W. G.	126.869	677	.187			
	3	147	3.34	0.36							
Information about the institution	1	121	3.40	0.78	B. G.	3.673	2	1.836	3.805	.023*	1-3, 2-3
	2	412	3.36	0.67	W. G.	326.797	677	.483			
	3	147	3.20	0.70							
Management quality	1	121	3.87	0.63	B. G.	1.827	2	.913	2.960	.052	-
	2	412	3.74	0.55	W. G.	208.905	677	.309			
	3	147	3.72	0.50							
Products and services	1	121	2.88	1.15	B. G.	26.358	2	13.179	12.070	.000*	1-3, 2-3
	2	412	2.68	1.01	W. G.	739.192	677	1.092			
	3	147	2.28	1.05							
Leadership	1	121	3.81	0.53	B. G.	2.155	2	1.078	4.527	.011*	1-2
	2	412	3.66	0.48	W. G.	161.166	677	.238			
	3	147	3.72	0.48							
Distinctiveness	1	121	3.63	0.66	B. G.	8.887	2	4.444	12.285	.000*	1-2, 1-3
	2	412	3.36	0.59	W. G.	244.883	677	.362			
	3	147	3.29	0.58							
Credibility	1	121	3.82	0.68	B. G.	13.636	2	6.818	17.269	.000*	1-2, 1-3, 2-3
	2	412	3.58	0.64	W. G.	267.289	677	.395			
	3	147	3.37	0.56							

Social responsibility	1	121	3.74	0.73	B. G.	5.638	2	2.819	7.009	.001*	1-2, 1-3
	2	412	3.56	0.63	W. G.	272.307	677	.402			
	3	147	3.45	0.55							

1: Very good, 2: Moderate, 3: Weak

* $p < .05$

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, information about the institution, products and services, leadership, distinctiveness, credibility and social responsibility perceptions differ significantly according to the variable of level of relationship with instructors ($p < .05$). According to the results of the Tukey test conducted to determine among which groups this differentiation was, it was determined that students who had very good and moderate relationships with academic staff had more positive perceptions of corporate reputation than students who had a weak relationship with academic staff. However, it is seen that the corporate reputation perceptions of the pre-service teachers in the management quality sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to the relationship with the teaching staff variable.

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In this study, which aims to determine pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation in terms of various variables, pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation were found to be high. The pre-service teachers think that the institution where they study has a high reputation. Pre-service teachers have the highest quality of management, and the lowest perception of corporate reputation in terms of products and services. When the studies conducted are examined, the results of the research conducted by İcil (2008) and Çillioğlu (2010) in academic organizations support these findings. İcil (2008), in her research on the perception of corporate reputation in academic organizations, concluded that the participants of the study have a positive opinion on the institutional reputation of Akdeniz University. Çillioğlu (2010) concluded that the participants generally have a positive opinion on the corporate reputation of Anadolu University. In addition, Çillioğlu (2010) found that the participants did not express positive opinions about the reputation

of Anadolu University in terms of management and leadership, employees, products and services, and that they expressed positive opinions in the dimensions of workplace environment, corporate culture and social responsibility.

According to the result of the study, pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation do not differ according to gender. Female and male students have similar levels of positive corporate reputation perceptions. When the studies on the subject are examined, it has been determined that there are studies that support the findings of the research. In the study conducted by Karaköse (2006), it was revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between students' gender and corporate reputation perception. In the study conducted by Montilla (2004) to measure the academic reputation of the university, it was revealed that there was no difference between male and female students' perceptions of reputation. However, there are also studies with different results. In his study, Çillioğlu (2010) concluded that male and female participants have a positive opinion about the reputation of Anadolu University, and that female participants see Anadolu University's reputation more than men. In addition, in this study, it was revealed that women liked the administration and leader of the university, the institutional culture, products and services, and social responsibility studies more, and this made them see the institution more prestigious. Finally, in the study conducted by Namal (2011) to measure the institutional reputation of universities in Kyrgyzstan, it was concluded that males have a higher perception of reputation than females.

Pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation and management quality, products and services, leadership, reliability and social responsibility differ significantly according to the class variable. It was found that the corporate reputation perceptions of the students studying in the first year were more positive than the students

studying in other classes. Karaköse (2006) found that there is a significant difference between the perception of corporate reputation and the class variable in his study on secondary school students, and that 6th and 7th grade students see their schools as more prestigious compared to 8th grade students, supporting the findings of this study.

According to another result of the study, pre-service teachers' perceptions of institutional reputation do not differ according to their academic success and economic status. Accordingly, academic success or economic status of the student does not affect their perception of the institution

Pre-service teachers' corporate reputation, management quality, leadership, difference, reliability and social responsibility perceptions do not differ significantly according to the age variable. However, it was concluded that pre-service teachers' general knowledge of the institution and their perception of products and services differed significantly according to the age variable. It was determined that the general knowledge of the students in the age group of 27 and over about the institution was more positive compared to the 17-21 and 22-26 age groups. When the researches are examined, Çillioğlu (2010) in her study aimed at evaluating the reputation of Anadolu University, determining that the participants evaluate the reputation of the institution positively in all age groups and that the positive perception of institutional reputation increases as the age increases, supports the findings of this research.

According to another important result obtained from the study, the institutional reputation, general information about the institution, management quality, products and services, leadership, reliability, and social responsibility perceptions of the pre-service teachers do not show a significant difference according to the department selection variable. However, it was concluded that pre-service teachers' perceptions of corporate reputation in the sub-dimension of difference significantly differed according to the variable of choosing a department. Accordingly, it was seen that the students who chose their department voluntarily had more positive perception of corporate reputation in the difference dimension compared to those who chose their

department due to the influence of others.

Finally, as a result of the research, the institutional reputation, general information about the institution, products and services, leadership, distinctiveness, credibility and social responsibility perceptions of the pre-service teachers differ significantly according to the relationship variable with the instructors. It has been determined that the institutional reputation perceptions of the students who have very good and medium-level relationships with the instructors are more positive than the students who have a weak relationship with the academic staff. However, it is seen that the institutional reputation perceptions of pre-service teachers in the management quality sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to the variable of relationship with teaching staff. When the studies conducted are examined, the results obtained by Işık (2011) and Çillioğlu (2010) in their studies support the results of this research. In the study conducted by Işık (2011), it was concluded that education and institution employees are an important factor in the choice of university students to the university they study in terms of corporate reputation dimensions. Çillioğlu (2010), in her study to measure the institutional reputation of Anadolu University, concluded that the contribution of faculty members is extremely important for the university to have a strong reputation.

In the context of the results of the research, the following suggestions can be made to researchers and practitioners: This research conducted in the education faculty can also be done in other faculties. This study is limited to students. A study can be conducted on this subject, which will include other internal and stakeholders of the university. This study conducted at higher education level can be done at primary and secondary education level. Studies can be conducted to determine communication strategies that can be used in the management of corporate reputation in academic organizations. Studies investigating the effect of corporate reputation on job satisfaction and motivation of faculty staff may be useful.

References

- Adams, William C. "Reputation, Size, and Student Success in Public Administration / Affairs Programs." *Public Administration Review*, vol. 43, no. 5, 1983, pp. 443-446.
- Altıntaş, Erkan. *Kurumsal İtibar ve Anadolu Üniversitesi İ.B.F Örneği*. Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2005.
- Argüden, Yılmaz. *İtibar Yönetimi*. ARGE Danışmanlık Yayınları, 2003.
- Avcı, Kemal. "Organizational Reputation Perception of Internal Stakeholders of the University: Organizational Reputation Research of the Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University." *Selçuk İletişim*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2019, pp. 42-63.
- Bennett, Roger, and Rita Kottasz. "Practitioner Perceptions of Corporate Reputation: An Empirical Investigation." *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2000, pp. 224-235.
- Braddock, Jomills Henry, and Lv Hua. "Determining the College Destination of African American High School Seniors: Does College Athletic Reputation Matter?." *The Journal of Negro Education*, vol. 75, no. 3, 2006, pp. 532-545.
- Brissette, Susan, and Bruce Power. "Reputation Management." *Nuclear Plant Journal*, 2005, pp. 24-31.
- Büyüköztürk, Şener, et al. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi, 2011.
- Çillioğlu, Aslı. *İç ve Dış Paydaşların Değerlendirmelerine Göre Anadolu Üniversitesi'nin Kurumsal İtibarı*. Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2010.
- Fombrun, Charles J., et al. "The Reputation QuotientSM: A Multi-Stakeholder Measure of Corporate Reputation." *Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 7, 2000, pp. 241-255.
- Grunig, Stephen D. "Research, Reputation, and Resources: The Effect of Research Activity on Perceptions of Undergraduate Education and Institutional Resource Acquisition." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 68, no. 1, 1997, pp. 17-52.
- Işık, Elçin Yılmaz. *Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Kurumsal İtibarın Öğrenci Tercihleri Üzerindeki Rolü: Vakıf Üniversitelerinde Bir Araştırma*. İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2011.
- İcil, Aslı. *Akademik Örgütlerde Kurumsal İtibar ve İletişim İlişkisi Akdeniz Üniversitesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Akdeniz University, 2008.
- Kadıbeşegil, Salim. *Şimdi Stratejik İletişim Zamanı*. Mediacat Kitapları, 2009.
- Kadıbeşegil, Salim. *İtibar Yönetimi*, MediaCat Kitapları, 2012.
- Karaköse, Turgut. *Eğitim Örgütlerindeki İç ve Dış Paydaşların Kurumsal İtibara İlişkin Algılamaları*. Fırat University, 2006.
- Keser, Claudia. "Experimental Games for the Design of Reputation Management Systems." *IBM Systems Journal*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2003, pp. 498-506.
- Montilla, Josefa Maria. *The Construct Validation of an Instrument based on Students' University Choice and their Perceptions of Professor Effectiveness and Academic Reputation at the University of Los Andes*. University of South Florida, 2004.
- Namal, Bülent. *Hizmet İşletmelerinde Kurumsal İtibarın Oluşturulmasında Pazarlama İletişiminin Rolü: Kırgızistan Üniversiteleri Örneği*. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2011.
- Özalp, İnan, et al. "Stakeholders' Perceptions of University Reputation." *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2010, pp. 99-106.
- Sarstedt, Marko. "Reputation Management in Times of Crisis." *Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 16, 2009, pp. 499-503.
- Saylı, Halil, and Özlem Yaşar Uğurlu. "An Evaluation of Institutional Dignity and Managerial Ethics Relationship Analyses." *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2007, pp. 75-96.
- Schoenherr, Holly J. *Beyond Academic Reputation: Factors that Influence the College of First Choice for Achieving Students*. University of South Florida, 2009.
- Sung, Minjung, and Sung-Un Yang. "Student-University Relationships and Reputation: A Study of the Links between Key Factors Fostering Students' Supportive Behavioral Intentions towards their University." *Higher*

Education, vol. 57, 2009, pp. 787-811.

Tüysüzoğulları, Ende. *Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında
Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Kurumsal İtibara*

İlişkin Algulamaları: Kastamonu Uygulaması.
Dumlupınar University, 2010.

Author Details

Öznur Ataş Akdemir, *Fırat University, Turkey*, **Email ID:** aselcukakdemir@gmail.com

Ahmet Ayık, *Atatürk University, Turkey*