International Journal of Organizational Analysis

A development of the dimensions of personal reputation in organizations

Robert Zinko William A. Gentry Mary Dana Laird

A development of the dimensions of personal reputation in organizations

Robert Zinko
College of Business and Law, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia
William A. Gentry
Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina, USA, and
Mary Dana Laird
Department of Management and Marketing, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA

Abstract

Purpose – The current, established scale used to measure personal reputation treats the construct as a unidimensional measure. For example, the scale fails to distinguish between individuals who are known for being socially popular versus those who are known for being experts in their field. This study aims to address this issue by developing a multidimensional personal reputation scale.

Design/methodology/approach – Based on existing theory, a scale is developed and validated against existing, similar constructs. First, a panel of three academic experts who have done research on personal reputation, and also two professional experts who have rich experience in the management field, evaluated the items for face validity. Then 112 working adults were asked to rate the reputation of a co-worker. Each dimension of personal reputation was validated against an existing, similar scale (e.g. social reputation was validated against an existing "popularity" scale).

Findings – A multi-dimensional, personal reputation scale is presented. This measure purports that personal reputation has three dimensions: task, social and integrity.

Originality/value – The presented scale allows researchers to distinguish different types of reputations in the workplace. This is significant because both anecdotal evidence and empirical findings suggest that to simply assume that reputation based upon being a person of high integrity and upon being an expert at a specific task will present the same outcomes is a fallacy. To further the knowledge of personal reputation, a need exists to be able to measure the different dimensions of reputation.

Keywords Personal reputation, Social role valorization

Paper type Research paper

"Reputation" is a term that is arbitrarily used throughout the management literature and in popular media; yet, our knowledge of the concept is still in its infancy. Regardless of the existing relationship between personal reputation and career success (Judge *et al.*, 1995), the construct has been historically understudied. That is to say, beyond a few initial attempts at identifying general, related paradigms (Tsui, 1984), the construct has remained relatively unknown. Indeed, this ever-so-common, yet unstudied, variable is just recently finding a definition on which scholars can agree. As little as a decade ago, conflicting definitions were still being provided by some (Gotsi and Wilson, 2001), whereas others addressed the

International Journal of Organizational Analysis
Vol. 24 No. 4, 2016
pp. 634-649

1934-8835
DOI 10.1108/IJOA-04-2015-0854

problem by simply stating that "readers will be familiar with the everyday phenomenon of […] personal reputation" (Balmer and Bromley, 2001, p. 14).

In reaction to this lack of comprehension, research on personal reputation has gained significant interest in the organizational sciences in the past few years (Zinko and Rubin, 2015; Ferris *et al.*, 2014; Laird *et al.*, 2012) to include the emergence of on-line reputation (Jøsang *et al.*, 2007). In doing so, reputation can now be examined at the corporate level (e.g. the reputation of a company such as Ford or Microsoft) and individual level, and be influenced by the online environment. Indeed, reputations can now exist between individuals who have never met each other.

For the purpose of the development of this scale, we will be measuring the personal reputation of individuals in an organization. However, in exploring current research regarding this type of reputation, the majority of these studies have operationalized the phenomenon as unidimensional. Indeed, regardless of the action that may have caused the reputation (e.g. citizenship behaviors, excelling at one's work task, etc.), most studies measure personal reputation as a single dimension (Hochwarter *et al.*, 2007; Zinko *et al.*, 2010; Liu *et al.*, 2007; Laird *et al.*, 2012). This is surprising as both antidotal evidence and theory (Ferris *et al.*, 2003) dictate that individuals may develop reputations for a variety of reasons. For example, one may benefit from being known as an expert, while another may achieve rewards for being socially popular; yet, the current scale would measure both as simply "reputation", failing to distinguish between the two. Regardless of the lack of an empirical, multi-dimensional measure, this idea of multiple reputations aligns with current theory that suggests that individuals may develop reputations for several different facets of their behavior (Ranft *et al.*, 2006; Ferris *et al.*, 2014). This has led to frequent calls to create a multidimensional scale that measures different aspects of one's reputation (Ferris *et al.*, 2003; Zinko *et al.*, 2007).

Regardless of the obvious differences in reputations and the repeated appeals for a more robust, multidimensional personal reputation scale, current reputation measures (Hochwarter *et al.*, 2007) treat these different dimensions as indistinguishable. The development of a unidimensional scale was an important first step, but as the theory driving our knowledge of personal reputation matures, so must the devices that we use to measure this construct. No longer can scientists continue to propose multiple facets of reputation, but persist in measuring the construct as though it was a single dimension.

Based primarily on the construct of social role valorization (SRV), we address this issue by first showing the theoretical division between social and task with regard to personal reputation in organizations. Then, we build upon theoretical and empirical findings in the organizational sciences to refine these concepts, showing that social can be broken into two different reputation dimensions (i.e. general social and integrity).

Theoretical foundations and hypothesis development

Introduced by Wolfensberger and Thomas (1983), SRV was first proposed as a framework for challenged individuals to present themselves as a valued member of the society. A need was identified for the development of a theoretical framework that would identify the different ways in which individuals might increase their standing in society, causing audiences to recognize their skills and abilities. SRV posits that people are more likely to gain significance in an organization if others believe that they are occupying valued roles. There are two main strategies for achieving these goals. The first is social development, the enhancement of an individual's social image in the eyes

of an audience. SRV posits that people who reflect the values and norms of their organization are more likely to be perceived as valuable by their audiences (Wolfensberger, 1995). This is consistent with current reputation research which suggests that those who deviate positively from the norms of an organization will "become known" for those deviations, and as such, be rewarded with a positive personal reputation (Zinko and Rubin, 2015). The second strategy for an individual to develop value is task proficiency, which is the perceived abilities of an individual to accomplish one or more duties; essentially, gaining value is contingent upon how well one is able to perform a task (Osburn, 2006). As with the social dimension, the task in question must be of value to the audience. Indeed, one's ability to perform a task that is not seen to hold value to the organization will not be seen as significant when analyzing the value of an individual (Ferris *et al.*, 2003).

Just as SRV presents itself as a framework for establishing one's value in society by manipulating the perceptions of an audience, individuals may develop and/or maintain a reputation by focusing on these two areas: social development and task proficiency. The theory that individuals can have social and task reputations can be seen in other fields as well. In examining electronic communities, Yu and Singh (2000) found that entities had reputations for both expertise (task) and service (i.e. social). Likewise, psychologists state that individuals may become known for not only the tasks they perform but also other (social) aspects of their observable behaviors (Goffman, 1959).

When examining behaviors that may result in a reputation, audiences deliberate the cause of the actions (Ferris *et al.*, 2003). In doing so, an assessment regarding the intent of the individual is considered (Weick, 1995). This may result in the development of a reputation based upon a perceived level of integrity of the individual in question. Indeed, the assessment of not only the cause but also the intent behind that cause is at the core of attribution theory (Kelley and Michela, 1980 for an overview of attribution theory). Therefore, we propose that one may also develop a reputation based upon how others view their integrity.

Exploring these theories in the context of personal reputation, it can be seen how the use of a unidimensional measure for personal reputation would not be satisfactory for capturing an individual's entire reputation. Reputation scholars themselves admit that individuals may hold several different reputations in an organization (Blass and Ferris, 2007; Tsui, 1984). Appendix 1 shows the items used in the current unidimensional reputation scale. Although this scale is able to capture a general reputation, we propose that it fails to fully capture the social aspect of reputation (Hochwarter *et al.*, 2007 scale listed in Appendix 1 lacks any items that could be considered purely "social"). As such, we build upon existing theories to provide a foundation of developing a multidimensional scale for personal reputation. In doing so, we examine the aspects of task, social and integrity as part of personal reputation in organizations.

Dimensions of personal reputation

Task reputation

When considering task reputation, Zinko *et al.* (2012a) showed how negotiators could develop a reputation for their level of success at negotiations. This supports current theory in suggesting that one of the dominant areas in which an individual can "become known" in organizations is for their ability to perform tasks (Ferris *et al.*, 2014, 2003; Tsui, 1984; Gyekye *et al.*, 2015). Likewise, Bartol and Martin (1990) linked reputation to

expertise to financial rewards. Those who are known to be experts at a task are often granted a higher level of autonomy (Zinko *et al.*, 2012a). This may be because of the fact that as experts, they consistently have performed proficiently in the past (i.e. developing a reputation as such), and one would expect them to act in the same manner in the future. Because reputations are often used to signal our intentions to others (Spence, 1974), which helps an audience predict an individual's future behavior (Ferris *et al.*, 2003), individuals often intentionally build reputations based on a level of expertise at a task (Bromley, 1993). Similarly, Emler (1984) stated that reputation is the skill or expertise for which an individual wants to be known. If an individual shows an unusual proficiency over time, he or she may become considered an expert (Littlepage *et al.*, 1997), and easily be recognizable as such (Laughlin *et al.*, 1991). Thus, we posit:

H1. Individuals in organizations will have reputations based upon their level of skill at performing tasks.

Social reputation

By their nature, humans are social creatures. They tend to form coordinated social units, working together toward common valued goals (Brewer, 2001) and engage in repeated interdependent interactions with other group members (Kurzban and Neuberg, 2005). As organizations are considered "social arenas", reputations regarding the social aspect of an individual will develop (Ferris *et al.*, 2003). These reputations may not necessarily be based on one's ability to perform a task, but rather on one's interactions (i.e. or lack thereof) with those around them. Because reputations are based upon deviations from norms (e.g. becoming an expert at a task), when individuals deviate from the social norms of a group, they will become known for those behaviors (Haviland, 1977). This is one of the tenets of charismatic leadership (Klein and House, 1995). What charismatic leaders often are known for is not the ability to perform a technical task, but rather their behaviors on a social level. Their ability to inspire others (i.e. often toward a common goal) via social maneuvering is beyond that of "typical" individuals (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996), and as such, the leader becomes known for this social deviation. Therefore, we propose the following:

H2. Individuals in organizations will have reputations based upon their social behaviors.

Integrity reputation

Although much of the theory presented thus far suggests two dimensions of personal reputation, current research suggests a third dimension of integrity. Zinko *et al.* (2012b) showed integrity to be an essential component of leader reputation. Likewise, Murshed *et al.* (2015) call attention to the relationship between perceived integrity and personal reputation. When discussing the concept of a social reputation (i.e. the character/integrity dimension), Ferris *et al.* (2014, p. 44) stated that the dimension "seems a bit broader, and probably is driven by a number of different types of behaviors demonstrated in the past". They purported that there is an aspect to personal reputations that included what is called a "prosocial or citizenship behavior, as well as behaviors that reflect an "other orientation" (p. 42). This suggests it is unlikely that there is a single dimension to identify all aspects of individuals' social reputations. As reputations are based upon observable actions, and typically these actions are relayed to

a larger audience by an observer, the audience will evaluate the subject in question (Emler, 1994). This evaluation will be an attempt to "make sense" (Weick, 1995) of how these actions relate to the existing information that they have of the person. The audience will attempt to understand the motivations behind the reported behavior. To accomplish this, the character (i.e. integrity) of the individual must be taken into consideration (Zinko *et al.*, 2007).

As reputations are used to predict the behaviors of others (Ranft *et al.*, 2006), integrity is a necessary component, as it allows audiences to extrapolate about other behaviors. For example, a reputation for being good at a specific task would not necessarily suggest that an individual may perform *other* tasks well, but a reputation for being a person of integrity informs the audience of the individual's decision-making processes across all situations. Indeed, those who are seen as having a high level of integrity often are given higher autonomy and more trust (Gagné and Deci, 2005) and as such, individuals may likely aspire to enact a positive reputation to gain those rewards (Braun and Daigle, 1973). Therefore, we propose the following:

H3. Individuals in organizations will have reputations based upon their perceived integrity.

Relatedness of reputation

In examining the different facets of personal reputation, theory suggests that there will be a strong correlation between the different dimensions of personal reputation (Ferris *et al.*, 2003). That is to say, someone who is known to have a positive reputation for being able to perform a task well also may be seen as someone who is considered to possess a high level of integrity. Coombs and Holladay (2006) argued a similar theory, showing how halo effects and reputation are related (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977 for a review of halo effect). The halo effect states that global evaluations of a person can induce altered evaluations of the person's attributes, even when there is sufficient information to allow for independent assessments of them (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977). This suggests that if an individual is well known for one aspect of their being (e.g. the ability to perform a task well), then the positive reputation gleaned from that ability may affect how audiences see the person as a whole. When asked about another aspect of the individual (e.g. social standing), the halo effect suggests that observers' knowledge of the individual's high task performance may positively affect how they view the individual's social ability as well. Therefore, when an audience has a positive impression of one aspect of an individual's personal reputation, they are also likely to view other aspects of that individual's personal reputation favorably.

Personal reputation is not unique in this overlap of constructs. A strong correlation is typical when examining the relationships between dimensions of a single construct. For example, the dimensions of political skill often relate to each other at about 0.50 (Shi *et al.*, 2011). Likewise, when examining the different types of power (i.e. expert and referent power), the correlations between these unique, but related, constructs are often as high as 0.72 (Politis, 2005). Further, some leadership scales will correlate in the range of 0.70 and above (Hinkin and Tracey, 1999), such as the four factors of transformational leadership (Tejeda *et al.*, 2001).

Previous research also has shown that the dimensions of corporate reputation are highly correlated. *Fortune Magazine* ranks the "most admired corporations" each year. A quick search of Google scholar shows that the data set provided by *Fortune* has been

used in hundreds of studies as a proxy for corporate reputation. In particular, their corporate reputation measure is broken up into seven dimensions such as community and environmental responsibility, quality of the product or service being presented and innovativeness. Face validity suggests that these dimensions are unique, but when analyzed, the dimensions of this well-published reputation scale tend to correlate between 0.56 and 0.93 (Fryxell and Wang, 1994). The preceding discussion leads us to believe that these different constructs of personal reputation will be related. Therefore, we therefore posit:

H4. Because of the nature of the personal reputation construct, social, task and integrity reputations will be significantly correlated.

Although the three aspects of personal reputation measure unique characteristics, when combined, they should capture the overall assessment of an individual's reputation in an organization:

H5. Combining the three facets of personal reputation (i.e. social, task and integrity) will correlate with the current unidimensional reputation scales.

Method

To validate the different scales of personal reputation (i.e. social, task and integrity), three multiple-item scales were created to measure social reputations as well as expertise-based reputations in an organizational context (Appendix 1). The items were developed by the authors based on the conceptualization of reputation by Ferris *et al.* (2003) and (Zinko *et al.*, 2007). A panel of three academic experts who have done research on personal reputation, and also two professional experts who have rich experience in the management field, then evaluated the items for face validity. These experts were provided definitions of task, social and integrity reputations and asked to sort the items into the proper categories. All experts were able to do this with 100 per cent success. The panel members agreed that the items consistently and comprehensively reflected the theoretical underpinnings of the constructs, thus establishing the face validity of the items. The wording of each of the items was carefully adjusted based on their comments to ensure clarity.

To further validate these scales, data were collected to gain construct validity. We pursued the aforementioned objectives in a sample of working adults. The respondents consisted of 112 subjects, with 51 of them being female. The average age of each participant was 32.42 years, ranging from 18 to 54 years. All were full-time employees, ranging from entry-level workers (63 per cent) to lower management (24 per cent), middle management (10 per cent) and upper management (3 per cent). All respondents were from the USA, the majority from the east coast. The sample was gained by asking MBA students to find "working adults" to fill out the surveys. If the students did not wish to complete this task, they were given an option to opt out. All participants were required to fill out an online survey. IP address and time checks were performed to assure adhesion to the requirement on the part of the MBA students.

Subjects were asked to pick a specific co-worker of their choosing, and rate the reputation of that individual. Items were presented from both the proposed reputation scale and the existing, established, related scales. To validate the social scale, we adapted the 11-item "popularity" scale developed by Lorr and Wunderlich (1986) to measure our social scale. Items consisted of statements such as "Everyone likes to be

with this person" and "This person has many friends". Gest (1997) reported an alpha of 0.93 for the popularity scale. Next, we compared our integrity scale to the three-item manager integrity scale ($\alpha = 0.88$) that was developed by Zinko *et al.* (2012b). An example item is "Doesn't put own ambitions ahead of the organization's objectives". Finally, task reputation was measured by correlating it with a well-known, five-item expert power scale (Politis, 2005). Appendix 2 lists all items for these scales.

Using SPSS-20, correlations between the existing scales and the proposed scales were evaluated, followed by a *t*-test to validate the significance of those relationships. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then conducted on the proposed 12 reputation items to confirm the validity of the scales. Finally, to confirm that the three scales do, in fact, capture what is determined in the literature as "personal reputation", we also collected the well-established Hochwarter *et al.* (2007) unidimensional reputation scale, with the intent of comparing it to a combined finding of our three personality scales.

Results

Supporting *H1* (i.e. the different dimensions of personal reputation, as well as the combination of the three correlating with the current reputation scale), Table I shows that the level of validity reflected for the reputation scales (i.e. in light of their strong, significant relationships with the more well-established scales) is sufficiently high to provide confidence that these scales representatively sample from the construct domain of content we call "reputation". The results of the CFA were $\chi^2/\text{df} = 4.9, p < 0.05$; NFI = 0.86; CFI = 0.88; RMSEA = 0.15. These results showed the presented dimensions of reputation to be adequately unique (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

As shown in Table II, there is the expected correlation between the dimensions of personal reputation. When all three reputation scales were combined, they correlated at 0.91 with the existing Hochwarter scale. This suggests that the three scales do, in fact, capture the crux of the Hochwarter scale, thus capturing the overall, general construct that is currently being measured in the literature as "personal reputation".

Discussion

Developing a universal scale for organizations

Industries have long developed their own scales regarding personal reputation and performance. Perhaps the best known is the one used by on-line giant eBay. This scale consists of such items as "How accurate was the item description?" and "How quickly did the seller ship the item?" (Ebay, 2015). In doing so, they are focusing on specific actions or perceptions. Although context-specific scales are useful in nature, they remain quite limiting in three different ways:

(1) Such scales can only be used in a single, specific environment (i.e. as they are designed for that environment).

Social Reputation & Popularity Scale	0.85**
Task Reputation & Expert Power Scale	0.80**
Integrity Reputation & Manager Integrity Scale	0.83**
Combined Reputation & Hochwarter Reputation Scale	0.91**

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed) $N = 112$

Table I.
Scale validation

(2) Environment-specific scales do not allow for changes in norms and values to occur. Research suggests that the norms and values of organizations change over time (Fiol and Lyles, 1985); because of this, scales may quickly become outdated (i.e. as they will be measuring deviations that audiences no longer care about).

(3) If an environment-specific scale is developed, it may not reflect the norms and values of the audience.

Often such measures come from upper management, and they may wish to measure what management feels is important, but not what employees feel is worthy of discussion. In the context of organizations, if there is no discussion by an audience, there is no reputation being developed. For a scale to be universally used among organizations, it must allow for the audiences in the organization to determine what is worthy of discussion about an individual.

The need for a multi-dimensional scale

Thus far, the majority of research on personal reputation in organizations has used a unidimensional scale. Although this has provided a solid foundation into the exploration of the construct, a call to develop a measure that assesses the different dimensions of personal reputation has been consistent throughout the personal reputation literature (Hochwarter *et al.*, 2007). Simply measuring a reputation based on a single dimension is limiting in not only practical application of the construct but also in moving the theoretical stream of personal reputation forward. Indeed, current studies that have used a unidimensional measure of reputation have, theoretically, offered the same findings for someone who is the "life of the party" as someone who is considered an "expert" at the task of negotiating (Zinko *et al.*, 2012a).

Likewise, as evidenced by SRV, the necessity of developing a reputation measure that distinguishes between different dimensions of personal reputation (i.e. a reputation based on task performance versus one based on social behaviors) is vital to further our knowledge of the construct. To gain rewards in the workplace, one must excel in some way (Bromley, 1993). SRV has suggested that this could be done by focusing on task or social behaviors. This study expands upon that theory by including the concept of integrity. This development was based upon cross-disciplinary research that suggests that individuals look beyond behaviors in an attempt to understand what caused those actions. Often the intent of the subject is questioned (Weick, 1995). Intent can be understood better by evaluating the integrity of the individual. Therefore, the additional

No.	Scales	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Social reputation	4.84	1.26	0.94				
2	Task reputation	5.06	1.39	0.46**	0.94			
3	Integrity reputation	5.11	1.44	0.59**	0.63**	0.95		
4	Combined reputation	5.00	1.14	0.79**	0.83**	0.88**	0.91	
5	Hochwarter reputation	5.11	1.43	0.62**	0.73**	0.90**	0.91**	0.79

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

Table II.
Correlations

dimension of reputation has been implied, just not overtly assessed by current SRV theory. This study advances SRV by developing integrity reputation.

Next, although these dimensions are unique, both the present findings and the existing literature (Fryxell and Wang, 1994) suggest a relationship between the dimensions. Table II shows a significant relationship between the dimensions varying from 0.46 to 0.63. This supports established theory that suggests that individuals are rarely looked at by others in only one context, but in fact, several traits of the individual are considered (Taylor and Lobel, 1989). Therefore, the correlations found between dimensions may not necessarily be indicative of an underlying, shared latent variable, but may instead be caused by halo error on the part of the evaluator. Alternatively, as integrity is highly correlated with both the presented constructs (i.e. social and task) and also with the existing Hochwarter *et al.* (2007) unidimensional scale, these findings support the idea that reputation is based on more than simple actions, but rather is assessed in the context of what we know about an individual. One who is well regarded may be viewed differently by others for performing the same action as one who is looked upon less favorably. An audience cannot simply assign an individual a reputation based on actions until that audience has examined those actions not only in the context and norms of the organization but also in the context of what they know about the individual. By this logic, one could speculate that integrity is simply a sub-dimension of social and/or task reputation. Although these constructs are related, the emerging stream of research regarding sociopaths in corporations suggests that an individual can be successful by being high in both social and task reputation, while having a very poor reputation with regards to integrity (Pech and Slade, 2007). It should be acknowledged that perceived integrity will play a role in evaluating the actions of others, but this developing stream of literature supports the empirical findings presented here in suggesting that integrity is a unique construct. Indeed, it is this dimension of integrity that sociopaths are known to be lacking. There may well be an interaction effect between the dimensions of personal reputation. Indeed, if one is high in both task and social, but low in integrity, one might expect them to derail, but in the case of these sociopaths, they actually excel. Likewise, if one is high in integrity and social, but low in task, they may use political skill to develop a network to cover their short comings. Finally, if one is high in task and integrity, but low in social, they may be thought of as a worker bee, that may not be able to develop the networking skills needed to excel in an organization.

Practical applications and future research

It has been argued by Ferris *et al.* (2003) that individuals may hold different reputations with different groups. In the case of organizations, an individual may hold different reputations at different layers of the company. Indeed, it may be best for a manager to have a strong task reputation with upper management, a social reputation with the other managers and an integrity reputation with the direct reports. Individuals in the workplace have a finite amount of resources to expend on developing reputations, and as such, they may find it in their best interests to focus on specific dimensions. The new scale allows researchers to examine which dimensions of an individual's reputation are most prominent among different levels of the organization.

Likewise, this new scale furthers our understanding of the halo effects, in that managers need to be aware of how different reputations may affect their perceptions of an individual and their performance. In doing so, these findings also support the

growing literature in sociopathy and psychopathy in the workplace (Pech and Slade, 2007; Boddy, 2011; Boddy *et al.*, 2010) by potentially making managers more aware of the relationship between integrity and other dimensions of reputation. Although the results lead to speculation that there may be an interactive effect among the different dimensions of personal reputation, such a finding is beyond the scope of the study.

When considering the dimension of integrity, as shown in Table II, integrity correlated highly with the existing unidimensional scale. This suggests that, as stated earlier, a halo effect may occur with reputation. It is important to understand the dimensions of personal reputation because it has been shown that one may excel in an organization based on social skills (Ferris *et al.*, 2007), or one's ability to perform a task (Walker, 2005). In this, the presented scale can distinguish between the two, allowing managers to better assess individuals, based upon reputation.

Similarly, research has suggested that individual may be hired by an organization based upon their reputation (Zinko and Rubin, 2015). In doing so, current scales will only provide an overall assessment of an individual's reputation. The presented scale allows for more specific information as to what aspect of an individual is driving that reputation. In doing so, an individual can distinguish between one who excels that as aspect of their job and someone who is well liked because of their charismatic nature. Likewise, further research is needed to show the relationship between the reputation of an individual and that of the organization. Although there has been some theory presented that links one's reputation to that of an organization (Hayward *et al.*, 2004), the nature of that reputation as it relates to the organization has yet to be fully explored. By the development of a multidimensional scale of reputation, further knowledge into the relationship between and individual's social, task and integrity reputation can be explored. Indeed, Meindl *et al.* (1985) showed that the known social aspects of leaders and CEO are often more important for a successful leader than the actual decisions leaders make.

When considering research in the area of gender, evidence exists that men and woman are viewed differently in the workplace. Although this scale shows that different dimensions exist, it fails to show how gender may play a role in the development of reputation. Romero and Cruthirds (2006) showed a difference between how men and women view humor in the workplace. Not only do the genders perceive humor differently but also view the individual using humor differently (Elsesser and Peplau, 2006). This suggests that such behaviors (telling jokes) that build a positive social reputation for one gender may have a vastly different outcome for the other. Although there may be no difference with task or integrity reputation, potential discrimination based upon social norms suggests that females may find the behaviors that they can choose from to develop a social reputation to be limited. The development of this multidimensional scale allows further exploration of this area of research.

Finally, although this scale is designed for organizational reputation, when dealing with on-line reputation, aspects of the scale may be appropriate for adaptation. One could argue that integrity is a significant dimension of on-line reputation. Indeed such examination as Dellarocas (2000), Xiong and Liu (2004) and Resnick and Zeckhauser (2002) have explored the importance of trust as it relates to on-line reputation. Likewise, when considering the task aspects of reputation, online reputations are often based on one's ability to deliver a product or service. Herein, one could argue that most on-line metrics are an actual proxy for this dimension, in that ranking often occur for products or services (Travelocity.com) (Ghose *et al.*, 2012). If one is ranked at the top of the list of competitors, by definition, they deviate

from the norm in that areas that audiences (i.e. who do the ranking) feel matter the most. The social aspect of reputation is where online reputation deviates from organizational, individual reputation. The reason for this is likely twofold: first, online reputations are often used more in the vain of corporate reputations, in asking: can this person or organization deliver the products as they claim? There is no "social" aspect to these sorts of reputation. Second, when dealing with individuals on-line, the social aspect is limited. In examining individual reputations in such things as chat rooms, massively multiplayer online role-playing games (MMOPRGs), there may be a social quality wherein aspects of the presented social scale may be applied.

Conclusion

This investigation presented the next steps in the program of research on personal reputation in organizations. Building upon existing, theoretical contributions, a multidimensional scale of reputation was offered. The scale showed reputation as having the dimensions of task, social and integrity. Furthermore, evidence suggested that when combined, the new three-dimensional scale captures that essence of the existing single dimension scale. In doing so, the scale not only presented the results in dimensions but also can be used as an alternative to the existing reputation scale. The development of such a scale will aid both researchers and practitioners in better understanding the aspects of personal reputation.

References

Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W. (1988), "Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103 No. 3, pp. 411-423.

Balmer, J.M. and Bromley, D.B. (2001), "Relationships between personal and corporate reputation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 Nos 3/4, pp. 316-334.

Bartol, K.M. and Martin, D.C. (1990), "When politics pays: factors influencing managerial compensation decisions", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 599-614.

Blass, F.R. and Ferris, G.R. (2007), "Leader reputation: the role of mentoring, political skill, contextual learning, and adaptation", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 5-19.

Boddy, C.R. (2011), "Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 100 No. 3, pp. 367-379.

Boddy, C.R., Ladyshewsky, R. and Galvin, P. (2010), "Leaders without ethics in global business: corporate psychopaths", *Journal of Public Affairs*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 121-138.

Braun, J.S. and Daigle, G. (1973), "Machiavellianism and reputation for manipulativeness in adolescent inpatients", *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 11-15 August*.

Brewer, M.B. (2001), "Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict", in Ashmore, R., Jussim, L. and Wilder, D. (Eds), *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Bromley, D.B. (1993), *Reputation, Image and Impression Management*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.

Coombs, W. and Holladay, S.J. (2006), "Unpacking the halo effect: reputation and crisis management", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 123-137.

Dellarocas, C. (2000), "Immunizing online reputation reporting systems against unfair ratings and discriminatory behavior", *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, Minneapolis, MN, 17-20* October, *ACM, New York, NY*, pp. 150-157.

Ebay (2015), available at: www.ebay.com/ (accessed 4 July 2015).

Elsesser, K. and Peplau, L.A. (2006), "The glass partition: obstacles to cross-sex friendships at work", *Human Relations*, Vol. 59, pp. 1077-1100.

Emler, N. (1984), "Differential involvement in delinquency: toward an interpretation in terms of reputation management", *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, Vol. 13, pp. 173-239.

Emler, N. (1994), "Gossip, reputation, and social adaptation", in Goodman, R. and Ze'Ev, A.B. (Eds), *Good Gossip*, Kansas University Press, Lawrence, KS.

Ferris, G.R., Blass, F.R., Douglas, C., Kolodinsky, R.W. and Treadway, D.C. (2003), "Personal reputation in organizations", in Greenberg, J. (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*, 2nd ed., Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Ferris, G.R., Harris, J.N., Russell, Z.A., Ellen III, B.P., Martinez, A.D. and Blass, F.R. (2014), "The role of reputation in the organizational sciences: a multilevel review, construct assessment, and research directions", *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 32, pp. 241-303.

Ferris, G.R., Treadway, D.C., Perrewé, P.L., Brouer, R.L., Douglas, C. and Lux, S. (2007), "Political skill in organizations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, pp. 290-320.

Fiol, C.M. and Lyles, M.A. (1985), "Organizational learning", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 803-813.

Fryxell, G.E. and Wang, J. (1994), "The fortune corporate'reputation'index: reputation for what?", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 1-14.

Gagné, M. and Deci, E.L. (2005), "Self-determination theory and work motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, pp. 331-362.

Gest, S.D. (1997), "Behavioral inhibition: stability and associations with adaptation from childhood to early adulthood", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 467-475.

Ghose, A., Ipeirotis, P.G. and Li, B. (2012), "Designing ranking systems for hotels on travel search engines by mining user-generated and crowdsourced content", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 31, pp. 493-520.

Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Gotsi, M. and Wilson, A.M. (2001), "Corporate reputation: seeking a definition", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 6, pp. 24-30.

Gyekye, S.A., Haybatollahi, M., Stokes, P. and Stokes, P. (2015), "Organizational citizenship behavior: an empirical investigation of the impact of age and job satisfaction on Ghanaian industrial workers", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 285-301.

Haviland, J.B. (1977), *Gossip, Reputation, and Knowledge in Zinacantan*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Hayward, M.L., Rindova, V.P. and Pollock, T.G. (2004), "Believing one's own press: the causes and consequences of CEO celebrity", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 25, pp. 637-653.

Hinkin, T.R. and Tracey, J.B. (1999), "The relevance of charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 105-119.

Hochwarter, W.A., Ferris, G.R., Zinko, R., Arnell, B. and James, M. (2007), "Reputation as a moderator of political behavior-work outcomes relationships: a two-study investigation with convergent results", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, p. 567.

Jøsang, A., Ismail, R. and Boyd, C. (2007), "A survey of trust and reputation systems for online service provision", *Decision Support Systems*, Vol. 43, pp. 618-644.

Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Boudreau, J.W. and Bretz, R.D. (1995), "An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success", *Personnel psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 485-519.

Kelley, H.H. and Michela, J.L. (1980), "Attribution theory and research", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 31, pp. 457-501.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. (1996), "Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 36-51.

Klein, K.J. and House, R.J. (1995), "On fire: charismatic leadership and levels of analysis", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 6, pp. 183-198.

Kurzban, R. and Neuberg, S. (2005), "Managing ingroup and outgroup relationships", in Buss, D.M. (Ed.), *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, Wiley, New York, NY.

Laird, M.D., Zboja, J.J. and Ferris, G.R. (2012), "Partial mediation of the political skill-reputation relationship", *Career Development International*, Vol. 17, pp. 557-582.

Laughlin, P.R., Vanderstoep, S.W. and Hollingshead, A.B. (1991), "Collective versus individual induction: recognition of truth, rejection of error, and collective information processing", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 61, pp. 50-67.

Littlepage, G., Robison, W. and Reddington, K. (1997), "Effects of task experience and group experience on group performance, member ability, and recognition of expertise", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 69, pp. 133-147.

Liu, Y., Ferris, G.R., Zinko, R., Perrewé, P.L., Weitz, B. and Xu, J. (2007), "Dispositional antecedents and outcomes of political skill in organizations: a four-study investigation with convergence", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 71, pp. 146-165.

Lorr, M. and Wunderlich, R.A. (1986), "Two objective measures of self-esteem", *Journal of Personality Assessment*, Vol. 50, pp. 18-23.

Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B. and Dukerich, J.M. (1985), "The romance of leadership", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 78-102.

Murshed, S.T.H., Uddin, S. and Hossain, L. (2015), "Transitivity, hierarchy and reciprocity of organizational communication network during crisis", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 23, pp. 2-20.

Nisbett, R.E. and Wilson, T.D. (1977), "The halo effect: evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 250-258.

Osburn, J. (2006), "An overview of social role valorization theory", *The SRV Journal*, Vol. 1, pp. 4-13.

Pech, R.J. and Slade, B.W. (2007), "Organisational sociopaths: rarely challenged, often promoted. Why?", *Society and Business Review*, Vol. 2, pp. 254-269.

Politis, J.D. (2005), "The influence of managerial power and credibility on knowledge acquisition attributes", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 197-214.

Ranft, A.L., Zinko, R., Ferris, G.R. and Buckley, M.R. (2006), "Marketing the image of management: the costs and benefits of CEO reputation", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 35, pp. 279-290.

Resnick, P. and Zeckhauser, R. (2002), "Trust among strangers in internet transactions: empirical analysis of eBay's reputation system", *The Economics of the Internet and E-commerce*, Vol. 11, pp. 23-25.

Romero, E.J. and Cruthirds, K.W. (2006), "The use of humor in the workplace", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 20, pp. 58-69.

Shi, J., Chen, Z. and Zhou, L. (2011), "Testing differential mediation effects of sub-dimensions of political skills in linking proactive personality to employee performance", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 26, pp. 359-369.

Spence, A.M. (1974), *Market Signaling: Information Transfer in Hiring and Related Processes*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Taylor, S.E. and Lobel, M. (1989), "Social comparison activity under threat: downward evaluation and upward contacts", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 96, pp. 569-581.

Tejeda, M.J., Scandura, T.A. and Pillai, R. (2001), "The MLQ revisited: psychometric properties and recommendations", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, pp. 31-52.

Tsui, A.S. (1984), "A role set analysis of managerial reputation", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 34, pp. 64-96.

Walker, K. (2005), "Reaching for the stars: career advancement and the registered nurse", *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, Vol. 11, pp. 185-190.

Weick, K.E. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations*, New York, Sage.

Wolfensberger, W. (1995), "An if this, then that formulation of decisions related to social role valorization as a better way of interpreting it to people", *Mental Retardation*, Vol. 33, pp. 163-169.

Wolfensberger, W. and Thomas, S. (1983), *Passing: Program Analysis of Service Systems' Implementation of Normalization Goals: A Method of Evaluating the Quality of Human Services According to the Principle of Normalization*, Canadian Nat. Inst. on Mental Retardation.

Xiong, L. and Liu, L. (2004), "Peertrust: supporting reputation-based trust for peer-to-peer electronic communities", *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, Vol. 16, pp. 843-857.

Yu, B. and Singh, M.P. (2000), "A social mechanism of reputation management in electronic communities", in Klusch, M. and Kerschberg, L. (Eds), *Cooperative Information Agents IV-The Future of Information Agents in Cyberspace*., Springer, Berlin.

Zinko, R., Ferris, G.R., Blass, F.R. and Laird, M.D. (2007), "Toward a theory of reputation in organizations", *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 26.

Zinko, R., Ferris, G.R., Humphrey, S.E., Meyer, C.J. and Aime, F. (2012a), "Personal reputation in organizations: two-study constructive replication and extension of antecedents and consequences", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 156-180.

Zinko, R., Furner, C.P., Royle, T. and Hall, A. (2010), "Self-perceptions of our personal reputations: the mediating role of image in the development of organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of International Management Studies*, Vol. 5, pp. 1-9.

Zinko, R., Gentry, W.A., Hall, A. and Grant, G.L. (2012b), "Reputational change among managers", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 24, pp. 9-26.

Zinko, R. and Rubin, M. (2015), "Personal reputation and the organization", *Journal of Management & Organization*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 1-20.

Appendix 1

Multidimensional scale developed for this study:

(1) Social reputation:
- This person is interested in everyone having a good time.
- People like having this person around for social events.
- This person is well liked by others.
- This person is popular.

(2) Task reputation:
- This person is known to be an expert in his/her area.
- This person is often asked for advice regarding work-related issues.
- People go to this individual when they have a technical issue at work.
- This person understands the "technical systems" of the workplace.

(3) Integrity reputation:
- This individual is seen as a person of high integrity.
- This person is known for being upstanding.
- People feel they can trust this person.
- This person is of high moral character.

Hochwarter et al. *(2007) Reputation Scale:*

- This individual is regarded highly by others.
- This individual has a good reputation.
- This individual has the respect of his/her colleagues and associates.
- This individual has the trust of his/her colleagues.
- This individual is seen as a person of high integrity.
- This individual is regarded as someone who gets things done.
- This individual has a reputation for producing results.
- People expect this individual to consistently demonstrate the highest performance.
- People know this individual will produce only high-quality results.
- People count on this individual to consistently produce the highest quality performance.
- This individual has the reputation of producing the highest quality performance.
- If people want things done right, they ask this individual to do it.

Appendix 2

Existing, related scales use for validation of developed scales

(1) Popularity (Lorr and Wunderlich, 1986):
- This person is popular with his or her peers.
- People think well of this person.
- People like being with this person.
- The person is often included in affairs.
- Many show interest in this person.
- People look up to this person.

- People say nice things to this person.
- This person feels accepted by most.
- People confide in this person.
- Many people like to associate with this person.
- This person is fun to be with.

(2) Manager integrity scale (Zinko *et al.*, 2012b):

- This person doesn't hide mistakes.
- This person has integrity and is trustworthy.
- This person doesn't put own ambitions ahead of the organization's objectives.

(3) Expert power (Politis, 2005):

- This person is an expert at his/her job.
- This person gives me good technical suggestions.
- My coworker shares with me his/her considerable experience and/or training.
- My coworker provides me with sound job-related advice.
- My coworker provides me with needed technical knowledge.

Corresponding author
Robert Zinko can be contacted at: robert.zinko@newcastle.edu.au