2017

An evaluation of the impact of event attendance on perceptions of the host organisation's reputation: a university case study

Angliss, Katie

Copyright statement

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior consent.

An evaluation of the impact of event attendance on perceptions of the

host organisation's reputation: a university case study

By

KATIE ANGLISS

A thesis submitted to Plymouth University in partial fulfilment for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Tourism and Hospitality, Plymouth University

March 2017

Volume 2 of 2

12 Appendices

Contents

Table of tables

Appendix 1 - Image and reputation definitions

Table 12.1 Image vs reputation definitions (adapted from Gotsi and Wilson (2001b))

Author/ reference	Definition of image/ reputation
Analogous School of thought	
Martineau (1958)	Regarded the term image as the functional qualities and psychological attributes that exist in the mind of the consumer
Boulding (1973)	Image as subjective knowledge
Kennedy (1977)	Views corporate image as synonymous with corporate reputation
Kennedy (1977: 124)	An image, whether of a product or a company takes many years to cultivate'
Crissy (1971: 77)	Corporate image as 'an aggregate stimulus value'
Gray and Balmer (1998)	Corporate image as the immediate mental picture that audiences have of an organisation
Dowling (1993) + Ditcher (1985: 75)	Image as the total impression of a company
Bernstein (1984)	Reputation is a term loosely trading places with images
Dutton et al (1994)	Corporate reputation represents outside members' perception of corporate image
Alvesson (1998: 98)	A company's image is a 'comprehensive summarised picture of the company held by a certain section of the environment'
Ind (1997: 21)	Corporate image is 'the picture that an audience has of an organisation through accumulation of all received messages'
Differentiated School of thought	
Kotler (…)	Image is a set of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person holds of an object'
Webster dictionary	An image is a reproduction or imitation of a person or thing
Balmer (1997)	Corporate image is mainly based on negative associations
Bernstein (1984) and Grunig (1993)	Corporate image can mean the falsehood or opposite to reality
Olins (1989)	Corporate image implies manipulation
Bernstein (1984)	A corporate image is manufactured and hence not a true reflection of the company's reality.
O'Sullivan (1983)	Original meaning of image has been equated with a visual representation of reality, and now commonly refers to a fabrication or public impression created to appeal to the audience rather than to reproduce reality.
Normann's (1984)	Corporate image should not be related to falsehood or imitations of reality
Boulding (1973)	Image as a mental representation of reality/ image represents a model of our beliefs and understanding of a phenomenon or situation

Author/ reference	Definition of image/ reputation
Barich and Kotler (1991)	An image represents the sum of beliefs, attitudes and impressions that a person or group has of an object
Fombrun (1996: 72)	Corporate reputation is a snapshot that reconciles the multiple images of a company held by all its constituencies'
Saxton (1998: 396)	Corporate reputation is the reflection of an organisation over time as seen through their thoughts and words'
Fombrun (1996: 3)	A reputation embodies the history of other peoples' experience with a service provider'
Gotsi and Wilson (2001: 29)	A corporate reputation is a stakeholder's overall evaluation of a company over time. This evaluation is based on the stakeholder's direct experiences with the company, any other form of communication and symbolism that provides information about the firm's actions and/or a comparison with the actions of other leading rivals.
Weigelt and Camerer (1988)	Corporate reputation is a set of economic and non-economic attributes ascribed to a firm, inferred from the firm's past actions.
Yoon et al (1993)	A company's reputation reflects the history of its past actions.
Levitt (1965)	Reputation is a combination of a number of attributes form a buyer's perception that consists of the extent to which a company is well-known, good or bad, reliable, trustworthy, reputable and believable
Martick and Fill (1997)	Identity is the 'organisation's presentation of itself to its various stakeholders and the means by which it distinguishes itself from all other organisations'
Bromley (2001)	Image is the internal collective state of mind that underlies its corporate communications efforts to present itself to others
Whetten and Mackey (2002: 401)	Image is what organisational agents want their external stakeholders to understand is most central, enduring and distinctive about their organisation.
Fombrun (1996: 36)	Identity is the set of values and principles employees and manages associate with the company
Barnett, Jermier and Lafferty (2006:34)	Observers' collective judgements of a corporation based on assessments of the financial social and environmental impacts attributed to the corporation over time.
Fombrun and Rindova (1996)	A corporate reputation is a collective representation of a firm's past action and results that describes the firm's ability to deliver valued outcomes to multiple stakeholders. It gauges a firm's relative standing both internally with employees and externally with its stakeholders, in both its competitive and institutional environments.

Appendix 2 - Differing interpretations of Corporate Identity

Table 12.2 Differing interpretations of corporate identity (Alessandri, 2001, p.175)

Author(s)	Year	Definition of corporate identity
Abratt	1989	A set of visual cues - physical and behavioural - that makes a firm recognizable and distinguishes it from others. These cues are used to represent or symbolize the company
Ackerman	1988	A firm's unique capabilities
Balmer	1993	A fusion of strategy, behaviour (culture) and communications. It is not the preserve of any one management discipline, but instead draws from several. It comes into being when there is a common ownership of an organization's philosophy
Balmer and Soenen	1997	It encompasses 3 core dimensions: the mind, the soul and the voice. The mind is the product of conscious decisions. The soul results from subjective elements such as the firm's distinct corporate values and the sub-cultures present in the firm. The voice represents all of the ways the firm communicates
Carls	1989	Corporate identity is "active" and visual consistency is more of an "attitude" than a "rigid set of rules". The corporate identity program is a series of compatible but not uniform images
Gioia et al.	2000	The consistent and targeted representations of the firm with an emphasis on corporate symbols and logos. It is strategic and applied both internally and externally
Gray and Balmer	1998	The reality - the distinct characteristics - of the firm
Gregory and Wiechmann	1999	The planned visual elements that distinguish one firm from all others
Hawn	1998	Identity is what the firm is. Image is how the firm is perceived. A corporate identity program is the visual melding of identity and image
Lambert	1989	All the distinctive manifestations of a firm
Leitch	1999	Both corporate identity and "logo-centrism" see identity as something that can be constructed - therefore controlled - by the firm
Leuthesser and Kohli	1997	The ways an organization reveals its philosophy and strategy through communication, behaviour and symbolism
Margulies	1977	All the ways a company chooses to identify itself to all its stakeholders - the community, customers, employees, the press, present and potential stockholders, security analysts and investment bankers
Markwick and Fill	1997	The firm's presentation of itself to stakeholders and the ways it distinguishes itself from all other firms through a variety of cues. It represents how the organization would like to be perceived and can include corporate identity programs, advertising, dress codes and standards of customer contact. Some of the cues will be part of the visual identity. Some will focus on behaviour
Olins	1990	"Consists of the explicit management of some or all of the ways in which the company's activities are perceived. It can project three things: who you are, what you do, how you do it"
Portugal and Halloran	1986	The comprehensive and orchestrated presentation of what a firm is, where it is going and how it is different. Corporate identity is the communicated essence of the firm
Schmitt et al.	1995	The degree to which the firm has achieved a distinct and coherent image in its aesthetic output

Author(s)	Year	Definition of corporate identity
Topalian	1984	Articulates what the firm is, what it stands for and what it does. Corporate identities are projected and are largely under the control of the host organizations
van Rekom	1997	"The set of meanings by which an object allows itself to be known and through which it allows people to describe, remember and relate to it"
van Riel and Balmer	1997	Indicates the way a company presents itself through behaviour, as well as through symbolism, to internal and external audiences. It is rooted in the behaviour of individual firm members, expressing the firm's "sameness over time", "distinctiveness", and "centrality"

Appendix 3 – Event motivation studies

Table 12.3 Event motivation studies

Authors (year)	Main aim of research	Motivation dimensions	Event
Wann (1995)	Motivations for attending a sports event	escape, "eustress" (i.e. stress evoked by emotions or events, here considered to be positive stimulation), aesthetics (appreciation of the beauty of sports), self-esteem, group affiliation, family, entertainment and economic	
Wann, Schrader, and Wilson (1999)	Motivations for attending a sports event	escape, "eustress" (i.e. stress evoked by emotions or events, here considered to be positive stimulation), aesthetics (appreciation of the beauty of sports), self-esteem, group affiliation, family, entertainment and economic	
Schofield (1983)	Motivations to attend men's sport	economic variables, demographic variables, game attractiveness variables, residual variables	
Kim, Uysal & Chen (2001)	Data collected from the festival and event organizers	Social/Leisure, Event Novelty, Family Togetherness, Escape, and Curiosity	Commonwealth of Virginia in 1998.
Lee et al. (2002)		push dimensions: escape and getaway, novelty seeking, relaxing, bragging about trip, hedonism and family togetherness; pull dimensions: environment and safety, nature/ecological sites, ease and vale, art/culture and shopping, climate, unique people and outdoor activity for family.	
Jang and Cai's (2002) found five	Study of British tourist motivation to travel to seven long haul destinations	push dimensions: novel experience, escape, knowledge seeking, fun and excitement, rest and relaxation, and family and friend togetherness; pull dimensions: natural and historic environment, cleanliness and safety, easy-to-access and economical deal, outdoor activities, and sunny and exotic atmosphere.	
Lee, Lee & Wicks (2004)	Segments customer market based on motivations Importance of motivation in influencing overall satisfaction	Cultural exploration, family togetherness, novelty, escape, event attractions, and socialization.	2002 World Culture Expo
Zyl & Botha, 2004		Family togetherness, socialization, escape, event novelty, community pride, self-esteem, entertainment, food and beverages, information and marketing, transport	National art festival

Authors (year)	Main aim of research	Motivation dimensions	Event
Ferreira, Armstrong (2004)	Examines students decisions to attend college sports event	Cost, game attractiveness, free offerings and promotion, pregame and in-game entertainment, facility, convenience and accessibility, physical contact and popularity of sport	Hockey & Basketball match
Yuan, Cai, Morrison, & Linton, 2005		Festival and escape, wine, socialization, family togetherness	Regional wine and food festival
Bowen & Daniels, 2005		Discovery, music, enjoyment	Regional music festival
Kim, Borges & Chon (2006)		Family Togetherness, Socialization, Site Attraction, Festival Attraction, and Escape from Routine.	International Festival of Environmental Film and Video (FICA) Brazil
Chang, 2006		Equilibrium recovery, festival participation and learning, novelty seeking, socialization, cultural exploration	Aboriginal cultural event
Schofield & Thompson (2007)	Visitor motivation for attending the 2005 Naadam Festival in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia	Cultural exploration, togetherness (with family and friends), socialisation, sports attraction, local special events	2005 Naadam Festival in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
Severt, Wang, Chen & Brieiter (2007)	Motivation and behavioural intentions of convention attendees	Activities and opportunities, networking, convenience of conference, education benefits, products and deals	Conference in South-East United States
Snelgrove et al. (2008)	Compared the fan motivation, leisure motivation, and identification with the subculture of athletics	Learning Athletics, Learning destination, Social, Escape, Entertainment, Aesthetics, Vicarious Achieve	2005 Pan American Junior Athletics Championships
Meng, Tepano & Uysal (2008)	Measures tourist satisfaction by motivation	Activities for seeing and doing, relaxation/familiarity, family/friend togetherness, novelty/ romance	Nature-based resort; South-East Virginia
Thompson & Schofield (2009)	Visitor motivation for attending the 2005 Naadam Festival in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia	Cultural exploration, togetherness (with family and friends), socialisation, sports attraction, local special events	2005 Naadam Festival in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

Authors (year)	Main aim of research	Motivation dimensions	Event
Li, Huang & Cai (2009)	Examines the motivation of the attendees	escape, novelty, nostalgia and patriotism, event excitement, family togetherness, and socialization	2006 Rural community-based festival in Indiana
Gelder & Robinson (2009)	Comparison of visitor motivations for attending music festivals	Socializing With Friends/Family, Music or Artist Playing, Novelty or Excitement, General Entertainment, Escape Everyday Life, Cultural Exploration	Glastonbury and V-Festival
Lee & Beeler (2009)	Examines the relative weights of motivation, involvement, service quality, and demographics on satisfaction and future intention	Novelty, Reminiscence, Family togetherness, Escaping from boredom, Fun with friends	Tallahassee's 19th Annual Winter Festival in 2005
Smith & Costello (2009)	Event attendees segmented on the basis of push motivations	food event, event novelty, and socialization	International Barbeque Competition, Memphis
Pegg & Patterson (2010)		Friends/family, Love country music, Business/professional reasons, country Music Awards, Always wanted to come, Chance to meet stars, Annual holiday, Line dancing	Tamworth Country Music Festival
Devesa, Laguna & Palacios (2010)	Investigates relationship between motivation and satisfaction	Visitor looking for tranquillity, rest and contact with nature; cultural visitor; Proximity, gastronomic and nature visitor; return tourist	Rural destination in Spain
Petrick, Bennett & Tsuji (2013)	Measures event attendees evaluation of event to determine loyalty	Music and concerts, festival village, athletes and competition	The Dew Action Sports Tour; USA
Lee, Kang & Lee (2013)	Examine the motives of Chinese nationals who attended the Expo 2010 in Shanghai, China		Expo 2010, Shanghai

Authors (year)	Main aim of research	Motivation dimensions	Event
Duran & Hamerat (2014)	Investigate underlying motivational dimensions of visitors attending the International Troia Festival (ITF)	Family togetherness, cultural exploration, event attraction, escape and excitement,	International Troia Festival (ITF); Turkey
Li & Wood (2016)	Motivations for attending a music festival	Spiritual escape, spiritual pursuit, togetherness, love of the music, novel experience, music sharing, educational enrichment	Midi music festival

Appendix 4 - Ethics Application

		(For FREC use only) Application No:	
RESEARCH WITH PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	**Faculty of Business Academic Partnerships** **Faculty Research Ethics Committee** **APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL OF RESEARCH**	Chairs action (expedited)	Yes/ No
		Risk level -if high refer to UREC chair immediately Cont. Review Date	High/ low / /
		Outcome (delete)	Approved/ Declined/ Amend/ Withdrawn

1.	**Investigator/student** *Note:1* Katie Angliss	Student - *please name your Director of Studies or Project Advisor*: Nigel Jackson, Steve Butts and Course/Programme: MPhil/PhD Tourism and Hospitality
	Contact Address: 341 Cookworthy Building, Plymouth University, Plymouth, PL4 8AA	
	Tel: 01752 588029	Email: Katie.angliss@plymouth.ac.uk
2.	**Title of Research:** An evaluation of an organisation's reputation by event attendees: a university case study	
3.	**Nature of approval sought** (Please tick relevant boxes) *Note:2* a) PROJECT: ☑ b) PROGRAMME ☐ (max 3 years) *If a) then please indicate which category:* <table><tr><td>Funded/unfunded Research (*staff)*</td><td></td><td>Undergraduate</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>MPhil/PhD, ResM, BClin Sci</td><td>✓</td><td>Or Other *(please state)*</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Masters</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	
4.	**Funding:** a) Funding body (if any): Funded by School of Tourism and Hospitality as a part of a Doctoral Teaching Assistant contract	

	b) If funded, please state any ethical implications of the source of funding, including any reputational risks for the university and how they have been addressed. *Note: 3 :* ethical standards the same as Plymouth University
5.	a) Duration of project/programme: b) Dates: Jan 2013 – Dec 2017 *Note: 4* 5 years

6.	Has this project received ethical approval from another Ethics Committee? ~~Y~~/N
	   a) Please write committee name:
	   b) Are you therefore only applying for Chair's action now? Yes / No

7.	**Attachments** (if required)
	
	   a) Application/Clearance Form ~~Yes~~ / No
	   b) Information sheets for participants Yes / ~~No~~
	   c) Consent forms (*included in information sheet*) Yes / ~~No~~
	   d) Continuing review approval (if requested) ~~Yes~~ / No
	   e) Other, please state:

1. Principal Investigators are responsible for ensuring that all staff employed on projects (including research assistants, technicians and clerical staff) act in accordance with the University's ethical principles, the design of the research described in this proposal and any conditions attached to its approval.
2. In most cases, approval should be sought individually for each project. Programme approval is granted for research which comprises an ongoing set of studies or investigations utilising the same methods and methodology and where the precise number and timing of such studies cannot be specified in advance. Such approval is normally appropriate only for ongoing, and typically unfunded, scholarly research activity.
3. If there is a difference in ethical standards between the University's policy and those of the relevant professional body or research sponsor, Committees shall apply whichever is considered the highest standard of ethical practice.
4. Approval is granted for the duration of projects or for a maximum of three years in the case of programmes. Further approval is necessary for any extension of programmes.

8.	**Aims and Objectives of Research Project/Programme:**
	
	Aim:
	To *contribute to the knowledge* of events management by developing a reputation-based typology of university events through establishing the extent events impact on a host organisation's reputation
	
	Objectives:
	   1. To confirm characteristics of Plymouth University's reputation by assigning value to reputation attributes
	   2. To establish the role of university events as a strategic communication tool
	   3. To analyse to what degree levels of event exposure influences event attendees' reputational insights
	   4. To evaluate event attendees' perception of a university's reputation

	5. To develop a typology to measure a university's reputation based on the perceptions of event attendees
9.	**Brief Description of Research Methods and Procedures:** This project aims to use both quantitative and qualitative methods in the form of semi-structured interviews as well as a questionnaire. The interviews will be with senior management of Plymouth University who are involved with the implementation of events within the university. The interviewees will be emailed requesting for them to take part in the research. Five candidates have been identified to interview. These interviews are estimated to last between 30-45 minutes and will be used to determine the strategic purpose of holding university events, as well as to identify events to be used to target respondents for the questionnaire. It is anticipated approximately 50 events will be selected of varying size and audience. The questionnaire aims to confirm characteristics of reputation as well as evaluate event attendees' perception of the University's overall reputation. The questionnaire will be administered electronically for those events that have a contact list. Permission to access the contact list will be requested from the event owner – these details will be used for no other purpose other than sending the research questionnaire. It is anticipated that not all events identified will have a contact list for their attendees; therefore, permission to attend the event will be requested from the event owner, to request attendees complete the questionnaire in person. The population size is yet to be determined as it is dependent on the events that are selected within the interview stage however, it is anticipated to be in the region of 5000-10000 possible event attendees. The population size is the total number of possible event attendees from the events selected during interview stage. While the sample size is the number of questionnaire respondents I need in order to gain significance. The minimum sample size, in order to gain significance, will be calculated with a minimum of 95% confidence level, with a 5% confidence interval. Therefor for a population size of 5000 event attendees, I will need to gain a minimum of 357 respondents in order to gain significance. *Specify subject populations and recruitment method. Please indicate also any ethically sensitive aspects of the methods. Continue on attached sheets if required.*
10.	**Ethical Protocol:**

Please indicate how you will ensure this research conforms with each clause of the University of Plymouth's *Principles for Research Involving Human Participants.* Please attach a statement which addresses each of the ethical principles set out below.

Informed Consent:

(a) An information sheet detailing the research aims, methodology and outcome(s), as well as summarising core aspects of the ethics approval (e.g. security, withdrawal, debriefing and confidentiality) has been created, and will be shown to all participants prior to taking part in this research project appendix 1

(b) Draft copies of information sheets and consent forms intended for participants can be seen in appendix 1.

Openness and Honesty:

(a) There are no reasons to withhold information from participants about the purpose and application of this research. The researcher will be open and honest with participants at all stages of this research.

(b) Participants will be provided with an information sheet that will contain details regarding the research. This will include the researchers contact details, inviting participants to contact the researchers if they have any questions relating to the research.

Note that deception is permissible only where it can be shown that all three conditions specified in Section 2 of the University of Plymouth's Ethical Principles have been made in full. Proposers are required to provide a detailed justification and to supply the names of two independent assessors whom the Sub-Committee can approach for advice.

Right to Withdraw:

(a) Staff participation in the interviews is voluntary and participants have the right to withdraw their data from their interview at any time before **1 January 2015** without prejudice. This means that whether they decide to participate or not will not affect their relationship with the researcher or university in any way.

(b) Please note that after **1 January 2015**, due to anonymity of data for the purposes of data analysis, any contributions made will not be able to be withdrawn as it would be difficult to identify individual responses.

(c) Event attendee participation in completing the questionnaire is voluntary and participants have the right to withdraw any time prior to submitting their questionnaire. Due to the anonymity of their responses I will not be able to withdraw any contributions made as it would be difficult to identify individual responses.

Note that this section should also clarify that participant's data will be destroyed should they withdraw, in accordance with best practice.

Protection from Harm:

(a) It is not anticipated that this research will cause participants any harm, and potential participants will be given sufficient information to enable

them to make an informed decision regarding their contribution to this research.

(b) To avoid any potential harm to the researcher as a lone PhD researcher, the interviews will be conducted at a time and in a place considered safe by both the interviewer and the interviewee. The details of these interviews (timings and whereabouts) will be shared with the project supervisors as well as a colleague.

Debriefing:

a) Participants will be provided with details explaining the aims, methods and intended outcomes of the research. Names and appropriate contact details of the researcher will also be made available for those participants wanting to gain more information about the project.

Confidentiality:

(a) Participants taking part in the interviews (staff members) will be provided a participant number when completing the interview transcripts so as to not identify who said what. Staff members will be asked permission to record the interview in order to transcribe information at a later stage.
(b) Event attendees completing the questionnaire will not be requested to provide their names or contact details when completing the questionnaire. This will ensure confidentiality of responses when analysing the data.
(c) All research data will be kept electronically for 10 years within an encrypted file. An electronic copy of any paper based research will be created, with the original paper documents destroyed confidentially.
(d) The sample population will be referred to as: event organisers and event attendees
(e) The sample size is expected to be 5 staff members, and approximately 5000-10,000 event attendee's dependent on events selected during the interview stage

(a) Professional Bodies Whose Ethical Policies Apply to this Research: "SRA" or similar Professional Bodies

The committee strongly recommends that prior to application, applicants consult an appropriate professional code of ethics regardless of whether or not they are members of that body (for example, Social Research Association . http://www.the-sra.org.uk/ethical.htm Market Research Society http://www.mrs.org.uk/standards/codeconduct.htm British Sociological Association http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/). Applicants MAY choose to write "not applicable" in the "Relevant Professional Bodies" section of the Ethical Application Form. However, it is very rare that there would be no professional/academic code of ethics relevant to a given research project. If based on the information written in other sections of the form, FREC considers a particular professional code to be of relevance, then the Committee may make its consultation and adherence a condition of acceptance.

11. **Declaration*:**

To the best of our knowledge and belief, this research conforms to the ethical principles laid down by Plymouth University and by the professional body specified in 6 (g).

	Name	E-mail (s)	Date
Principal Investigator:	Katie Angliss	Katie.angliss@plymouth.ac.uk	16/10/14
Other Staff Investigators:			
Director of Studies (only where Principal Investigator is a postgraduate student):	Dr Nigel Jackson	Nigel.jackson@plymouth.ac.uk	16/10/14

*You will be notified by the Research Ethical Approval Committee once your application is approved.

Appendix 5 - Information sheet for Interviewees

Project title:

An evaluation of an organisation's reputation by event attendees: a University case study

What is this project about?

The aim of this research is to develop a tool to measure a university's overall reputation based on the perceptions of a variety of audiences who attend university events. This will be achieved by, seeking the purpose of using events as a method of communicating to their audiences and, analysing whether attending events alters people's perceptions of the university's reputation.
There are two stages to the research: interviews with University staff and questionnaires sent to event attendees.

You are invited to participate in this research because you are a member of senior management at Plymouth University.

How will the data be collected?
Staff interview
I would like to seek your assistance as a member of senior management at Plymouth University who is involved with the strategic decision process of holding events at the university. The purpose of the interview is to determine the strategic purpose of holding events at Plymouth University. You will also be requested to identify 10 events within your area that can be used as within the research, in order to access event attendees to complete the questionnaire. The interview is estimated to last between 30-45 minutes.

Event attendee Questionnaire:
Event attendees are requested to complete a questionnaire that will either be emailed to them following attendance at/ or administered during an identified event. The purpose of the questionnaire is to confirm characteristics of reputation, as well as for the attendee to evaluate the university's overall reputation. The questionnaires will be anonymous as respondents will not be requested to complete their personal details.

Dissemination of findings:
- PhD publication
- Peer reviewed journal articles
- Presentation at selected conferences
- Plymouth University report of findings

Who am I?
The project will be undertaken by:

- Katie Angliss, Doctoral Teaching Assistant, School of Tourism and Hospitatlity, Plymouth University

This research study forms part of a PhD I am completing as part of the School of Tourism and Hospitality with Plymouth University. I intend to publish and disseminate the findings by publishing the completed PhD, submitting articles to peer reviewed journal, presenting at selected conferences as well as report of finding to Plymouth University.

Confidentiality

All collected data will be kept confidential and only used for the purposes identified above. In any documents / material I produce I endeavour to protect your identity, names of participants will not be included and every effort will be made to ensure that participants are not identifiable. In preparation for the data collection participants will be requested not to reveal / discuss

- any information or conversations outside of the data collection situation,
- the subject of the discussions or
- the identities of other participants.

However, the small number of participants involved in this research may limit the extent to which we can ensure anonymity. Any data, including audio-recordings, will be kept securely for a period of 10 years after the completion of the project according to University guidelines and then destroyed.

Informed consent and the right to withdraw

The information I will seek / questions I will ask you to address during any data collection relate to your perceptions of the university's reputation and the use of events. Participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time before 1 January 2015 without prejudice. To withdraw, contact the project lead, Katie Angliss (Katie.angliss@plymouth.ac.uk)

Furthermore, you have the right to leave at any time during a data collection process or not to answer any questions. You may also request the audio recording or note-taking to cease at any time.

Feedback

Please don't hesitate to contact me at any time if you have questions regarding the informed consent or this research study. Furthermore, you may obtain information on my progress / request copies of any outputs produced at any time from Katie Angliss (Katie.angliss@plymouth.ac.uk).

For further information, please contact Katie via email. If you agree to take part, please sign the consent form below – many thanks!

Appendix 6 - Example participant consent form (Interviewees)

Permission

I have read and understand the information sheet and the conditions of this project. I have read and understand what you want me to do for this study, and my right to withdraw. I hereby voluntarily agree to participate in this project. I may withdraw my consent at any time during this phase of the project and before or during any of the data collection processes without penalty.

Name of Participant:

I would like to participate in the interview: Yes / No

I am happy for the interview to be recorded: Yes / No

The dates and times I am available for interview are:

Signature:

Date:

Appendix 6 - Example participant consent form (Interviewees)

Appendix 7 - Information sheet for event attendees

Project title:

An evaluation of an organisation's reputation by event attendees: a University case study

What is this project about?

The aim of this research is to develop a tool to measure a university's overall reputation based on the perceptions of a variety of audiences who attend university events. This will be achieved by, seeking the purpose of using events as a method of communicating to their audiences and, analysing whether attending events alters people's perceptions of the university's reputation.

There are two stages to the research: interviews with University staff and questionnaires sent to event attendees.

You are invited to participate in this research because you have attended a selected event at Plymouth University.

How will the data be collected?

Event attendee Questionnaire:
Event attendees are requested to complete a questionnaire that will either be emailed to them following attendance at/ or administered during an identified event. The purpose of the questionnaire is to confirm characteristics of reputation and rank them in order of importance. You will also be asked to evaluate the university's overall reputation based on a set of characteristics. The questionnaires will be anonymous as respondents will not be requested to complete their personal details. The questionnaire should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete.

Dissemination of findings:
- PhD publication
- Peer reviewed journal articles
- Presentation at selected conferences
- Plymouth University report of findings

Who am I?
The project will be undertaken by:
- Katie Angliss, Doctoral Teaching Assistant, School of Tourism and Hospitatlity, Plymouth University

This research study forms part of a PhD I am completing as part of the School of Tourism and Hospitality with Plymouth University. I intend to publish and disseminate the findings by publishing the completed PhD, submitting articles to peer reviewed journal, presenting at selected conferences as well as report of finding to Plymouth University.

Confidentiality

All contact details and collected data will be kept confidential and only used for the purposes identified above. In any documents / material I produce I endeavour to protect your identity, names of participants will not be included and every effort will be made to ensure that participants are not identifiable. In preparation for the data collection participants will be requested not to reveal / discuss

- any information or conversations outside of the data collection situation,
- the identities of other participants.

Any data collected and contact details will be kept securely for a period of 10 years after the completion of the project according to University guidelines and then destroyed.

Informed consent and the right to withdraw

The information I will seek / questions I will ask you to address during any data collection relate to your perceptions of the university's reputation and the use of events. Participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time prior to submitting the questionnaire without prejudice. The questionnaires will be anonymous as you will not be requested to complete your personal details; therefore it will not be possible to withdraw any questionnaire responses after they are submitted.

Furthermore, you have the right to stop completing the questionnaire at any time or not to answer any questions.

Feedback

Please don't hesitate to contact me at any time if you have questions regarding the informed consent or this research study. Furthermore, you may obtain information on my progress / request copies of any outputs produced at any time from Katie Angliss (Katie.angliss@plymouth.ac.uk).

Permission

I have read and understand the information sheet and the conditions of this project. I have read and understand what you want me to do for this study, and my right to withdraw. I hereby voluntarily agree to participate in this project. I may withdraw my consent at any time during this phase of the project and before or during any of the data collection processes without penalty.

By completing the questionnaire you agree to take part in the research project.

For further information, please contact Katie via email.

Informed consent: An information sheet detailing the research aims, methodology and outcome(s), as well as summarising core aspects of the ethics approval (e.g. security, withdrawal, debriefing and confidentiality) was created, and available to all participants taking part.

The email sent to event attendees summarised key points of the information sheet, providing contact details should the participant seek additional information about the research project

Openness and honesty: the researcher was open and honest with participants at all stages of research

Right to withdraw: Participation in the interviews was voluntary and participants were given the right to withdraw their interview responses at any time before a specified date. This was due to responses being anonymised, and as a result their responses would not have been identifiable. Interview participants were informed that taking part or not, would in no way affect their relationship with the researcher or university in any way.

Event attendee participation in completing the questionnaire was voluntary and participants were given the right to withdraw any time prior to submitting their questionnaire. Due to the anonymity of responses, submitted questionnaires were unable to be withdrawn as it would have been difficult to identify individual responses.

Protection from harm: It was not anticipated that this research would cause participants any harm, and participants were given sufficient information to enable them to make an informed decision regarding their contribution to this research.

To avoid any potential harm to the researcher as a lone PhD researcher, the interviews were conducted at a time and in a place considered safe by both the interviewer and the interviewee. The details of those interviews (timings and whereabouts) were shared with the project supervisors as well as a colleague.

Debriefing: Participants were provided with details explaining the aims, methods and intended outcomes of the research. Names and appropriate contact details of the researcher will also be made available for those participants wanting to gain more information about the project.

Confidentiality: Participants taking part in the interviews (staff members) were provided a participant number when completing the interview transcripts so as to not identify who said what. Staff members were asked for permission to record the interview in order for the information to be transcribed.

Event attendees completing the questionnaire were not be requested to provide their names or contact details when completing the questionnaire. This ensured confidentiality of responses when analysing the data.

All research data will be kept electronically for 10 years within an encrypted file. An electronic copy of any paper based research will be created, with the original paper documents destroyed confidentially as per the ethical guidelines.

1. How would you describe your role in terms of University events
   a. What involvement do you have with University events?
2. How would you define reputation?
3. What reputation does the university want to get across to its stakeholders?
   a. Who decides this? and how is it addressed?
4. How important is reputation to PU?
5. How does the university measure their reputation?
6. Who/ which stakeholders do you think have the greatest influence on the university's reputation? Why?
   a. Which stakeholder do you think have the best perceptions of the organisation's reputation? Why?
7. What characteristics do you think influence a university's overall/general reputation?
8. What reputation building activities does the university engage with?
9. How are events used to influence reputation?
10. What types of events does PU run?
    a. Are all university run events designed with a reputational purpose?
11. Why does PU hold these events?
    a. Are the events used to deliver a strategic message? (Link to agenda setting?)
       i. What message does the university want to get across? Does the message change for different events?
    b. What outcome does the university want to achieve by engaging stakeholders at events?
12. Which events/ event type do you feel impacts the university's reputation the most?
    a. How do you think these events influence the reputation?
13. In your opinion, what specific events that the university runs are, from a strategic point of view, most important to the university? (up to 10)
14. How do you think events have impacted on the university's reputation so far?
    a. Where do you think the university's reputation is going in terms of events?
15. How does the university intend on using events to influence its future reputation?
16. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix 9 – Inductive and Deductive Coding Sheet

Inductive Codes		Deductive Codes
Main theme	**Sub- theme**	**Sub- themes emerging from inductive codes**
Reputation	Reputation Characteristics	Facilities, Taking Opportunities, Campus, Research, Community Engagement, Location, Sustainability, Accessibility, Enterprising, ROI, Student Experience, Teaching, Performance, Community, Employability, Winning Awards, Transparency, Visibility
	Reputation Building Activities	Putting words into actions, Experiencing the university, Secondary or third-party events, relationships, Celebrity endorsements, Showcasing the university
	Reputation Measures	
	University Reputation	Reputation Impact, Takes time to build, Future prospects, importance to the university
	Reputation Definitions	Bad Reputations,
Events	Purpose of Events	
	Event Types	
	Event Characteristics	Event operations, Event Quality, Service Characteristics,
	Event Impact	Importance of events
Communication	Types of Communication	Events as a communications tool, Word of Mouth (Internal & External), Digital media (Social media & Website), Written Communication, Media, Sponsorship,
	University Communication	Strategy 2020, Top-down communication
	Purpose of Communication	Sharing information, Top-down communication
Stakeholders	Types of Stakeholders	Partnerships
	University Structure	

Appendix 10 - Pilot survey responses

Table 12.4 Pilot survey responses

Questions\Respondents	Community member	Staff	Staff		Staff	Student	Alumni
What the survey was accessed on	Desktop PC	PC, Chrome.	pc and chrome		I accessed it on a laptop, through internet explorer.	Laptop, Chrome	I accessed it on an iPhone
How long the survey took to complete	15 Mins	About 15 mins, but I was interrupted a couple of times!	15 mins (because I was typing as I went)			about 10-15 mins	15-20 minutes
If the meaning of all questions were clear	Yes, completely understood them and not too simple. Better to be clear than not.	Generally easy	yes		I found it difficult to define reputation.		It was clear how to answer the questions
To check for spelling or grammatical errors	none noticed	Q28 I think there was a typo – 'better dresses staff'? or was that an order?!	University should start with a capital U (where it represents the words Plymouth University e.g. where did you find information on the University?)		Watch the use of capitals. Some question options have them, and some don't (e.g. Q10 – Workplace Environment, Q11 – Enterprise agenda). Keep it consistent.	Q28. Better DRESSED staff (not dresses)	No typos I noticed or questions I didn't understand.

Questions\Respondents	Community member	Staff	Staff		Staff	Student	Alumni
To provide any other general comments	The only bit I noticed was one of the questions towards the end where you have xxx but I think that is to fill in on the name of an event?	Q4 doesn't give you the option of hearing both positive AND negative things – either via word of mouth, or media.	Q3. Where have/do you find your information on the University? Amend printed promotional material to include brochures	Q10. When judging a University's reputation, how important are the following characteristics to you?	Q.6 - it wanted me to choose a value for 'other' even though I didn't write anything in there.	it seems pretty good. There were a couple of issues I picked up on:	I noticed some of the questions were actually statements. For example, the final question is thanking the person for completing the questionnaire.
		Q6 confused me (not hard) as I had to tick a box on the 'any other?' box. I suspect most people will not mind this ;)	Q4. The information received from the sources below gave me the following perception of Plymouth University: Change the scale to very negative, negative, neither negative nor positive, positive, very positive	Q11. When judging a university's reputation, how important are the following characteristics to you?	Q.9 - there are 9 options, so change wording from 8 to 9.	Question 5 is easily missed… perhaps put it on a separate page?	Q43 asks for gender. The answers are male / female / other (maybe other should be changed to prefer not to say?).

Questions\Respondents	Community member	Staff	Staff		Staff	Student	Alumni
			Q5. In one sentence, how would you define the term 'reputation'?	Q12. (some repetition with Q10 and 11 – can these be consolidated to make the questionnaire shorter?)	Q.9 & 10 - I wasn't sure if products/services meant products/services offered, or the quality of output of products/services.	I think question 8 needs re-wording slightly as it confused me a little (but then I'm easily confused lol)	Q22, should perhaps say 'were' instead of 'was'?
			Q6. Change 'On what other people say about it' to 'On what people outside of the University say about it' as you have a line on attitudes of staff and students (unless you mean their behaviour and not their attitude to Plym Uni)	Q30. Did the Plymouth University event change your perception of any of the characteristics?		What was Q23 and Q37? These were just instructions as far as I could see?	Q6 will not allow you to continue unless you type something in the 'other' box and select an option. The 'other' box may not apply to all who answer it though.

Appendix 11 - Final questionnaire

RESEARCH WITH PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY

Thank you for attending Plymouth University's Graduation events. These events have been selected to take part in a PhD research project, to identify if your experience at the event has changed your perceptions of Plymouth University.

By completing the questionnaire you agree to take part in this research project. All your responses will be anonymous as you will not be asked to complete your contact details, and as such you will be unable to withdraw your questionnaire once submitted. The questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We hope you enjoyed attending this event, and look forward to seeing you again in the future.

Did you attend a Plymouth University Graduation Ceremony?

○ Yes

○ No

A bit about you...

How would you describe your relationship with Plymouth University (Please select the most appropriate)

○ Staff (Academic/ Research)   ○ Student Body (Unions - SU/ NUS)   ○ University Partner

○ Staff (Non-Academic)   ○ Community Member   ○ Parent/ Guardian/ Relative

○ Staff (Governor/ Trustee)   ○ Local Business   ○ Media (Local)

○ Student (Undergraduate)   ○ National Business   ○ Media (National)

○ Student (Postgraduate/ Research)   ○ Government (Local)   ○ Other University/ College

○ Prospective Student   ○ Government (National)   ○ Other _____

○ Alumni

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

○ Some secondary school

○ GCSE level

○ A-level

○ College/ further education

○ Vocational qualification

○ Undergraduate degree

○ Postgraduate qualification

○ Doctorate degree

What is your employment status (please select the most relevant)?

- ○ Student in part-time education
- ○ Student in full-time education
- ○ Employed part-time
- ○ Employed full-time
- ○ Self-employed
- ○ Retired
- ○ Unemployed

Do you currently live within the United Kingdom?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Which town/ city do you currently live in?

[   ]

Which country do you currently live in?

[   ]

What nationality are you?

[   ]

Gender:

- ○ Male
- ○ Female
- ○ Other

Age:

- ○ 18-24
- ○ 25-34
- ○ 35-44
- ○ 45-54
- ○ 55-64
- ○ 65+

Your experience of Plymouth University

How well do you feel you know Plymouth University?

○ Not at all
○ A little
○ Reasonably well
○ Very well

Where have/ do you find your information on the University?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time
From University emails/ letters (including event invitations)	○	○	○	○	○
University website	○	○	○	○	○
Social media (Facebook and Twitter)	○	○	○	○	○
Digital promotional material (cinema/ television/ radio adverts)	○	○	○	○	○
Printed promotional material (fliers, prospectus, banners)	○	○	○	○	○
Word-of-mouth (from staff or students)	○	○	○	○	○
Word-of-mouth (from others)	○	○	○	○	○
News stories in the media (newspapers, TV, radio)	○	○	○	○	○
Attending meetings	○	○	○	○	○
Attending events	○	○	○	○	○
Working/ studying at the university	○	○	○	○	○
Other (please specify)	○	○	○	○	○

Which of these methods would you normally use to judge a university's reputation?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time
League table rankings	○	○	○	○	○
From stories in the media	○	○	○	○	○
On what staff and students of the University say about it	○	○	○	○	○
On what people outside the University say about it	○	○	○	○	○
Attitudes/ behaviour of staff and students	○	○	○	○	○
From personal experience/ engaging with the University	○	○	○	○	○
Research output	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching methods	○	○	○	○	○
Sustainability practices	○	○	○	○	○
Engagement with the local community	○	○	○	○	○

Are there any other methods you would use to judge a university's reputation?

○ Yes

○ No

Which other methods would you use to judge a university's reputation?

[   ]

Which group of people do you think should have the biggest influence on deciding a university's reputation? Please rank your choices from most to least important (1 = most important - 11 = least important; drag and drop options into the correct order).

Staff
_____

Students
_____

Prospective Students
_____

Alumni
_____

Student Bodies (Student Union/ National Union of Students)
_____

Community Members/ Local Businesses/ Partners
_____

National Businesses
_____

Government (Local/ National)
_____

Parents/ Guardians/ Relatives of Staff/ Students
_____

Media (Local and National)
_____

Other (Please specify) [   ]

In one sentence, how would you define the term 'reputation'?

[   ]

Which of the characteristics below do you feel are most important to a university's reputation? Please rank the characteristics from most to least important (1 = most important - 9 = least important; drag and drop options into the correct order).

Vision
_____

Leadership
_____

Performance
_____

Products/ Services
_____

Workplace Environment
_____

Social Responsibility
_____

Innovation
_____

Emotional Appeal
_____

Visibility

How would you describe your opinion of Plymouth University?

Plymouth University:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Has innovative products and services	○	○	○	○	○
Is enterprising in its approach to doing business	○	○	○	○	○
Has the ability to adapt to change	○	○	○	○	○
Recognises and takes advantages of opportunities	○	○	○	○	○
Is a positive influence on the community	○	○	○	○	○
Acts sustainably in the way it does business	○	○	○	○	○
Has an attractive campus with good facilities	○	○	○	○	○
Has good employment opportunities	○	○	○	○	○
Cares about employee wellbeing	○	○	○	○	○
Is an organisation that rewards employees fairly	○	○	○	○	○
Attracts good quality students	○	○	○	○	○
Is in a good location	○	○	○	○	○
Is open and transparent	○	○	○	○	○
Behaves ethically	○	○	○	○	○

How would you describe your opinion of Plymouth University?

Plymouth University:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Has a clear vision for the future	○	○	○	○	○
Has excellent leadership	○	○	○	○	○
Is well managed	○	○	○	○	○
Is well organised in its approach to doing business	○	○	○	○	○
Stands behind its products/ services	○	○	○	○	○
Offers good quality products/ service	○	○	○	○	○
Products/services offer good value for money	○	○	○	○	○
Meets the needs of its stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○
Performs well financially	○	○	○	○	○
Has a strong academic/ research performance	○	○	○	○	○
Has high achieving students	○	○	○	○	○
Has good prospects for future growth	○	○	○	○	○
Does business fairly	○	○	○	○	○
Supports good causes	○	○	○	○	○

Are there any other characteristics that you would judge a university's reputation on?

○ Yes

○ No

Which other characteristics would you use (Please identify up to 5 additional characteristics), and how would you rate Plymouth University on these?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Characteristic 1 (Please specify)	○	○	○	○	○
Characteristic 2 (Please specify)	○	○	○	○	○
Characteristic 3 (Please specify)	○	○	○	○	○
Characteristic 4 (Please specify)	○	○	○	○	○
Characteristic 5 (Please specify)	○	○	○	○	○

How would you rate the following statements?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Plymouth University is an organisation I trust	○	○	○	○
Plymouth University is an organisation I admire	○	○	○	○
I have good feelings towards Plymouth University	○	○	○	○
I respect Plymouth University as an organisation	○	○	○	○
I think of Plymouth University favourably	○	○	○	○

How well-known do you think Plymouth University is?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Is not well-known	○	○	○	○	○
Is well-known locally	○	○	○	○	○
Is well-known in the United Kingdom	○	○	○	○	○
Is recognised world-wide	○	○	○	○	○
Is well known in my field (please tell us what area this is)	○	○	○	○	○

How many Plymouth University events have you attended?

○ This is my first event

○ 2 - 4 events

○ 5 or more events

What types of events have you previously attended (select all that are relevant)?

☐ Meetings   ☐ Graduation

☐ Conference/ symposium   ☐ Alumni event

☐ Lecture   ☐ Staff/ student briefing

☐ Celebration event (awards ceremony/ launch event etc)   ☐ Student event

☐ Community day   ☐ Other (Please specify)

☐ Open day/ Applicant day

What were your main reasons for attending the Graduation Ceremony? (Please select up to 3 choices)

☐ Acquiring information, knowledge, education   ☐ Cultural/ religious festival

☐ Leisure, fun, entertainment   ☐ Work obligation

☐ Networking with like-minded individuals   ☐ You've attended this event/ similar event before

☐ Spending time with family and friends   ☐ Nostalgia/ reliving past experiences

☐ Meeting new people   ☐ Event excitement/ atmosphere

☐ Escape from the ordinary   ☐ Draw of the event/ specific interest in the topic (please specify what this is) [_____]

Prior to attending the Graduation Ceremony, my impression of Plymouth University was:

Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	I didn't think about it
○	○	○	○	○	○

In a minimum of 3 words, what was your impression based on?

[_____]

Please answer the following questions based on your perceptions of Plymouth University **after attending the event.**

Attending the Graduation Ceremony made my opinion of Plymouth University

More favourable	Less favourable	No different
○	○	○

How would you rate the following characteristics based on your experience at the event?

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Information received prior to event	○	○	○	○
Ease of getting information while at the event	○	○	○	○
Venue and facilities	○	○	○	○
Seating/ viewing of the event	○	○	○	○
Food and drinks	○	○	○	○
Appearance of staff	○	○	○	○
Friendly and approachable staff	○	○	○	○
Staff were able to answer questions accurately	○	○	○	○
Experience while at the event	○	○	○	○
Event atmosphere/ ambiance	○	○	○	○
Engagement with other event attendees	○	○	○	○
Event achieved its promised purpose	○	○	○	○
Overall quality of event	○	○	○	○

Which of these contributed to your change of opinion the most? (Please select your top 3)

☐ Other (Please specify) [   ]   ☐ » Friendly and approachable staff

☐ » Information received prior to event   ☐ » Staff were able to answer questions accurately

☐ » Ease of getting information while at the event   ☐ » Experience while at the event

☐ » Venue and facilities   ☐ » Event atmosphere/ ambiance

☐ » Seating/ viewing of the event   ☐ » Engagement with other event attendees

☐ » Food and drinks   ☐ » Event achieved its promised purpose

☐ » Appearance of staff   ☐ » Overall quality of event

Please rank your selected choices from what influenced your change of opinion the most (1) to the least.

» Other (Please specify) [   ]

» Information received prior to event

» Ease of getting information while at the event

» Venue and facilities

» Seating/ viewing of the event

» Food and drinks

» Appearance of staff

» Friendly and approachable staff

» Staff were able to answer questions accurately

» Experience while at the event

» Event atmosphere/ ambiance

» Engagement with other event attendees

» Event achieved its promised purpose

» Overall quality of event

The event has not changed my impression of Plymouth University because:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable
I did not learn anything new about the University	○	○	○	○	○	○
I have attended many other University events	○	○	○	○	○	○
I already knew a lot about the University	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other University events I have attended have been better than this event	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other (please specify) [ ]	○	○	○	○	○	○

In what ways could the event have made your opinion of Plymouth University 'more favourable'? (Please select all that apply)

☐ Clearer information prior to the event   ☐ Friendlier and more approachable staff

☐ Better sign-posted information while at the event   ☐ Staff are more helpful and knowledgeable

☐ More suitable venue, facilities   ☐ Better event atmosphere/ ambiance

☐ More/ better seating available   ☐ More opportunity to spend time with other attendees

☐ Friendlier welcome on arrival   ☐ Event achieved its promised purpose

☐ Improved food and drinks   ☐ Overall quality of event is better

☐ Better dressed staff   ☐ Other (Please specify) [   ]

Which of your choices is the most important? (Please rank your choices from most important (1) to least important)

» Clearer information prior to the event

» Better sign-posted information while at the event

» More suitable venue, facilities

» More/ better seating available

» Friendlier welcome on arrival

» Improved food and drinks

» Better dressed staff

» Friendlier and more approachable staff

» Staff are more helpful and knowledgeable

» Better event atmosphere/ ambiance

» More opportunity to spend time with other attendees

» Event achieved its promised purpose

» Overall quality of event is better

» Other (Please specify)

Please answer the following statements based on your experience with Plymouth University

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would attend another Plymouth University event in the future	○	○	○	○	○
I feel like I know more about Plymouth University after attending one of their events	○	○	○	○	○
The more I know about Plymouth University, the better I think of it	○	○	○	○	○
I am pleased to be associated with Plymouth University	○	○	○	○	○
I would speak positively about my experience with Plymouth University	○	○	○	○	○

Overall, did the event meet your expectations?

	Far short of expectations	Short of expectations	Equals expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
The event was:	○	○	○	○	○

Overall, attending a Plymouth University event has made my opinion of it's reputation:

Much Worse	Worse	About the Same	Better	Much Better
○	○	○	○	○

Which three words would you use to describe Plymouth University's reputation?

Overall, how would you rate Plymouth University's reputation?

Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
○	○	○	○	○

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

If you would like any more information about this research please contact Dr Nigel Jackson (Director of Studies), Associate Professor (Reader) in Persuasion and Communication, at Nigel.Jackson@plymouth.ac.uk.

Appendix 12 - Example email sent to respondents

Thank you for attending Plymouth University's House of Lords Event on the 24th of July 2015. This event has been selected to take part in a PhD research project, to identify if your experience at the event has changed your perceptions of Plymouth University. We would really appreciate if you could take the time to complete the questionnaire by following the link below.

https://plymouthbusiness.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6Ed5QqqZCkzUFIp

By completing the questionnaire, you agree to take part in this research project. All your responses will be anonymous as you will not be asked to complete your contact details, and as such you will be unable to withdraw your questionnaire once submitted. The questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

If you would like any more information about this research please contact Dr Nigel Jackson (Director of Studies), Associate Professor (Reader) in Persuasion and Communication, at Nigel.Jackson@plymouth.ac.uk.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We hope you enjoyed attending this event, and look forward to seeing you again in the future.

Many thanks,

Katie Angliss

Appendix 13 - Interview analysis coding

Table 12.5 Interview Coding: Reputation

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Define reputation	Personally, I would say that reputation is defined by what people say about you. So it's the perceptions that they create about the University that defines the reputation that we have and it can vary according to different audience of course. [1]	I think that academic reputation is a very nebulous thing, it's quite difficult. It's hard won and easy lost and I think reputation in your field of study comes from your publication output and therefore then your citations that you have of those publications and what follows on from that are invitations to do various other academic jobs at other institutions like external examine other people's PhDs… I think Institutional reputation is a different thing and I think an Institutional reputation is again built by the external perceptions, so that's everything that you would put out there to say that this is what defines our Institution, what is important to us. [2]	It really comes down to what we're trying to achieve with individual projects. [3a]	Well the reputation in terms of recruitment is really about, you know the reputation of the institution and how its qualities and its strengths can be communicated out to our potential, to our stakeholders, to potential students to ensure that they're aware of the quality of the work we do here. So it's, you know it's very important to what we do. [4]	I guess reputation is, it's a bit like brand in a sense. Reputation I guess is what people first think of when they hear the name. So in terms of the reputation of Xxx University, when people think of Xxx, hear University, I guess it's the first one or 2 bullet points that pop in their head that they associate with that, that word or that institution. [5]

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
how important is reputation to Xxx University.	Oh it's critical. I think, I can't remember what it says but there's a line in the Strategy that talks about, you know maintaining our reputation in the areas that obviously, that are critical to us and there are areas of research, there are areas of student experience, employability, enterprise, sustainability that I mentioned before. These are all critical agendas that we should be developing our reputation around [1]	… I'm a firm believer in we need to recognise how good we are and we need to promote how good we are in the International League because actually our international reputation is almost more important to me than our national reputation.[2]	Well it's very important. I mean we are a modern University as you know, post 92. We're very well known in this part of the UK. I think Xxx University has a profile and stands on its own 2 feet here in the South West but when you look at the University's ambitions in that document (strategy 2020) you will note that we're not just about regional local economy we're about national and international partnerships and work, and so we've got to work hard to leverage our local reputation, if you like, the best that we can, through our various networks and contacts that have an international standing. [3a]	I mean it's very important in terms of, you know, why a student chooses to come here and particularly in an era where fees have grown. [4]	Interviewee – I guess it's one of the key determined factors that ensure our sustainability of our business. So our reputation is really of key importance I think. I think people know you by your reputation,[5]

How rep is currently measured	Now that's a really interesting question. I'll have to think about that one. I would say at a very basic level, the Press Office are pretty core to this and they will be measuring, monitoring, evaluating our reputation in terms of media coverage. So I know only some of this I'm a bit vague on but I know what they do, is they look at the advertising value equivalent (AVE), they'll ascertain whether the coverage that's been generated about the University was positive impact for our reputation or negative impact for our reputation or neither one nor the other. So yes, we do measure it in that sense. There was a reputation audit, I think they called it, that was undertaken by I think SERIO that ascertained what people's, I think it was a Perception Survey actually and that just you know, tried to understand what people's perception, internally and externally	Well I think the League Tables have been getting more and more sophisticated and they are more important because they are more sophisticated and again it depends upon which indicators you want to pull out as being the most important for us. [2]	I mean there are league table rankings, as a basic indicator that are there. Now whether that measures reputation or registers performance, I suppose they go hand in glove. From our point of view in measuring reputation it is something that we are, as I mentioned we are still looking to tighten up and get, I suppose have those tools in place to measure the impact of a particular project or an event or an activity on our profile around a particular project, for example. As an institution though I think the league tables are probably the most obvious go to point. The higher up the league tables the higher up our reputation is… [3a]	we do a lot of market research within this department, with our potential students who come to, or participate in our recruitment events ready to see what they saw as being good and what they perceived as needing more work. It doesn't focus so much on the overarching reputation of the University… we monitor our reputation in terms of how we perform in certain league tables that give, that give people a sense of what, of your help to develop our reputation, you know reputation of quality or perceived quality. [4]	Reputation is a good one, so we measure our success on a lot of things… We have quite a lot of people looking at how often we get noted on social media, how often we appear on twitter. We clearly control the press, who have been very busy of late controlling the press but we get a sense of where we appear and our Press and Media Office keep a very close log of all of those things. What's interesting about the question is I don't think I've seen for some time an analysis of where our reputation might sit on the basis of that analysis of the press stories that we've got but we have an incredibly active press office in getting stories out. We monitor very carefully what is said about us in the press, and taking analysis of that. [5]

	amongst a whole breadth of audiences was of Xxx University and of course you've got the Staff Survey which does similar, has a similar focus, obviously on staff but there are a lot of questions in there, this time around. You know reputation and branding particularly because it's not long since we've rebranded. [1]				

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
What rep does the Uni want to get across?	I would say that is our mission and our Strategy 2020, so it's about transforming lives; it's about cross University agendas such as being the Enterprise University; being a top green sustainable University and connecting and working in partnership and that includes students as partners and that whole piece differentiates this University because I think lots of Universities say this but we here actually do genuinely want to work in partnership and by working in partnership we are engaging and connecting and leveraging those more opportunities for staff, for students, for the wider community, including businesses. [1]	Well I think that the University, if you look at its mission statement and its strategy, has a number of aspirations of what it wants to be. So the current strapline being the Enterprise University and to transforming lives… but it has to be really firmly embed in its values and actually reinforced by it' actions [2]	I think it kind of goes back to the Strategy 2020 doesn't it. [3b] So it could be, I mean reputation enhancing for us is essentially about saying will this project help in delivering one of the strategic ambitions of the University. [3a] From our point of view we think by insuring that we are constantly aligning our work with projects that are strategically aligned with the University's strategy and therefore aligned with the University's strategic profile and reputation, we can play our part in driving and delivering better performance in research and student engagement as well. [3a]	it's a reputation that is, there's a mixture of elements within that reputation. I mean it's the reputation around, you know, provision of equality, a high quality educational experience but also an enriched student experience because you know, we look to promote a reputation that is not only just purely about the academic components of coming into the University but also about the breadth of the student experience that a student will get whilst they're here. So reputationally yes we want to promote the high quality research, the high quality teaching but also we want to promote very heavily within this unit also the high quality of student support and sort of extracurricular components to being a student here.	I think it wants to get across several areas of institutional mission if you like. So the first one is that we are a World leading University so I think we absolutely want the World and particularly our local community to recognise that we play on a very large global scale… and I think I guess, at the moment what we really want to be known for is our World leading education, alongside some of our pockets of excellence in research. [5]

Who sets the strategy - top down communication	Well that was the process that was embedded at the very top of the Institution… However, they pulled a top level strategic team together, which included members of SEG (Senior Executive Group) or OVC (Office of the Vice-Chancellor) and VC (Vice-Chancellor), whatever it's called, plus Deans and I believe Heads of Schools, Board of Governors. So it's really high level and they determined the strategy and then there was a period of consultation where they came out to folk like me and consulted on whether we thought the strategy was pretty cool... I have to say I think the strategy is probably the most transparent, easy to understand strategy, that you can just wherever you are in the Institution you can apply it and it works for you.	Well, that's a very good question because I think that the Senior Leadership, so that would be the Vice Chancellor and inner coterie of advisors, so that would be the Deputy Vice Chancellors and the other Senior, very Senior Leaders. So at the moment that inner group is called the Chief Executive Group but it's had various names as in the past 5 or 6 years of Vice Chancellors Executive, Office of the Vice Chancellor and they will definitely see it is their responsibility to lead the strategic discussions and to define the University's mission as that's their responsibility but it has to be done in consultation because if they define a strategy that all the people in the Institution don't understand or cannot follow or think it's a joke then you can never do it, follow it through with actions			Ok, that should be and is decided, I think, decided by the setting of our strategy and I think we can have a fairly good way of engaging people across the University and our stakeholders in our strategy setting. So if you take the Strategy 2020 which defines our mission for the next 5, 6 years and beyond that was done by a, quite a wide consultation and it builds strongly on a strategy that we had before at 2015 which again was developed from quite a wide consultation. Probably more consultation than developing 2015 strategy than 2020 and we looked just to sense check whether we're still on the right path and nudge 2020 into place but we have engaged with external stakeholders. We have engaged with all aspects of community, we've done that through Café Forums. We done that through consultation events.

					We've done that by the sub-strategy so I'll get this wrong, but in 2020 we have 4 ambitions and we have 4 enablers, that bits correct. I'm trying to think how many sub-strategies we have sitting underneath it, I think it's around 7 or 8 sub-strategies, such as internationalisations such as engagement etc. There's a teaching and learning strategy that directly sits underneath it.

What characteristics people judge rep on	consistency of message and performance I suspect would, I would put in here. So you know if we have our Strategy 2020 and it is all about partnership then let's be consistent in how we work in partnership… when we say we're going to do something, we commit to doing it, let's do it... if we say we're the Enterprise University let's give clear and a sustainable, top sustainable University, let's give consistently clear evidence of why we claim that, or have that as a top ambition	Well size is important; people recognise a certain amount of maturity that goes with size, so that's important. Its research output and its research citations as I said before are really important characteristics and that is then backed up with REF results that come out... (attracting high quality students) In terms of building a reputation with students, well, first of all it's quite interesting to note that the best students go to the best Universities and will always go to the best Universities that have the highest tariff points. So having low tariff points to entry into courses may be a way of getting bums on the seats but a way of getting mediocre bums on the seats. They're not a way of actually getting the best bums on the seats who actually will then build a reputation, it all gets better and better and better.	I think in the main, probably league tables is an easy go to on… I think there's also just the general perception, particularly those within the business community… It's not necessarily about the league tables because as far as they're concerned they've got a good performing University in their city. So for them it's more about what the University is doing and where the University is involved in the local economy... the fact we've got a good performing University in the City, would be more important to them because they can see, visibly see where the University is engaged with and what contribution the University is therefore making to the local economy. If you wanted to study Law, you know, you might want to look quite carefully at where Law is ranked in, what offering	Well it's a variety of components really and it also depends on the type of student that you're asking because it can vary from being about, purely about academic quality through to location, through to cost of living, through to accommodation provision. I think the general overarching kind of quality of the academic education here and the overarching quality of the student experience… it's about actually coming and experiencing things because reputation is one thing. You can have a reputation without anyone ever having actually been here and seen it in the flesh. We tend to find that we have much higher conversion rates from students who have actually come to the University and experienced either an event or an activity with us.	So reputation would be on its quality, so what people say about the quality of that which we deliver and that would be the quality of our research, the quality of our teaching and the quality of our engagement with the community in driving the economy largely or in driving the opportunities and access for individuals in the region and we are. I think the degree of quality is then, the degree of reach that we have in our reputation. the degree of universality of reach would be important, as a metric of reputation and generally how strong, I think there's, I don't know quite how you measure it, but somewhere being able to hold strong reputation over a period of time, and something like the sustainability reputation, rather than quick cycles of reputation getting lost. So people have a confidence of measuring the

				you have in Law, who's lecturing in Law, what alumni we have come through the University that have studied law, what makes our course. So you'd probably drill into the course. (discussing open days) I think also, the type of the City as well. We do our best to try to expose students to the City experience while they're here.		confidence of the institution and being able to sustain itself and its quota.

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Is well managed			so we've got much better at ensuring that we have Senior Representation at any event, whether it's anything from an Open Day to the launch of a new centre, Research Centre, to a conference that those academics that we've asked to play a role in leading that a bit, are well briefed and we engineer things within the event to make sure that that join-up of participants goes on so that people don't turn up and leave without engaging in any meaningful sort of dialogue.		

| **Taking advantage of opportunities** | Previously when the University ran Graduation, it was a really closed event, at the Pavilions, so we take it in a really pioneering way, stick some Marquees up on Xxx Hoe, which could potentially alienated the local community and members of the city but we included them in a whole range of different events, hinged around Graduation. In some cases invited some people to come to Graduation and it's just added massive value to our reputation. | | I think that the students themselves are [judging the university on], it's the kind of course contents; it's the academic side of that. I think the difference that our events have made, I think is possibly around mum and dad. They come onto campus, they see that the students are really well looked after, there's hospitality. We've got an army of student ambassadors that are there to look after people on the day.

[b] So when there are internal conferences, our academics are overseeing them and running them and that's an opportunity for them to put their selves, their courses, their research, you know in the shop window

So when we look at something like the IMO Secretary, who is an International Maritime organisation – huge opportunity for the University to get that right. Make sure the right | | |

			people are in the room, make sure the right people are talking to the right people. All that sort of thing has to go on. From there it could be a real great spring board to a whole stuff that we may not even see coming right now but it's about creating the conditions for all those conversations and opportunists to take place, that wouldn't otherwise happen.		

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Location	Some are on campus, some are off campus. Some are, around the World. Graduation Ceremonies, we run massive events on the Hoe. We dovetail different events into the marquees while they're up at the Hoe to make maximum use of the infrastructure that we have. Um, we take events, expertise overseas and we run graduation ceremonies. This year we did one in Hong Kong again, or run alumni events. We did one in Athens and Beijing this year as well as little local alumni events here in xxx or the region. We've even had events on the beach given our location. We'll do events on Dartmoor, in gardens of the reservoir. we're really fortunate here and we'll use our infrastructure and we use our facilities and run events that are most appropriate.	So for Xxx being one of the furthest Universities away from London we have to work doubly, trebly hard to make sure that we get people that are represented in those situations.	We do our best to try to expose students to the City experience while they're here. So we run City tours for the students and their families to jump on a bus, have a drive around town and we encourage them to get out and experience the City while they're here because you know, so central to the overall student experience I'm sure as you know here in Xxx, we are, smack bang in the middle of town, so we'll run into town when we engage, so I think that part comes in at the moment. We can't always have the best room, we can't always have the best space but what we can do is ensure that the people in the room are very well briefed.	what do you think people actually judge us on? Interviewee – Well it's a variety of components really and it also depends on the type of student that you're asking because it can vary from being about, purely about academic quality through to location, through to cost of living, through to accommodation provision. Because of our location, you know, we are at a disadvantage compared to other universities. So you know by running events it enables us to have a strong reason for people to come here and experience something and to gain access to people that they can ask questions of and you know, get to see what the University's really like.	I think from there, it's [graduation] only ever run here, been here 5, 5 and a bit years and it's only ever run on the Hoe, prior to that it was run through the Pavilions. That wasn't ever seen as a very good venue but it was also hidden away, so the Graduation could occur without the City really noticing it. You always know that it's Graduation and what we get from people is "what a fantastic place and what a fantastic venue" and of course we open it up and we invite lots of stakeholders in to share the event so they get that sense of celebration and feel a part of it and so I think that's made a major impact on our reputation.

Campus and Facilities	Any events, some are student run, some are fund raising events. Some are on campus, some are off campus. Some are, you know around the World. Graduation Ceremonies, we run massive events on the Hoe. We dovetail different events into the marquees while they're up at the Hoe to make maximum use of the infrastructure that we have. overseas and we run graduation ceremonies. This year we did one in Hong Kong again, or run alumni events. We did one in Athens and Beijing this year as well as little local alumni events here in xxx or the region. We've even had events on the beach given our location. We'll do events on Dartmoor, in gardens of the reservoir. You know, we're really fortunate here and we'll use our infrastructure and we use our facilities and run events that are most appropriate.		I think that the students themselves are [judging the university on], it's the kind of course contents; it's the academic side of that. I think the difference that our events have made, I think is possibly around mum and dad. They come onto campus, they see that the students are really well looked after, there's hospitality. We've got an army of student ambassadors that are there to look after people on the day. [b] We can't always have the best room, we can't always have the best space but what we can do is ensure that the people in the room are very well briefed... It's probably just worth and without wanting to sound like I'm contradicting myself now, when we said we can't always get the best space, we can't always get the best facilities but we do always. If we look at the approach that we take for instance with		I think we use the events that are held on campus and within Xxx, are there to specifically show and showcase what is excellent about the University. So we shouldn't have any events that are running here, even if they're run by an external body about us that isn't using and showcasing the best of the University. When we're doing events we're specifically using, so we have demonstrations, we have a variety of activity, we really engage as far as we can the academic community, we try and pull together using our best buildings. If I get any visiting Vice Chancellor or anyone else onto the campus we will try and show them around. We will pick the right route around the campus, so anything that shows what is best about the University and drives that and making sure that we've got a ready fact file

| | | | | Graduation, we were aware of the fact that the Pavilions when we were there 10 years ago, I think it was 2008 we moved to the Hoe, that wasn't the right space to do Graduation. We had to limit the number of guests that students could bring; it was, you know, they had to put their robes on at the ice rink where it was freezing cold. There was no room to do any catering. So we took the view then, if we want to enhance this event, how do we add value to this event, how do we engage more, yes, mums and dads, stakeholders – how do we bring those into that. So then that was looking at that whole approach and actually invested in marquees and putting them up on Xxx Hoe. | | If things to feed into that. |

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Research and academic performance	consistency of message and performance	at the coal-face we know what's important. We know its teaching, quality teaching and we know its quality research output that generates University reputation	So our courses have to measure up to the reputation of some of our real sort of flagship courses and measure up.		I think different stakeholders we want to say different things, I think there's always a common message. So I think we should always distil it back to "This is a University that delivers the highest quality in its research, its teaching and that it translates that into a transformation, so that our mission says "transforming lives effectively", so that we do things with impact.
Rep building - winning awards	I think if you're not out there winning awards how do people know what you're doing and you can say what you do, you can say that you know, you aspire to be a top green University but if you haven't got that accreditation that backs it up by somebody external, it's really hard to win over hearts and minds and build that knowledge and the understanding of what you stand for.				

| Rep Building - other activities | sometimes it will be through direct sponsorship. Um, we're actually buying our way into achieving some kind of reputational gain. Sometimes it will be through media, internal coms. You know you're internal champions are your best ambassadors. If you don't influence them to be saying the right sorts of things, you'll negatively impact upon your reputation. Encouraging students to talk positively about the University and what differentiates this University because obviously that then inspires other potential students to come and study here... they (partners) choose to come here because we're articulating our strategy and showcasing, you know, some of our activities. | so website is paramount and the re-design of the website is really, really important and how you handle that website is really important because now it's the first port of call for anybody making an enquiry for rebrand really. So that, that's really, really, I would say probably the number one importance. I think that we also do, or try to do local schools communication in the region, to the students we know that come from the region to try and raise that reputation a bit. I'm not sure we do that very well. There was an exciting thing which I was talking to a guy about yesterday which is being run out of the ETE unit, which is down in Sherwell. About, and this is about penetrating into schools but with exciting research snippets that come out of the University. That's the sort of way I think that we have to build... I don't think we do enough with our research reputation | I think Graduations probably a key one… but on the back of that it's about actually again just reinforcing the University's standing in the City and in the Region. It's about how we use Graduation as a way to engage VIP stakeholders in that celebration.

The Hon Doc programme is another example where you know Graduation is a fantastic opportunity to recognise the performance of key individuals through the Hon Doc programme and we will look at the Hon Doc programme quite strategically again to say "ok we could award Hon Docs to a variety of people but why". Therefore, is the Hon Doc ceremony becomes the first stepping stone in a relationship with the University in support of and one of our key project areas that we're looking to pursue. | People only know how good you are if you sort of broadcast it really and I think there's a lot more work that we can do within the institution to promote the strengths that we have here and the amazing things that go on within this University

There's a whole range of things that External Relations are involved with through the business communities, through sort of show casing events, through sponsorship of different awards. Also kind of, there's a, you know there's scholarship programmes and that kind of thing but I'm meaning sort of, you know, like a, contributing towards I don't know, Xxx's Herald Award and that kind of thing and then the pushing of general reputations through recruitment events | mostly things are about reputation gain, so I think we do very little, where we haven't considered the impact on our reputation and that's in our choice not to do things as well as I chose to do them. So, I think at the very high levels and the things that we do to build it, is make sure that we engage with strong partners that are based on our values. So we, I'd like to think that we are always values led in the kind of activities that we do. I would like to think that we're quite principle driven in the decisions that we make and the activities we engage in and that it is really about making sure that whatever we do there is a high degree of visibility of the University in those elements and that there is a clarity about what the University is doing and why it's doing it. |

		which is undoubtedly high in some areas and needs more shouting from the roof tops. We need to shout about that a lot harder.

the University had a real punt last year which was when we co-hosted in Miami the new University's forum, where we really did put on a World stage of what we are and what we're trying to do... those sorts of activities (attending international events) are actually pretty important and we have a very small international mobile team that goes around the work promoting us as an Institution.

There are a limited number of people as I say operating at government level, advising which is also raising the profile but again it's too limited.

there are events particularly in the Faculty of Arts and the in the | | | |

		Peninsula Arts and things that are being promoted through the City to try to bring people in. As a University that's providing stuff, we do do school days, when we bring school kids in and things like that. We do events on the Hoe, the events in the tents; you know have been reasonably successful in limited areas. Marine Institute does things which are very visible for their Marine Industries. Again those are important activities that you need to keep massaging and showing what we're good at			

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Rep building - putting words into actions	consistency of message and performance I suspect would, I would put in here. So you know if we have our Strategy 2020 and it is all about partnership then let's be consistent in how we work in partnership and not blow hot and cold and when we say we're going to do something, we commit to doing it, let's do it	I think that anybody can say they are the World's best university for "X", "Y" and "Z" but it has to be really firmly embed in its values and actually reinforced by it' actions and I think that's a really challenge for any University Well apart from standing up and strutting, you know that we are "X" in the league table and we're very, very good and we're doing some fantastic things here... so that you get people to think you're great, then that's building on, you know, whatever reputation you've got which is based on true sound stuff, you only maintain and build that reputation by the follow-up actions.	I think the difference now and the approach that we're taking is about the follow-up to that and about how we engage that Hon Docs going forward and how we use that, Graduation an opportunity to leverage other opportunities		

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
experiencing the university				Because of our location, you know, we are at a disadvantage compared to other universities. So you know by running events it enables us to have a strong reason for people to come here and experience something and to gain access to people that they can ask questions of and you know, get to see what the University's really like. it's a good showcase of the different; it's a showcase of the facilities. It's a showcase of things like research strengths, subject strengths because we talk about them in the talks, the welcome talks that we do, the subject talks that we do. It's exposure to current students, who are very powerful as a way of demonstrating, you know the positivity of the student experience here.	

Interviewee	1	2	3	4	5
Showcasing the university	so it's a great way of connecting partners with the University, inter-connecting partners with one another and just showcasing to the wider community because obviously around key events like that, we'll do media, internal and external comms and through digital means, just showing how amazing we are as a University within our community				I think we use the events that are held on campus and within Xxx, are there to specifically show and showcase what is excellent about the University. So we shouldn't have any events that are running here, even if they're run by an external body about us that isn't using and showcasing the best of the University.
endorsements	So using others to endorse your messages, like media, like partners, like stakeholders. We're members of all sorts of different bodies, so University Alliance, Universities UK. You've got to try and differentiate your, our Institution within those bodies in a way that, when they want to do something; um, they know to come to Xxx because of our credentials in whatever it is they want to do.				we now have people like Tom Daley, Sharon Davis, Trevor Francis, a whole range of what you would consider elite athletes and performance sports people on our books as Honorary Alumni effectively but we also have a whole range of community people who are just doing good things in the community, being recognised as well.

Appendix 14 - Defining Reputation responses

Table 12.6 Coding scheme for reputation definitions

	Coded number	Code description
Reputation Paradigm categories	1	Single stakeholder (investor or managers)
	2	Image/corporate/ identity
	3	Linking reputation to buyer's intention
	4	Customers' view of company and salesperson image
	5	Linking reputation to employee identification
	6	Management perception of image and identity
	7	Media Linking reputation to favourableness of media coverage
	8	Multiple stakeholders in general
	9	Linking internal view (identity) and external views (image) of corporate reputation
	10	Linking reputation (external view) and identity (internal view)
New categories added	11	general perception
	12	External perceptions only
	13	good/bad perceptions
	14	What you are known for/ how well known you are
	15	Quality, success, achievement, popularity, ranking
	16	Branding, name, values, attitude, ambition
	17	Links to community
	18	Reputation among peers/ within a specified industry
	19	Other
	20	not relevant

Table 12.7 Questionnaire responses for defining reputation

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
449	Likelihood for people to invest and engage with	1
578	An image of someone or organization	2
23	What people think of you	2
27	the outside view (what was done god or bad and transported to the wider public)	2
215	The image presented to the public and prospective students	2
237	Image	2
250	The image it projects	2
278	Good image	2
318	Image	2
419	The image, expectations and belief in an institute, item or person	2
421	Image of a thing	2
485	the image it reflects including the quality	2
486	The by text made image	2
489	Image or stereotype given to someone/something	2

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
493	The image or legacy a specific person, team or event leaves post meeting/delivery	2
501	The image of university	2
521	Generally perceived image	2
573	Image of someone, a party or company	2
592	The standard and image in society	2
21	Peoples thoughts and opinions regarding the running or the way things are done at a particular institution	3
22	The level of esteem enjoyed by an individual or organisation	3
29	Perception of a person's/organisations credibility	3
459	The perception of quality of a company/person/university	3
13	the collective experience of your customers	4
464	Feedback from service users	4
20	Quality of teaching and research	4
62	Perception of the 'public' on the quality of an institution's learning and teaching provision.	4
110	having good student	4
369	Something that encourages people to go there	4
438	How the university is viewed/regarded by different client and interest groups.	4
439	How most people attending or having attended rate it	4
446	Good feedback from potential staff and pupils	5
356	What Wendy Purcell has destroyed at Plymouth	6
286	Sound good in the media	7
50	The collective perceptions of all stakeholders	8
2	A perception of something which is made from a number of different sources	8
100	How a body is perceived by those who either rely upon that body or can influence and impact on its development	8
164	Collective mind set of gathered information	8
352	The stakeholders views on the present, past and potential future of the University's history	8
491	The views of any stakeholders on individual or organisation.	8
507	How you are judged by the majority of stakeholders	8
572	perception of those with any interest	8
59	The view of something developed through one's own experiences and those of others.	9
112	Previous opinions from people involved (or not involved) in something that has taken action in the past.	9
57	How something is viewed by individuals, often in comparison to another similar body	11
310	The opinions and views that someone holds about organisation which they may pass on to others	11

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
311	Reputation is, ideally, a fact-based opinion people have (of a person, institution, etc.), which is influenced most heavily through previous actions taken by the reputable person/institution in question.	11
1	The way in which something or someone is perceived	11
7	An opinion someone has about something.	11
8	Reputation is the image that people have of a person or an institution.	11
12	Reputation is a collective opinion that is forged of a certain entity.	11
15	how perceptions influence people's decisions and outlook	11
16	what we think about something	11
28	An organisation or individuals standing in relevant or associated communities	11
31	how something is perceived	11
33	People opinion about something or someone	11
35	What is thought of something be it positive or negative.	11
39	What people think about the way the place is run and what it offers	11
41	General opinion of a person not necessarily factual but often dependent on word of mouth.	11
42	What people think of you or a business good or bad .	11
43	what people think of the organisation	11
44	How one rates something	11
46	How you are thought of	11
53	the opinion held about a thing/person	11
63	Temporary perception of an entity based around value judgements	11
69	The perception of the university	11
73	A commonly held belief about a certain thing or person	11
75	A general feeling about an person/institution based on character	11
82	Collective or individual judgment	11
84	The beliefs that are generally held about someone or something.	11
87	How an organisation is viewed by its stakeholders and the wider community, hard won, easily lost.	11
89	How people perceive something	11
105	The general belief or perception about the quality and character of a person or institution	11
107	How something is judged or perceived.	11
109	what you are more commonly known for.	11
111	In terms of people - how someone is thought of/seen	11
113	What something is thought of due to actions and previous events that have taken place	11
114	What people understand it to be like	11
115	An opinion held about someone or something	11
118	What people think about it	11

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
119	How people see an organization/person/etc whether it be good or bad depending on various criteria important to said person.	11
122	the general beliefs or opinions an individual has about someone or something	11
124	The thoughts people have of something	11
125	accustomed to opinion	11
128	Opinion held by many of an institution, object	11
129	it is the belief or opinion of someone or something.	11
131	opinion about something	11
132	the perceived esteem of a person, body, or organisation among an audience	11
138	What people think and value in you	11
141	How something is viewed	11
144	Peoples opinion on a subject	11
147	What is thought about and/or history of someone/something	11
151	The way something is perceived to people	11
163	What people think and feel about you	11
180	How the university is regarded itegaec	11
182	How you are perceived to be by people	11
190	What people think	11
202	What people say about it	11
204	Opinion	11
208	The legacy and what people think	11
211	The perception or image held of an individual or organisation	11
214	What people say or think	11
221	What people think of the university	11
223	What people believe and think	11
224	What people perceive of the university	11
225	a prescription of the way something is	11
230	The way an individual or establishment is viewed	11
234	Opinion of people about uni	11
235	General opinion of an institution	11
236	What people think of something and the likeliness of them engaging with that thing	11
238	What people say about it	11
240	Something that tells about what a thing is like	11
257	How the university is perceived	11
258	What people think of you	11
259	How you are perceived	11
263	What people think of you	11
265	What the organisation is recognised as being	11
267	Perception	11
280	View of something	11

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
283	The widespread impression of something/someone	11
284	Peoples thoughts and views of the product	11
290	Key to determining the perception of a thing	11
292	What people think of an organisation	11
297	People's Perception of a thing	11
299	How an individual or group of people feels about a specific issue.	11
301	The overall opinion of something	11
302	What people think of you	11
304	What is thought of the body	11
307	The general opinion	11
308	Pre-judgement or assumption	11
309	The thing that everyone judges you on	11
314	A wider understanding of the honesty and integrity of an establishment	11
319	What people say and think about organisation	11
320	Perception	11
322	The attitude an individual has towards an entity	11
327	Overall consensus	11
339	It is a brief description of the university.	11
342	What people think of the university	11
350	The perception that precedes the knowledge of an organisation	11
355	Your standing in the eyes of the world	11
360	what is thought about something	11
366	What people think of a place or think	11
368	Outlook	11
371	How people describe you or your organisation	11
372	What people think	11
373	The attitude or brief someone has about a place or thing	11
376	Things people say about something	11
379	A perception or view of something or someone	11
384	What people think about you	11
387	People's perspective of an individual or thing	11
389	What people think	11
391	People's views on you	11
405	Perception	11
408	General opinion or perception	11
411	How you think of something	11
413	How you are viewed	11
416	What people think of them	11
422	How people think about something good or bad	11
425	What people say a place is like	11
426	What is thought of you	11
430	How you are perceived	11
431	The standing of a person or organisation	11

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
432	Perception of	11
442	How people think of a thing or place	11
452	How one is thought of	11
455	How a particular characteristic of something is perceived	11
460	An opinion or perception about someone or something	11
470	Opinions held about something	11
475	A measure of how well thought of something is, hopefully matching the quality of experience received.	11
477	widespread belief that someone / groups has a particular characteristic.	11
478	How people think about something in terms of how good or bad it is, and what it's strengths and weaknesses are.	11
480	How a university, in this case, is viewed and valued.	11
488	Ways in which something is seen.	11
494	The beliefs that are held about something.	11
495	How people think of a place	11
496	the way you are known around the area	11
497	How the place is perceived by people	11
498	What is said or believed about a person or organisation	11
499	How you're perceived	11
509	Overall quality and character judged by people in general	11
512	The perception of impact	11
515	An impression based on fact and/or anecdote	11
518	What is the general opinion of the university	11
519	what you personally think about a person, thing , location, or any object	11
523	the beliefs or opinions that are generally held about someone or something	11
524	How you feel about someone or them about you	11
526	What someone thinks about something because of what they have heard.	11
533	How something is perceived.	11
535	How you are perceived	11
538	A shared opinion about something or someone.	11
541	A persons view of something/someone	11
542	The thoughts perceived about a particular product, service, industry etc	11
546	The opinion that is generally held about something or someone.	11
555	The commonly accepted opinions about something	11
556	general opinions or judgements about someone or something	11
558	How people perceive a person/company to be/act; either in a positive or negative way	11
559	a way in which we are able to judge things/people at a glance	11
561	Generally held belief in a characteristic	11

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
563	Associations and opinions	11
566	How people base their opinion on something	11
570	how an organisation is perceived and judged	11
576	People's perception and whether something or someone is respectable	11
586	An opinion about something/ someone.	11
589	the opinion that people in general have about it	11
399	Impression of an institution provided by stakeholders perceived by outsiders	12
520	Perception by those who have no knowledge	12
530	How something is viewed by those who do not have direct experience of it.	12
5	Image held by others of professionalism	12
9	How you are perceived by others.	12
10	How others view the university	12
14	What others think of you	12
24	The level of awareness of an individual or organisation in the wider world in combination with the quality in the eyes of those viewing it.	12
25	grade or rank of the organisation in terms of belief and trustworthiness given by others	12
26	Reputation is the opinion that people in general have about someone or something, based on past behaviour or character:	12
36	Reputation is the general or specific public's acknowledgement towards a person, group of people or organisation.	12
40	Outward understanding of what is	12
45	Erm, what other people have to say about you	12
47	How one is perceived by others.	12
49	The opinion others have of a group/individual	12
51	Reputation refers to how highly regarded the university is by those outside the university itself.	12
52	What others believe to be true about something.	12
54	how you are rated and ranked by others	12
61	How others see and measure you,	12
68	What others think of you	12
71	How a person or institution is seen to be by others	12
76	Reputation is what people THINK something is like.	12
77	What other people think of your abilities and quality	12
78	The quality perceived by others	12
79	The university's attractiveness to others	12
80	Positive or negative perception of a person or entity by others	12
81	Opinion others have of you	12
85	The estimation in which a person or thing is held, especially by the community or the public generally	12
86	the perception of someone's capability and authority from an external point of view	12
88	How others view you	12

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
91	public perception	12
92	recognition by others of attainment	12
94	How an organisation is viewed by outside agencies	12
95	third party awareness of the institution and its achievements	12
96	the regard a community or people have for an individual or institution	12
99	how you present yourself within others	12
117	What other people think of a person or place	12
126	The general view from an outside perspective.	12
130	How something or someone is perceived by others	12
134	What does a future employer think of my degree	12
137	How others think of you	12
148	how others see you	12
153	The opinion of others	12
156	What general public think	12
157	What other people think or know about you	12
168	Whaele think and say about place and people	12
173	How we'll thought of with employers	12
176	Others evaluation	12
183	How other people view the uni	12
193	What others think of you	12
197	The regard in which the wider community hold the establishment	12
198	The ability to project success or failure on an outside eye.	12
200	How the community views it	12
207	The impression you give others and what people think of you	12
210	How someone is viewed by others	12
242	how other sees you	12
247	What the general public and businesses have as a collective opinion	12
248	A preconception of behaviour and output from a third party	12
249	What others think of you	12
256	External opinion of something	12
268	Perception by the general public both nationally & internationally	12
279	Actions based on other people's opinions	12
285	What the public think about the university	12
289	What others think positive or negative	12
291	The factor that defines what others think about you	12
303	How you are viewed by others	12
313	Beliefs of others about a certain idea or item	12
315	Public perception of an entity	12
317	How something is perceived by others	12

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
323	Public opinion	12
329	The view of the university from an outside perspective	12
331	Others opinions	12
332	What others think of you	12
333	How others know you	12
334	How a person/institution/ company ... is judged by the majority in public	12
338	How uni is viewed by others	12
348	How the public see and experience the university.	12
349	The external perception of a body, person or institution regarding the specific prowess of the aforementioned against competitors	12
351	The view of something from an outside perspective	12
359	How good something is perceived to be to someone who is not involved in the organisation	12
361	How others perceive something	12
375	How something is viewed by others.	12
377	The quality as known and described by others	12
397	The opinion of others	12
404	What others think	12
410	What is deemed to be, as seen by those on the outside.	12
414	What others think of you	12
415	Local peoples oppppp?. Other what	12
417	The outside view or perception of what an organisation or person is like.	12
435	How you are viewed by other people	12
436	How others perceive	12
437	How something is perceived by the wider public	12
441	How something is perceived by others	12
444	The perception of a person, group or institution outside of the person, group or institution in question	12
451	Perception by wider community	12
453	What others think of you	12
462	Public perception	12
467	How you are perceived by others	12
468	How you are viewed by others who are outside your organisation.	12
469	Standing in different community groups	12
471	How you are perceived by others	12
473	The broad consensus of public opinion of the institution's standing.	12
482	Public opinion about and value placed on the subject	12
492	The view of a given business/organization by others	12
500	The opinion others have about you or an organisation	12
502	How the university appears to others	12
511	How the organisation is perceived by others outside the organisation.	12

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
525	A shared public belief of the quality of a person, company or institution	12
529	How something(one) is perceived by others	12
532	Opinions of others	12
536	How you are perceived by others	12
539	How you are perceived externally by those who may not know you	12
543	What others think of you	12
544	A summary of experiences had by others	12
545	The opinion an individual holds towards something/someone external to themselves; either positive or negative	12
550	How others view something	12
551	Perceptions of a person/establishment from an external party	12
553	How one is perceived by others based on previous knowledge and current experiences	12
562	Level of others' opinion of something/someone	12
564	The external feeling of a person/place/institution.	12
574	the judgment from the others	12
580	How something, or somebody, is perceived by others	12
142	How good something is	13
216	A way of assessing how good or bad an organisation is	13
32	High reputation	13
106	good	13
108	are they good or bad at what they do?	13
120	something that is good which stands out from the crowd.	13
133	Very good	13
146	How good the place is	13
154	How good something is known for	13
159	Something that is good	13
161	High	13
170	The positive or negative word of mouth	13
174	Excellent	13
181	Plymouth the best	13
191	Class	13
212	Good or bad judgements of an object/place	13
217	Good	13
222	Good	13
226	Good	13
228	Good or bad	13
239	How good something is	13
241	Good results	13
253	Feedback has a positive attitude and expresses a good foundation for the working world	13
270	Everything good from the bottom to the top.	13

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
271	Important	13
273	Having good feedback	13
276	It was a good	13
281	How good a certain asset is	13
282	Very important	13
294	Good	13
324	Outstanding	13
335	One's standing in the community due to past behaviour: positive and negative	13
336	Important	13
344	Good or bad, how people view stuff	13
346	How good or bad something apparently is	13
374	Good	13
388	How good something's	13
393	Whether the place is good or not	13
400	How good others perceive an institution/person/group to be.	13
406	Bad is good	13
409	Amazing	13
427	Goodness	13
429	Good	13
448	Good/bad positive/negative views	13
457	Nice	13
505	very important	13
527	misleading	13
540	A measure of characteristics of a body, that may influence you positively or negatively to engage with that body.	13
547	Whether something has a good or bad name	13
549	An opinion on how good/bad something is	13
557	Ok, think it is made to sound worse than it is	13
569	The good things people think about an organisation	13
582	No bad records	13
140	How well a name is known/what it is known for	14
188	What something is known for and how well it is known	14
30	the information on which an opinion is formed	14
38	'Reputation' is that which has potential to provide decision-making information to the undecided.	14
55	knowledge	14
56	what bells ring when you hear about the university	14
90	Your immediate thoughts when someone asks you what you feel about the institution	14
103	Its standing and identity locally and nationally, the knowledge and skills it is thought to foster in students and what is seen to be its contribution to knowledge.	14
121	What you hear and then chose to believe about something	14
145	A place where you would like your children to go!!	14

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
150	Instant thoughts/impressions on a particular thing	14
155	How something is defined	14
162	What people build it to be	14
178	The knowledge, in terms of awareness - whether positive or negative - of an entity or individual	14
189	First impressions	14
206	What you know of a otherwise unknown person.	14
227	Preconceived expectations based on information from various sources concerning one's qualities	14
229	How an institute is judged with no other information	14
231	Prominent	14
233	What you are known for	14
243	The level of recognition in the society	14
262	How we'll known	14
266	THE BRAND, NAME AND RANK OF THE SCHOOL.	14
275	Being mainstream	14
277	How something is perceived due to direct experience or hearing about it from other sources	14
312	How something is reflected by another	14
330	How proud you can be in general of your university	14
345	how well known something or someone is with a positive element	14
353	Known as	14
367	What something is seen as	14
380	To be recognised internationally	14
385	Word of mouth	14
386	How we are seen to operate	14
401	Past	14
402	How people perceive it and what it is known for.	14
434	How is known	14
440	Feedback that university give at the world around	14
443	What people consider to be assets or benefits of a place or organisation or person	14
445	What I hear	14
458	What people generally know about you	14
461	The value and stereotypes the other attribute to a thing	14
465	The phrases used to describe the university buildings, students and research profile	14
472	What people say about you	14
481	What people think of something and how common that thought is amongst a variety of people.	14
483	how something is known	14
484	how the uni is known	14
504	the way something or someone presents itself	14
513	The esteem in which it is held	14
514	The factor which influences people's opinion the most	14

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
534	The outward appearance of an institution/organisation	14
552	The thought that lingers in your head about them/it	14
560	What is thought of you and immediately associated when mentioned.	14
567	Historical Standing	14
571	what people think of you when asked	14
575	what your defining characteristic is	14
583	To be known for something which immediately stands out.	14
587	how well-known is the particular subject/person	14
590	How well known of its good aspects	14
64	An opinion or consensus, whether informed by evidence or not, of quality, integrity and performance.	15
220	The past the present and future success of the university	15
274	How people perceive something in terms of quality, ethics & fit with their beliefs	15
487	Quality of an establishment that has been built up over a number of years.	15
17	High standards all the time	15
48	Established outcomes and expectations	15
58	Something of quality	15
60	Good work	15
66	How well does	15
67	The standards of teaching research and self-promotion	15
97	results/outcome based on previous actions	15
98	The quality of the university offer	15
123	Plymouth academically could be higher in the league tables	15
127	It show's what a person has achieved in life.	15
152	Valuable	15
167	A collection of deeds that the institution or individual has performed	15
171	Reliability to perform	15
175	The perceived value	15
179	Successes	15
186	Someone status quo	15
187	A term of quality	15
194	The ability to fulfil the job with appropriate knowledge and enthusiasm	15
195	A rating of quality	15
199	Performance, excellence and commitment	15
205	Consistent excellence	15
209	Excellent place to study and make achievements	15
213	Qualitable	15
218	Honour	15
232	Achievements of alumni and usefulness of research to others	15
244	Grandeur	15

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
245	Success	15
246	Reliability and quality out graduates, research and engagement with relevant current issues	15
252	Standard of achievement	15
254	Major influence	15
255	Perceived quality	15
260	A standard in which people view	15
261	Based on course and results achieved	15
269	Integrity to the prorogation of learning for the benefit of society	15
295	Respectful achievement	15
296	A consistent integrity	15
305	Credibility	15
306	How you are ranked or seen within a group or community	15
316	Past reports and how good they are rated	15
321	The popularity of the object in question	15
340	Delivery and recommendation	15
343	rank	15
354	Hughes value for the choice	15
363	School of excellent	15
378	A judge on past performances	15
382	Experiences backed up by theory	15
390	A time to achieve the best this place has to offer	15
396	Quality	15
407	the quality of university	15
424	The track record of achievement	15
428	The appreciation of the universities abilities, facilities and achievements.	15
433	Academic and overall standards	15
454	The level of knowledge effectively taught to students, and effectively learnt as well	15
456	The overall ability/influence of the institution	15
463	Quality of teaching, involvement with students, research undergone and responsibility towards society	15
466	Quality of teaching and research	15
474	outputs, impact, future proofing	15
506	Good standard, popularity, fame.	15
508	Collective demonstration of consistent achievement	15
510	How a university's performance and relationship with its stakeholders and the wider community is measured	15
531	The level of satisfaction perceived of an organisation by an individual.	15
548	In the context of a university a subjective view about the perceived ability of the institution to educate their students	15
554	An anecdotal judgement of something's perceived behaviour or quality	15

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
565	Perspective of the quality of someone or something	15
577	Rank	15
585	Quality of education and the recognition of certificate	15
591	Reputation should represent all the good achievements that achieved by the institution.	15
328	Description of core values and behaviour	16
4	Engaged	16
11	Mutual agreement that working in partnership with the University produces a state of distinction and respectability	16
37	Is the thing I will give you when have you given me	16
72	General esteem	16
83	Credibility from the belief and viewpoint of stakeholders	16
104	perceived characteristics	16
116	someone's or somethings set group of believed characteristics	16
135	Brand and history	16
158	The way in which behaviours or experiences of something are perceived	16
172	The behaviours and passion of a university	16
185	Influence	16
196	How the person conducts themselves	16
201	Integrity	16
219	Promise of the brand	16
251	Attitude	16
264	Reputation represents everything you ate and everything you strive to be	16
288	The prevailing attitude towards an organisation	16
293	Perceived values	16
298	Confidence that you will get what you expect.	16
325	The care for others	16
358	A Behaviour in which self , organisation, and members of strive on respect, good behaviour, and encouragement.	16
364	Respect. Do they have respect for themselves and their communities?	16
365	Respectful integrity	16
370	How you act around people	16
381	Feeling	16
383	Setting a good example	16
392	Complex of different things	16
395	Good name	16
398	Very kind, helpful and considerate.	16
403	Trust	16
447	People respect	16
450	How much respect/value something generates	16
479	a favourable and publicly recognized name	16
490	A company's brand	16

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
516	Integrity, honesty and transparency.	16
522	Transparency	16
528	The perceived attributes of (an organisation or person) based on recommendations within a public body.	16
537	quality of the brand	16
581	The initial brand image perceived by outsiders	16
18	...is the value and esteem in which a university is held by the individuals and groups who may benefit from their connections with the university.	17
3	(in this case) The University's ability to illicit positive (good reputation) or negative (bad reputation) perception and prejudice from an individual about its attributes, sometimes without direct or only minimal contact or experience.	17
34	Standing in society	17
65	How much of a positive impact the university has in the wider community	17
160	The way a body relates to the community	17
326	Good standing within the community	17
357	The perception of a body/individual based on their actions coupled with their speech and values!	17
412	Community impact	17
418	Ability to integrate within the community and provide consistent student performance.	17
503	the social standing	17
579	The ethos that is carried by an institution based on societies perspectives.	17
568	The standing of a person or institution among their peers.	18
93	A collection of recognised metrics judged by peer review amongst the sector.	18
165	A individuals or a groups social or intellectual standing according to peers.	18
166	Good words being said	18
184	level of goodwill, support and knowledge acknowledged by academia and general public	18
203	The Perception of an organisation from peers and stakeholders	18
300	good standing in further education	18
341	How past associates see you professionally	18
476	Standing within the education sector	18
6	may not represent the reality	19
70	Reputation is earned, not acquired.....	19
136	Takes years to build and minutes to destroy	19
517	you can live or die based on your reputation	19
588	Got to be in this game, one way or another.	19
19	the university of Plymouth have a good deal with international research student and so many things are very good at it	20
74		20

Respondent ID	Rep Description	Description coded
101	Reputation	20
102	Standing	20
139	Ease of communication	20
143	Your	20
149	Standing	20
169	Not	20
177	Need for future reference	20
192	Repeating something	20
272	Being of sound mind	20
287	Great bant	20
337	Bklah	20
347	Needs to support students more when problems occur	20
362	Rep	20
394	Not sure	20
420	It's means that you need to listen to stuff	20
423	Reputation	20
584	Reputation	20

Appendix 15 - Chi-Square results

Table 12.8 Chi-Square summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Gender * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Age * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Age * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Education * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Education school/ HE * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Employment * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Employment * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%

Stakeholder * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Stakeholder * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * Fam	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * Event Impact recoded	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * RChange	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * Expec	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * Prior	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * PURep	585	98.5%	9	1.5%	594	100.0%
stakeholders Internal and external * Rep description coded	348	58.6%	246	41.4%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * Fam	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * Event Impact recoded	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * RChange	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * Expec	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * Prior	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * PURep	591	99.5%	3	0.5%	594	100.0%
Nationality coded * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * Fam	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * Event Impact recoded	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * RChange	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * Expec	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * Prior	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * PURep	584	98.3%	10	1.7%	594	100.0%
Nationality regrouped * Rep description coded	350	58.9%	244	41.1%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * Fam	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * Event Impact recoded	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * RChange	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * Expec	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * Prior	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * PURep	559	94.1%	35	5.9%	594	100.0%
Distance Grouped * Rep description coded	333	56.1%	261	43.9%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
LiveUK * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * Fam	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * Event Impact recoded	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * RChange	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%

Countries grouped * Expec	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * Prior	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * PURep	592	99.7%	2	0.3%	594	100.0%
Countries grouped * Rep description coded	352	59.3%	242	40.7%	594	100.0%
County * Fam	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * Event Impact recoded	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * RChange	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * Expec	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * Prior	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * PURep	558	93.9%	36	6.1%	594	100.0%
County * Rep description coded	333	56.1%	261	43.9%	594	100.0%
EventNo * Fam	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * Event Impact recoded	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * RChange	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * Expec	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * Prior	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * PURep	515	86.7%	79	13.3%	594	100.0%
EventNo * Rep description coded	298	50.2%	296	49.8%	594	100.0%

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Familiarity * Email	551	93.1%	41	6.9%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Website	554	93.6%	38	6.4%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Printed	530	89.5%	62	10.5%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * WOM others	540	91.2%	52	8.8%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Media	538	90.9%	54	9.1%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Meetings	535	90.4%	57	9.6%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Events	543	91.7%	49	8.3%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Digital	528	89.2%	64	10.8%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * WOM Staff	552	93.2%	40	6.8%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Working	537	90.7%	55	9.3%	592	100.0%
Familiarity * Social Media	523	88.3%	69	11.7%	592	100.0%

Table 12.9 Gender * Fam

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
Gender	Male	Count	20	55	90	91	256

		Expected Count	17.3	66.2	94.3	78.3	256.0
	Female	Count	20	98	128	90	336
		Expected Count	22.7	86.8	123.7	102.7	336.0
Total		Count	40	153	218	181	592
		Expected Count	40.0	153.0	218.0	181.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.051ᵃ	3	.045
Likelihood Ratio	8.069	3	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.840	1	.092
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.30.

Table 12.10 Gender * Expectation

Crosstab

			Expec					
			Far short of expectations	Short of expectations	Equals expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations	Total
Gender	Male	Count	0	10	109	112	25	256
		Expected Count	1.3	15.6	93.8	109.4	35.9	256.0
	Female	Count	3	26	108	141	58	336
		Expected Count	1.7	20.4	123.2	143.6	47.1	336.0
Total		Count	3	36	217	253	83	592
		Expected Count	3.0	36.0	217.0	253.0	83.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.042ᵃ	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	17.507	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.259	1	.262
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Table 12.11 Education * Familiarity

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
Education	Some secondary school	Count	5	14	4	4	27
		Expected Count	1.8	7.0	9.9	8.3	27.0
	GCSE level	Count	2	12	10	3	27
		Expected Count	1.8	7.0	9.9	8.3	27.0
	A-level	Count	7	28	32	18	85
		Expected Count	5.7	22.0	31.3	26.0	85.0
	College/ further education	Count	5	18	24	10	57
		Expected Count	3.9	14.7	21.0	17.4	57.0
	Vocational qualification	Count	6	5	9	7	27
		Expected Count	1.8	7.0	9.9	8.3	27.0
	Undergraduate degree	Count	11	39	68	80	198
		Expected Count	13.4	51.2	72.9	60.5	198.0
	Postgraduate qualification	Count	3	34	57	43	137
		Expected Count	9.3	35.4	50.4	41.9	137.0
	Doctorate degree	Count	1	3	14	16	34
		Expected Count	2.3	8.8	12.5	10.4	34.0
Total		Count	40	153	218	181	592
		Expected Count	40.0	153.0	218.0	181.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.042[a]	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	17.507	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.259	1	.262
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Table 12.12 Education (school)/ HE * Familiarity

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
Education school/ HE	Secondary	Count	14	54	46	25	139
		Expected Count	9.4	35.9	51.2	42.5	139.0
	Further & HE	Count	26	99	172	156	453
		Expected Count	30.6	117.1	166.8	138.5	453.0
Total		Count	40	153	218	181	592
		Expected Count	40.0	153.0	218.0	181.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.943[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.800	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.776	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.39.

Table 12.13 Education school/ HE * PURep

Crosstab

			PURep					
			Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Total
Education school/ HE	Secondary	Count	2	1	26	64	46	139
		Expected Count	1.2	5.9	35.5	64.6	31.9	139.0
	Further & HE	Count	3	24	125	211	90	453
		Expected Count	3.8	19.1	115.5	210.4	104.1	453.0
Total		Count	5	25	151	275	136	592
		Expected Count	5.0	25.0	151.0	275.0	136.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.440[a]	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	18.999	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.502	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.17.

Table 12.14 Employment * Familiarity

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
Employment	Student in part-time education	Count	4	2	8	7	21
		Expected Count	1.4	5.4	7.7	6.4	21.0
	Student in full-time education	Count	3	37	57	31	128
		Expected Count	8.6	33.1	47.1	39.1	128.0
	Employed part-time	Count	4	12	26	21	63
		Expected Count	4.3	16.3	23.2	19.3	63.0
	Employed full-time	Count	18	65	85	91	259
		Expected Count	17.5	66.9	95.4	79.2	259.0
	Self-employed	Count	5	19	8	9	41
		Expected Count	2.8	10.6	15.1	12.5	41.0
	Retired	Count	3	8	18	9	38
		Expected Count	2.6	9.8	14.0	11.6	38.0
	Unemployed	Count	3	10	16	13	42
		Expected Count	2.8	10.9	15.5	12.8	42.0
Total		Count	40	153	218	181	592
		Expected Count	40.0	153.0	218.0	181.0	592.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.466[a]	18	.011
Likelihood Ratio	34.043	18	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	.342	1	.559
N of Valid Cases	592		

a. 5 cells (17.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.42.

Before collapsing stakeholders to internal/external, many chi-square tests

showed $p < 0.05$, however the tests were not valid

Table 12.15 Stakeholders Internal and external * Familiarity

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
stakeholders Internal and external	Internal	Count	1	28	112	115	256
		Expected Count	16.6	66.5	94.1	78.8	256.0
	External	Count	37	124	103	65	329
		Expected Count	21.4	85.5	120.9	101.2	329.0
Total		Count	38	152	215	180	585
		Expected Count	38.0	152.0	215.0	180.0	585.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	101.473[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	114.238	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	94.949	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	585		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.63.

Table 12.16 Stakeholders Internal and external * Event Impact recoded

Crosstab

			Event Impact recoded			
			Less favourable	No Different	More Favourable	Total
stakeholders Internal and external	Internal	Count	4	131	121	256
		Expected Count	4.8	107.7	143.5	256.0
	External	Count	7	115	207	329
		Expected Count	6.2	138.3	184.5	329.0
Total		Count	11	246	328	585
		Expected Count	11.0	246.0	328.0	585.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.540[a]	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	15.551	2	.000

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.445	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	585		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.81.

Table 12.17 Stakeholders Internal and external * Expectations

Crosstab

			Expec					Total
			Far short of expectations	Short of expectations	Equals expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations	
stakeholders Internal and external	Internal	Count	3	19	106	106	22	256
		Expected Count	1.3	15.8	93.2	109.4	36.3	256.0
	External	Count	0	17	107	144	61	329
		Expected Count	1.7	20.2	119.8	140.6	46.7	329.0
Total		Count	3	36	213	250	83	585
		Expected Count	3.0	36.0	213.0	250.0	83.0	585.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.394[a]	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.007	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.513	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	585		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.31.

Table 12.18 Stakeholders Internal and external * PURep

Crosstab

			PURep					Total
			Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	
stakeholders Internal and external	Internal	Count	4	18	73	113	48	256
		Expected Count	2.2	10.5	65.6	118.2	59.5	256.0
	External	Count	1	6	77	157	88	329
		Expected Count	2.8	13.5	84.4	151.8	76.5	329.0
Total		Count	5	24	150	270	136	585
		Expected Count	5.0	24.0	150.0	270.0	136.0	585.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.013[a]	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.323	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.032	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	585		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.19.

Table 12.19 EventNo * Familiarity

Crosstab

			Fam				
			familiarityNot at all	FamiliarityA little	FamiliarityReasonably well	FamiliarityVery well	Total
EventNo	This is my first event	Count	30	66	56	32	184
		Expected Count	11.4	44.3	67.9	60.4	184.0
	2 - 4 events	Count	2	51	76	39	168
		Expected Count	10.4	40.5	62.0	55.1	168.0
	5 or more events	Count	0	7	58	98	163
		Expected Count	10.1	39.2	60.1	53.5	163.0
Total		Count	32	124	190	169	515
		Expected Count	32.0	124.0	190.0	169.0	515.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	147.401[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	159.678	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	119.908	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	515		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.13.

Table 12.20 EventNo * Event Impact recoded

Crosstab

			Event Impact recoded			
			Less favourable	No Different	More Favourable	Total
EventNo	This is my first event	Count	3	64	117	184
		Expected Count	3.2	83.2	97.5	184.0

2 - 4 events	Count		4	73	91	168
	Expected Count		2.9	76.0	89.1	168.0
5 or more events	Count		2	96	65	163
	Expected Count		2.8	73.7	86.4	163.0
Total	Count		9	233	273	515
	Expected Count		9.0	233.0	273.0	515.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.166[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	21.225	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.390	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	515		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.85.

Table 12.21 EventNo * PURep

Crosstab

			PURep					Total
			Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	
EventNo	This is my first event	Count	1	4	49	86	44	184
		Expected Count	1.4	8.6	43.2	85.7	45.0	184.0
	2 - 4 events	Count	2	6	33	71	56	168
		Expected Count	1.3	7.8	39.5	78.3	41.1	168.0
	5 or more events	Count	1	14	39	83	26	163
		Expected Count	1.3	7.6	38.3	76.0	39.9	163.0
Total		Count	4	24	121	240	126	515
		Expected Count	4.0	24.0	121.0	240.0	126.0	515.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.251[a]	8	.004
Likelihood Ratio	21.941	8	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.640	1	.056
N of Valid Cases	515		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.27.

Table 12.22 Familiarity * Email

Crosstab

			Email					
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	Total
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	32	2	2	1	0	37
		Expected Count	10.7	3.1	7.0	10.5	5.6	37.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	79	7	26	14	9	135
		Expected Count	39.2	11.3	25.5	38.5	20.6	135.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	38	24	46	75	27	210
		Expected Count	61.0	17.5	39.6	59.8	32.0	210.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	11	13	30	67	48	169
		Expected Count	49.1	14.1	31.9	48.2	25.8	169.0
Total		Count	160	46	104	157	84	551
		Expected Count	160.0	46.0	104.0	157.0	84.0	551.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	197.385[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	203.094	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	156.802	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	551		

a. 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.09.

Table 12.23 Familiarity * Website

Crosstab

			Website					
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	Total
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	25	3	6	2	0	36
		Expected Count	6.1	5.3	9.6	9.6	5.3	36.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	46	31	38	15	10	140
		Expected Count	23.8	20.7	37.4	37.4	20.7	140.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	20	23	67	74	22	206
		Expected Count	35.0	30.5	55.0	55.0	30.5	206.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	3	25	37	57	50	172
		Expected Count	29.2	25.5	45.9	45.9	25.5	172.0
Total		Count	94	82	148	148	82	554
		Expected Count	94.0	82.0	148.0	148.0	82.0	554.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	188.373[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	182.082	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	133.452	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	554		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.33.

Table 12.24 Familiarity * Printed

Crosstab

			Printed					Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	25	2	8	1	0	36
		Expected Count	8.2	7.5	12.9	5.6	1.9	36.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	43	29	53	8	2	135
		Expected Count	30.6	28.0	48.4	20.9	7.1	135.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	31	48	71	40	9	199
		Expected Count	45.1	41.3	71.3	30.8	10.5	199.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	21	31	58	33	17	160
		Expected Count	36.2	33.2	57.4	24.8	8.5	160.0
Total		Count	120	110	190	82	28	530
		Expected Count	120.0	110.0	190.0	82.0	28.0	530.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	89.916[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	85.782	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	56.499	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	530		

a. 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.90.

Table 12.25 Familiarity * WOM others

Crosstab

			WOM others					Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	20	3	13	2	1	39
		Expected Count	8.1	8.9	11.7	6.9	3.4	39.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	42	27	38	21	7	135
		Expected Count	28.0	30.8	40.5	24.0	11.8	135.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	35	55	61	31	17	199
		Expected Count	41.3	45.3	59.7	35.4	17.3	199.0

	FamiliarityVery well	Count	15	38	50	42	22	167
		Expected Count	34.6	38.0	50.1	29.7	14.5	167.0
Total		Count	112	123	162	96	47	540
		Expected Count	112.0	123.0	162.0	96.0	47.0	540.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	60.352[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	59.882	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.903	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	540		

a. 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.39.

Table 12.26 Familiarity * Media

Crosstab

			Media					Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	26	1	7	2	0	36
		Expected Count	10.8	10.6	10.1	2.9	1.6	36.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	54	39	34	6	1	134
		Expected Count	40.3	39.4	37.6	10.7	6.0	134.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	51	73	57	15	4	200
		Expected Count	60.2	58.7	56.1	16.0	8.9	200.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	31	45	53	20	19	168
		Expected Count	50.6	49.3	47.2	13.4	7.5	168.0
Total		Count	162	158	151	43	24	538
		Expected Count	162.0	158.0	151.0	43.0	24.0	538.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.116[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	80.800	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	49.531	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	538		

a. 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.61.

Table 12.27 Familiarity * Meetings

Crosstab

				Meetings				
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	Total
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	32	2	1	0	0	35
		Expected Count	14.9	6.0	7.2	4.3	2.6	35.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	95	16	15	4	3	133
		Expected Count	56.4	22.9	27.3	16.4	9.9	133.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	66	49	59	19	9	202
		Expected Count	85.7	34.7	41.5	24.9	15.1	202.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	34	25	35	43	28	165
		Expected Count	70.0	28.4	33.9	20.4	12.3	165.0
Total		Count	227	92	110	66	40	535
		Expected Count	227.0	92.0	110.0	66.0	40.0	535.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	168.631[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	169.790	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	123.588	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	535		

a. 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.62.

Table 12.28 Familiarity * Events

Crosstab

				Events				
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	Total
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	21	7	6	1	0	35
		Expected Count	7.1	6.3	12.9	6.3	2.4	35.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	39	39	46	7	3	134
		Expected Count	27.1	24.2	49.4	24.2	9.1	134.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	31	35	89	40	11	206
		Expected Count	41.7	37.2	75.9	37.2	14.0	206.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	19	17	59	50	23	168
		Expected Count	34.0	30.3	61.9	30.3	11.4	168.0
Total		Count	110	98	200	98	37	543
		Expected Count	110.0	98.0	200.0	98.0	37.0	543.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	111.801[a]	12	.000

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Likelihood Ratio	110.105	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	88.583	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	543		

a. 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.38.

Table 12.29 Familiarity * Digital

Crosstab

			\multicolumn{5}{c}{Digital}	Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	27	3	5	0	1	36
		Expected Count	15.4	11.0	6.7	1.9	1.0	36.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	78	32	20	3	2	135
		Expected Count	57.8	41.4	25.1	7.2	3.6	135.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	77	67	37	13	2	196
		Expected Count	83.9	60.1	36.4	10.4	5.2	196.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	44	60	36	12	9	161
		Expected Count	68.9	49.4	29.9	8.5	4.3	161.0
Total		Count	226	162	98	28	14	528
		Expected Count	226.0	162.0	98.0	28.0	14.0	528.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	53.424ª	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	56.765	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.378	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	528		

a. 4 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Table 12.30 Familiarity * WOM Staff

Crosstab

			\multicolumn{5}{c}{WOM Staff}	Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	17	6	11	2	0	36
		Expected Count	4.1	4.1	10.7	10.4	6.7	36.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	29	16	43	37	18	143
		Expected Count	16.3	16.3	42.5	41.4	26.4	143.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	12	23	72	62	34	203
		Expected Count	23.2	23.2	60.3	58.8	37.5	203.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	5	18	38	59	50	170
		Expected Count	19.4	19.4	50.5	49.3	31.4	170.0

							Total
Total	Count	63	63	164	160	102	552
	Expected Count	63.0	63.0	164.0	160.0	102.0	552.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	102.778[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	97.392	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	72.561	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	552		

a. 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.11.

Table 12.31 Familiarity * Working

Crosstab

			Working					Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	32	2	1	0	0	35
		Expected Count	12.8	2.4	4.4	7.9	7.5	35.0
	FamiliarityA little	Count	94	10	10	14	6	134
		Expected Count	49.2	9.2	16.7	30.2	28.7	134.0
	FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	55	19	35	56	36	201
		Expected Count	73.7	13.8	25.1	45.3	43.0	201.0
	FamiliarityVery well	Count	16	6	21	51	73	167
		Expected Count	61.3	11.5	20.8	37.6	35.8	167.0
Total		Count	197	37	67	121	115	537
		Expected Count	197.0	37.0	67.0	121.0	115.0	537.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	210.832[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	226.380	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	183.533	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	537		

a. 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.41.

Table 12.32 Familiarity * Social Media

Crosstab

			Social Media					Total
			Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All of the Time	
Fam	familiarityNot at all	Count	25	4	7	1	0	37

	Expected Count	10.3	6.7	9.0	7.6	3.5	37.0
FamiliarityA little	Count	61	25	31	8	5	130
	Expected Count	36.0	23.6	31.6	26.6	12.2	130.0
FamiliarityReasonably well	Count	40	43	50	48	12	193
	Expected Count	53.5	35.1	46.9	39.5	18.1	193.0
FamiliarityVery well	Count	19	23	39	50	32	163
	Expected Count	45.2	29.6	39.6	33.3	15.3	163.0
Total	Count	145	95	127	107	49	523
	Expected Count	145.0	95.0	127.0	107.0	49.0	523.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	119.107[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	122.455	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	97.643	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	523		

a. 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.47.

Appendix 16 - Descriptions of case study university's reputation

Table 12.33 Top 5 positive words to describe PU

Word to describe PU	No of responses
Good	49
Friendly	48
Innovative	29
Modern	21
Positive	18

Table 12.34 Negative descriptions of PU reputation

Below-average, weak
Not that great
Could do better
Wendy Purcell lol
Damaged by scandal
Not that notable.
Tarred by university politics in the press
Easy to get in to. it shows.
Greedy charging uni
Bad in the eyes media
Not Cambridge!
Not know as much as it should
Weak. Chairs. VC Scandal
Tainted mixed quiet
Chairs, badly run
A bit obscure
Fairly unheard of where I'm from
Some poor organisation
Poor
Dodgy vice chancellor
Understated environmental quality
Not that good
I had never heard of Plymouth University before being asked to attend this event.
Financial budgeting poor
Regionalised, narrow, selective
Poor management decisions.
Poor unethical leadership

Appendix 17 - Factors contributing to latent variables

Overall reputation

Factor 1 comprised of 10 variables derived from the 'leadership', 'products and services' and 'performance' groups from the original RepTrak scale. Additionally, the new variable UniAcademic, as identified from the interviews, factored with this group. As this variable considers the academic performance of the institution it is suggested to be aligned with the other performance variables. This recognises three groups within factor 1, leadership, products and services and performance.

> Leadership: well organised, well managed, excellent leadership and vision for the future are considered to contribute towards the leadership of the institution, thus this variable is labelled ***leadership***. This differs from the original RepTrak leadership variable as it considers 'well managed' and 'excellent leadership' as separate variables within this construct, as suggested within the interviews (Chapter 6).

> Products and Services: quality products and services, value for money, meets the needs of stakeholders and stands behind its products and services, are all related to products and services the institution offers. Accordingly, this factor was labelled ***products and services***.

> Performance: financial performance, future growth and academic/research performance are all indicators of performance of the institution. The inclusion of academic/research performance within this variable differs from the original RepTrak scale, and shows a clear distinction between profit making organisations and educational institutions. As such, this variable was labelled ***performance.***

Factor 4 contains variables owing to emotional appeal identified within the RepTrak scale, however this factor differs as it separates the 'esteem' variable into separate respect and favourability variables (as suggested in Chapter 6). Furthermore, 'overall reputation', 'prior perceptions' and 'speak positively' were grouped within this factor.

The judgement on 'overall reputation' and 'prior perceptions' are linked to perceptions of the institution as a whole, while intentions to 'speak positively' are likely to link to respondents' future intentions. Owing to this combination, factor 4 was labelled ***emotional perceptions***.

Factor 5 is comprised of variables derived from the innovation and citizenship variables of the RepTrak scale. Items from the innovation variable included; is enterprising in its approach to business, has innovative products and services and has the ability to adapt to change. While characteristics from the citizenship variable included, acts sustainably, and is a positive influence on the community. In addition to these variables, the new variable 'takes advantage of opportunities', was also grouped within this factor. These variables are all considered to be behavioural traits of an institution. Therefore, factor 5 was labelled ***institutional behaviour***.

Factor 8 consisted of the new variables 'is in a good location' and 'has an attractive campus and facilities'. These variables are both considered to be physical attributes of the institution. Subsequently, this factor was labelled ***physical attributes***.

Factor 9 included three items from the workplace variable from the RepTrak scale. This included, employee wellbeing, employment opportunities and rewards employees fairly. Overall, these items are thought to be aspects of behaviour exhibited towards employees. As such, this factor was labelled ***workplace behaviour***.

Event Influence (EI)

Factor 2 is made up of service quality characteristics considered to contribute toward the overall satisfaction had by attendees at events. Eight items contribute towards this factor. As recognised within the literature review, service quality characteristics in events have been linked to Hertzberg's maintenance factors, which are grouped according to physical and non-physical attributes. Therefore, it is recognised that two latent variables exist within this factor.

Physical attributes: the venue, seating/ viewing of the event, and provision of food/drink at the events are all considered to be physical attributes of service quality as well as 'dissatisfies'. Therefore, this was labelled as *SQ[1] physical attributes*.

Non-Physical attributes: event atmosphere, event quality, achieve the intended purpose, experience at the event and engagement with other attendees are all considered to be non-physical attributes of service quality as well as 'satisfiers'. This was therefore labelled as *SQ non-physical attributes.*

Factor 7 comprised of three variables, Event impact on reputation, reputation change following the event, and 'I know more about the university after attending the event'. These items are all considered to contribute towards the effect the event has on perceptions of the university. Subsequently, this factor was labelled *event impact*.

Knowledge and Familiarity (KF)

Factor 3 grouped items relating to methods of communication used to gain information about the university. Seven items were included within this factor, six of which were identified as direct communication. Of these, three items were considered as face to face communication (meetings, events and working/study at the university) (labelled as *direct face-to-face*) and, three recognised to be forms of direct online communication (Website, email and social media) (labelled as *direct online*). The final variable assessed perceptions of the respondents' familiarity with the organisation, and is grouped with the variables of Direct Online.

Factor 6: Similarly to factor 3, factor 6 was made up of variables indicating the extent that different communication methods from the university were used in gaining information. Two indirect communication methods were identified, these included WOM from external audiences and the media. Digital communication, including cinema, television and radio adverts, and printed material, which included fliers, banners and

---

[1] SQ = service quality

prospectus were also factored within this group. While the latter two (digital and printed material), could originate from the university and be forms of direct communication, they could also be viewed to be forms of indirect communication due to being seen/heard in third party mediums. As such, factor 6 was labelled ***indirect communication***.

Factor 10 consisted of characteristics assessing perceptions of visibility. These included local, national and international visibility. As such, factor 10 was labelled ***visibility.***

Appendix 18 – Multi-collinearity of parcelled items

Table 12.35 Multi-collinearity of parcelled items

Dependent Variable	Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
SQNonPhysical	(Constant)	1.260	0.724		1.741	0.082		
	SQPhysical	0.883	0.056	0.528	15.767	0.000	0.740	1.352
	Leadership	0.007	0.037	0.008	0.181	0.857	0.434	2.304
	ProductsService	-0.026	0.048	-0.024	-0.541	0.589	0.416	2.401
	Performance	0.025	0.061	0.018	0.410	0.682	0.409	2.446
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.020	0.032	0.026	0.616	0.538	0.472	2.117
	PhysicalAttributes	0.007	0.063	0.004	0.113	0.910	0.662	1.510
	Workplacebehaviour	0.034	0.049	0.026	0.690	0.490	0.564	1.774
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.094	0.025	0.145	3.819	0.000	0.575	1.738
	EventImpactFactor	0.263	0.049	0.183	5.329	0.000	0.706	1.416
	DirectOnline	-0.003	0.030	-0.005	-0.106	0.916	0.391	2.560
	DirectFacetoFace	0.077	0.034	0.106	2.239	0.026	0.374	2.677
	IndirectCommunication	0.017	0.026	0.023	0.665	0.507	0.666	1.502
SQPhysical	(Constant)	2.191	0.451		4.861	0.000		
	Leadership	0.013	0.023	0.025	0.542	0.588	0.434	2.303
	ProductsService	0.019	0.030	0.030	0.631	0.528	0.417	2.401
	Performance	0.002	0.038	0.003	0.064	0.949	0.409	2.447
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.005	0.020	0.011	0.244	0.807	0.472	2.118
	PhysicalAttributes	0.040	0.040	0.038	1.010	0.313	0.663	1.507
	Workplacebehaviour	-0.086	0.031	-0.111	-2.745	0.006	0.571	1.751
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.043	0.016	0.111	2.729	0.007	0.568	1.761
	EventImpactFactor	0.058	0.032	0.067	1.799	0.073	0.675	1.481
	DirectOnline	-0.013	0.019	-0.032	-0.660	0.510	0.391	2.558
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.013	0.022	-0.029	-0.572	0.567	0.370	2.700
	IndirectCommunication	0.014	0.016	0.032	0.859	0.391	0.666	1.501
	SQNonPhysical	0.355	0.023	0.595	15.767	0.000	0.656	1.523
Leadership	(Constant)	-2.779	0.834		-3.330	0.001		
	ProductsService	0.354	0.053	0.281	6.663	0.000	0.450	2.221
	Performance	0.460	0.068	0.289	6.797	0.000	0.443	2.255
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.122	0.037	0.134	3.287	0.001	0.482	2.077
	PhysicalAttributes	-0.017	0.073	-0.008	-0.238	0.812	0.662	1.510
	Workplacebehaviour	0.094	0.057	0.062	1.647	0.100	0.566	1.767
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.073	0.029	0.095	2.536	0.011	0.567	1.764
	EventImpactFactor	0.130	0.059	0.076	2.222	0.027	0.677	1.477

Dependent Variable	Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
	DirectOnline	0.011	0.035	0.015	0.330	0.741	0.391	2.559
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.141	0.040	-0.163	-3.552	0.000	0.379	2.641
	IndirectCommunication	0.019	0.030	0.023	0.651	0.515	0.666	1.502
	SQNonPhysical	0.009	0.050	0.008	0.181	0.857	0.450	2.221
	SQPhysical	0.043	0.079	0.021	0.542	0.588	0.508	1.970
ProductsService	(Constant)	1.886	0.650		2.900	0.004		
	Performance	0.407	0.052	0.322	7.837	0.000	0.455	2.198
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.119	0.029	0.165	4.161	0.000	0.487	2.053
	PhysicalAttributes	-0.053	0.057	-0.032	-0.944	0.346	0.663	1.508
	Workplacebehaviour	0.202	0.044	0.167	4.609	0.000	0.585	1.709
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.014	0.023	0.023	0.635	0.526	0.561	1.784
	EventImpactFactor	0.032	0.046	0.024	0.696	0.487	0.672	1.489
	DirectOnline	-0.039	0.027	-0.064	-1.439	0.151	0.392	2.550
	DirectFacetoFace	0.076	0.031	0.111	2.443	0.015	0.374	2.673
	IndirectCommunication	-0.021	0.023	-0.031	-0.904	0.366	0.666	1.501
	SQNonPhysical	-0.021	0.039	-0.022	-0.541	0.589	0.451	2.220
	SQPhysical	0.039	0.061	0.025	0.631	0.528	0.508	1.970
	Leadership	0.214	0.032	0.269	6.663	0.000	0.470	2.130
Performance	(Constant)	0.053	0.514		0.102	0.919		
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.070	0.023	0.122	3.079	0.002	0.480	2.082
	PhysicalAttributes	0.140	0.044	0.106	3.186	0.002	0.674	1.483
	Workplacebehaviour	0.055	0.035	0.057	1.571	0.117	0.566	1.768
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.045	0.018	0.093	2.557	0.011	0.567	1.764
	EventImpactFactor	-0.018	0.036	-0.017	-0.507	0.613	0.671	1.490
	DirectOnline	0.008	0.021	0.016	0.357	0.721	0.391	2.559
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.002	0.024	-0.003	-0.074	0.941	0.370	2.702
	IndirectCommunication	0.014	0.018	0.026	0.777	0.437	0.666	1.501
	SQNonPhysical	0.012	0.030	0.017	0.410	0.682	0.450	2.220
	SQPhysical	0.003	0.048	0.002	0.064	0.949	0.507	1.971
	Leadership	0.171	0.025	0.272	6.797	0.000	0.471	2.123
	ProductsService	0.250	0.032	0.316	7.837	0.000	0.463	2.159
Institutionalbehaviour	(Constant)	5.099	0.940		5.424	0.000		
	PhysicalAttributes	0.517	0.081	0.224	6.423	0.000	0.712	1.404
	Workplacebehaviour	0.358	0.064	0.214	5.591	0.000	0.596	1.679
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.015	0.033	0.018	0.462	0.644	0.560	1.784
	EventImpactFactor	-0.095	0.067	-0.051	-1.412	0.158	0.673	1.485

Dependent Variable	Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
	DirectOnline	0.065	0.040	0.077	1.635	0.103	0.393	2.547
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.049	0.046	-0.052	-1.070	0.285	0.371	2.696
	IndirectCommunication	0.015	0.034	0.016	0.448	0.655	0.666	1.502
	SQNonPhysical	0.035	0.057	0.027	0.616	0.538	0.451	2.219
	SQPhysical	0.022	0.090	0.010	0.244	0.807	0.507	1.971
	Leadership	0.160	0.049	0.146	3.287	0.001	0.443	2.259
	ProductsService	0.259	0.062	0.187	4.161	0.000	0.429	2.328
	Performance	0.246	0.080	0.141	3.079	0.002	0.416	2.405
PhysicalAttributes	(Constant)	1.301	0.493		2.640	0.009		
	Workplacebehaviour	0.115	0.033	0.159	3.447	0.001	0.575	1.738
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.035	0.017	0.095	2.035	0.042	0.565	1.771
	EventImpactFactor	-0.007	0.035	-0.009	-0.212	0.832	0.671	1.490
	DirectOnline	0.028	0.020	0.076	1.359	0.175	0.392	2.551
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.003	0.024	-0.009	-0.148	0.882	0.370	2.702
	IndirectCommunication	-0.014	0.017	-0.033	-0.773	0.440	0.666	1.501
	SQNonPhysical	0.003	0.029	0.006	0.113	0.910	0.450	2.221
	SQPhysical	0.047	0.046	0.049	1.010	0.313	0.508	1.967
	Leadership	-0.006	0.025	-0.013	-0.238	0.812	0.434	2.304
	ProductsService	-0.031	0.032	-0.051	-0.944	0.346	0.417	2.399
	Performance	0.131	0.041	0.172	3.186	0.002	0.416	2.402
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.137	0.021	0.315	6.423	0.000	0.508	1.969
Workplacebehaviour	(Constant)	1.135	0.628		1.808	0.071		
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.036	0.022	0.071	1.654	0.099	0.563	1.776
	EventImpactFactor	0.043	0.044	0.038	0.969	0.333	0.672	1.488
	DirectOnline	-0.015	0.026	-0.030	-0.583	0.560	0.391	2.558
	DirectFacetoFace	0.018	0.030	0.032	0.609	0.543	0.370	2.700
	IndirectCommunication	0.012	0.022	0.022	0.554	0.580	0.666	1.502
	SQNonPhysical	0.026	0.037	0.033	0.690	0.490	0.451	2.219
	SQPhysical	-0.160	0.058	-0.123	-2.745	0.006	0.514	1.944
	Leadership	0.053	0.032	0.080	1.647	0.100	0.436	2.293
	ProductsService	0.186	0.040	0.226	4.609	0.000	0.432	2.312
	Performance	0.082	0.052	0.079	1.571	0.117	0.411	2.436
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.152	0.027	0.255	5.591	0.000	0.499	2.003
	PhysicalAttributes	0.186	0.054	0.135	3.447	0.001	0.677	1.478
EmotionalPerceptions	(Constant)	4.700	1.232		3.815	0.000		
	EventImpactFactor	0.437	0.085	0.196	5.128	0.000	0.704	1.421
	DirectOnline	0.142	0.051	0.142	2.775	0.006	0.396	2.524

Dependent Variable	Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.027	0.059	-0.024	-0.447	0.655	0.370	2.701
	IndirectCommunication	-0.002	0.044	-0.002	-0.046	0.963	0.665	1.503
	SQNonPhysical	0.278	0.073	0.180	3.819	0.000	0.462	2.163
	SQPhysical	0.315	0.116	0.122	2.729	0.007	0.514	1.944
	Leadership	0.160	0.063	0.123	2.536	0.011	0.439	2.277
	ProductsService	0.052	0.082	0.032	0.635	0.526	0.417	2.401
	Performance	0.265	0.104	0.128	2.557	0.011	0.414	2.418
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.026	0.055	0.022	0.462	0.644	0.472	2.117
	PhysicalAttributes	0.219	0.108	0.080	2.035	0.042	0.667	1.499
	Workplacebehaviour	0.140	0.085	0.071	1.654	0.099	0.566	1.767
EventImpactFactor	(Constant)	2.824	0.602		4.690	0.000		
	DirectOnline	-0.042	0.025	-0.093	-1.665	0.096	0.393	2.547
	DirectFacetoFace	-0.064	0.029	-0.127	-2.206	0.028	0.373	2.678
	IndirectCommunication	0.055	0.022	0.109	2.537	0.011	0.673	1.485
	SQNonPhysical	0.189	0.035	0.272	5.329	0.000	0.474	2.110
	SQPhysical	0.103	0.057	0.089	1.799	0.073	0.510	1.959
	Leadership	0.069	0.031	0.118	2.222	0.027	0.438	2.283
	ProductsService	0.028	0.040	0.038	0.696	0.487	0.417	2.401
	Performance	-0.026	0.051	-0.028	-0.507	0.613	0.409	2.446
	Institutionalbehaviour	-0.039	0.027	-0.072	-1.412	0.158	0.474	2.110
	PhysicalAttributes	-0.011	0.053	-0.009	-0.212	0.832	0.662	1.510
	Workplacebehaviour	0.041	0.042	0.045	0.969	0.333	0.564	1.773
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.106	0.021	0.235	5.128	0.000	0.587	1.703
DirectOnline	(Constant)	2.035	1.035		1.966	0.050		
	DirectFacetoFace	0.759	0.037	0.678	20.467	0.000	0.656	1.525
	IndirectCommunication	0.143	0.036	0.128	3.955	0.000	0.685	1.461
	SQNonPhysical	-0.007	0.061	-0.004	-0.106	0.916	0.450	2.221
	SQPhysical	-0.064	0.097	-0.025	-0.660	0.510	0.508	1.969
	Leadership	0.017	0.053	0.013	0.330	0.741	0.434	2.304
	ProductsService	-0.098	0.068	-0.060	-1.439	0.151	0.418	2.394
	Performance	0.031	0.087	0.015	0.357	0.721	0.409	2.446
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.075	0.046	0.064	1.635	0.103	0.474	2.108
	PhysicalAttributes	0.122	0.090	0.045	1.359	0.175	0.664	1.505
	Workplacebehaviour	-0.041	0.071	-0.021	-0.583	0.560	0.563	1.775
	EmotionalPerceptions	0.098	0.035	0.099	2.775	0.006	0.568	1.760
	EventImpactFactor	-0.121	0.072	-0.054	-1.665	0.096	0.674	1.483

Dependent Variable	Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
DirectFacetoFace	(Constant)	0.456	0.903		0.505	0.614		
	IndirectCommunication	0.204	0.031	0.205	6.665	0.000	0.720	1.389
	SQNonPhysical	0.119	0.053	0.087	2.239	0.026	0.454	2.201
	SQPhysical	-0.048	0.084	-0.021	-0.572	0.567	0.508	1.970
	Leadership	-0.161	0.045	-0.139	-3.552	0.000	0.444	2.252
	ProductsService	0.144	0.059	0.098	2.443	0.015	0.421	2.377
	Performance	-0.006	0.075	-0.003	-0.074	0.941	0.409	2.447
	Institutionalbehaviour	-0.043	0.040	-0.041	-1.070	0.285	0.473	2.114
	PhysicalAttributes	-0.012	0.078	-0.005	-0.148	0.882	0.662	1.510
	Workplacebehaviour	0.037	0.062	0.021	0.609	0.543	0.564	1.775
	EmotionalPerceptions	-0.014	0.031	-0.016	-0.447	0.655	0.560	1.784
	EventImpactFactor	-0.139	0.063	-0.070	-2.206	0.028	0.677	1.477
	DirectOnline	0.574	0.028	0.642	20.467	0.000	0.692	1.445
IndirectCommunication	(Constant)	-0.231	1.217		-0.189	0.850		
	SQNonPhysical	0.048	0.072	0.035	0.665	0.507	0.451	2.219
	SQPhysical	0.097	0.113	0.042	0.859	0.391	0.508	1.968
	Leadership	0.040	0.062	0.035	0.651	0.515	0.434	2.302
	ProductsService	-0.072	0.080	-0.049	-0.904	0.366	0.417	2.399
	Performance	0.079	0.102	0.043	0.777	0.437	0.409	2.444
	Institutionalbehaviour	0.024	0.054	0.023	0.448	0.655	0.472	2.117
	PhysicalAttributes	-0.081	0.105	-0.033	-0.773	0.440	0.663	1.509
	Workplacebehaviour	0.046	0.083	0.026	0.554	0.580	0.563	1.775
	EmotionalPerceptions	-0.002	0.042	-0.002	-0.046	0.963	0.560	1.785
	EventImpactFactor	0.214	0.085	0.108	2.537	0.011	0.679	1.473
	DirectOnline	0.196	0.050	0.218	3.955	0.000	0.402	2.488
	DirectFacetoFace	0.371	0.056	0.369	6.665	0.000	0.400	2.498

Appendix 19 – AMOS result tables from initial model

Table 12.36 Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
EmotionalPerceptions	.400
DirectOnline	.730
DirectFacetoFace	.791
SQNonPhysical	.705
SQPhysical	.578
Leadership	.597
ProductsService	.653
Performance	.671
IndirectCommunication	.353
EventImpactFactor	.322
Institutionalbehaviour	.563
PhysicalAttributes	.311
Workplacebehaviour	.457

Table 12.37 Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.676
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.557
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.750
EventImpactFactor	<---	EventInfluence	.568
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.889
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.854
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	.632
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.594
SQPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	.760
SQNonPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	.840
Performance	<---	Reputation	.819
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.808
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.773

Table 12.38 Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.538	.035	15.594	***	
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.322	.025	12.706	***	
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	1.000				
EventImpactFactor	<---	EventInfluence	1.000				
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.930	.052	17.794	***	
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	1.000				
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	2.477	.223	11.118	***	

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.624	.044	14.135	***	
SQPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	1.154	.093	12.378	***	
SQNonPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	2.134	.167	12.754	***	
Performance	<---	Reputation	.625	.033	19.095	***	
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.779	.041	18.834	***	
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.938	.052	17.968	***	

Table 12.39 Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.676
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.557
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.750
EventImpactFactor	<---	EventInfluence	.568
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.889
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.854
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	.632
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.594
SQPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	.760
SQNonPhysical	<---	EventInfluence	.840
Performance	<---	Reputation	.819
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.808
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.773

Table 12.40 Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Workplacebehaviour	10.853	.083	130.812	***	
PhysicalAttributes	8.146	.060	135.136	***	
Institutionalbehaviour	22.739	.139	163.686	***	
EventImpactFactor	10.121	.074	136.475	***	
IndirectCommunication	9.676	.148	65.595	***	
Performance	10.971	.079	138.101	***	
ProductsService	14.559	.100	144.909	***	
Leadership	14.223	.127	112.408	***	
SQPhysical	9.888	.064	154.683	***	
SQNonPhysical	16.928	.107	158.247	***	
DirectFacetoFace	7.957	.147	54.212	***	
DirectOnline	11.698	.164	71.173	***	
EmotionalPerceptions	28.212	.165	171.046	***	

Table 12.41 Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	<-->	EventInfluence	1.169	.157	7.426	***	
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	Reputation	.676	.393	1.719	.086	
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	EventInfluence	.511	.169	3.022	.003	

Table 12.42 Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
Reputation	<-->	EventInfluence	.480
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	Reputation	.083
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	EventInfluence	.156

Table 12.43 Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	6.026	.606	9.944	***	
EventInfluence	.984	.147	6.700	***	
KnowledgeFamiliarity	10.947	1.007	10.871	***	
er6	2.072	.139	14.926	***	
er5	1.390	.088	15.739	***	
er4	4.684	.335	13.997	***	
ee3	2.068	.137	15.072	***	
ek3	7.816	.511	15.295	***	
er3	1.152	.093	12.410	***	
er2	1.944	.153	12.738	***	
er1	3.583	.264	13.588	***	
ee2	.957	.082	11.655	***	
ee1	1.871	.222	8.437	***	
ek2	2.498	.468	5.342	***	
ek1	4.047	.567	7.135	***	
ee4	9.063	.629	14.400	***	

Table 12.44 Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
EmotionalPerceptions	.400
DirectOnline	.730
DirectFacetoFace	.791
SQNonPhysical	.705
SQPhysical	.578
Leadership	.597
ProductsService	.653
Performance	.671
IndirectCommunication	.353
EventImpactFactor	.322
Institutionalbehaviour	.563
PhysicalAttributes	.311
Workplacebehaviour	.457

Appendix 20 – AMOS results tables from final model

Table 12.45 Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.306	.026	11.650	***	par_1
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.987	.058	17.081	***	par_2
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.621	.044	14.098	***	par_4
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	1.000				
Performance	<---	Reputation	.660	.032	20.535	***	par_9
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	1.000				
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.927	.052	17.866	***	par_10
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.630	.068	9.271	***	par_11
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.820	.041	20.171	***	par_12
Leadership	<---	Reputation	1.000				
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.533	.035	15.157	***	par_13

Table 12.46 Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.508
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.711
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.592
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	.876
Performance	<---	Reputation	.830
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.856
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.888
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.576
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.817
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.790
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.642

Table 12.47 Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Workplacebehaviour	10.853	.083	130.812	***	par_14
PhysicalAttributes	8.146	.060	135.136	***	par_15
Institutionalbehaviour	22.739	.139	163.686	***	par_16
IndirectCommunication	9.676	.148	65.595	***	par_17
EmotionalPerceptions	28.212	.164	171.759	***	par_18
ProductsService	14.559	.100	144.909	***	par_19
Leadership	14.223	.127	112.408	***	par_20
Performance	10.971	.079	138.101	***	par_21
SQtotal	26.817	.157	170.364	***	par_22
DirectFacetoFace	7.957	.147	54.212	***	par_23
DirectOnline	11.698	.164	71.173	***	par_24

Table 12.48 Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	<-->	EventInfluence	4.934	.485	10.164	***	par_3
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	EventInfluence	1.820	.501	3.632	***	par_5
er5	<-->	er4	.746	.139	5.346	***	par_6

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
er6	<-->	er4	.713	.175	4.083	***	par_7
er6	<-->	er5	.300	.086	3.475	***	par_8

Table 12.49 Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
Reputation	<-->	EventInfluence	.618
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<-->	EventInfluence	.162
er5	<-->	er4	.265
er6	<-->	er4	.207
er6	<-->	er5	.164

Table 12.50 Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	5.550	.520	10.676	***	par_25
EventInfluence	11.494	1.374	8.366	***	par_26
KnowledgeFamiliarity	10.989	1.007	10.910	***	par_27
er6	2.244	.150	14.961	***	par_28
er5	1.495	.095	15.779	***	par_29
er4	5.302	.371	14.285	***	par_30
ek3	7.838	.512	15.311	***	par_31
ee4	3.479	1.084	3.211	.001	par_32
er3	1.088	.093	11.736	***	par_33
er2	1.867	.153	12.221	***	par_34
er1	3.335	.257	12.985	***	par_35
ee1	9.192	.695	13.235	***	par_36
ek2	2.519	.465	5.417	***	par_37
ek1	4.005	.566	7.080	***	par_38

Table 12.51 Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
Leadership	.625
ProductsService	.667
SQtotal	.332
DirectFacetoFace	.789
DirectOnline	.733
Performance	.689
EmotionalPerceptions	.768
IndirectCommunication	.351
Institutionalbehaviour	.505
PhysicalAttributes	.258
Workplacebehaviour	.413

Appendix 21 - AMOS results tables: SEM model 1

Table 12.52 Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
EventInfluence	<---	Reputation	.896	.070	12.731	***	par_12
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.308	.026	11.669	***	par_1
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.990	.058	17.072	***	par_2
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.619	.044	14.111	***	par_3
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	1.000				
Performance	<---	Reputation	.661	.032	20.496	***	par_7
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	1.000				
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.918	.051	17.940	***	par_8
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.630	.067	9.408	***	par_9
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.822	.041	20.124	***	par_10
Leadership	<---	Reputation	1.000				
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.535	.035	15.151	***	par_11
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<---	EventInfluence	.113	.075	1.517	.129	par_13
EventInfluence	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.089	.069	1.297	.195	par_14

Table 12.53 Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
EventInfluence	<---	Reputation	.618
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.510
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.711
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.594
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	.877
Performance	<---	Reputation	.831
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.860
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.884
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.578
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.817
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.789
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.643
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<---	EventInfluence	.116
EventInfluence	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.087

Table 12.54 Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Workplacebehaviour	10.853	.083	130.812	***	par_15
PhysicalAttributes	8.146	.060	135.136	***	par_16
Institutionalbehaviour	22.739	.139	163.686	***	par_17
IndirectCommunication	9.676	.148	65.595	***	par_18
EmotionalPerceptions	28.212	.165	171.046	***	par_19
ProductsService	14.559	.100	144.909	***	par_20
Leadership	14.223	.127	112.408	***	par_21
Performance	10.971	.079	138.101	***	par_22
SQtotal	26.817	.158	170.058	***	par_23
DirectFacetoFace	7.957	.147	54.212	***	par_24
DirectOnline	11.698	.164	71.173	***	par_25

Table 12.55 Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
er5 <--> er4	.740	.139	5.313	***	par_4
er6 <--> er4	.706	.174	4.052	***	par_5
er6 <--> er5	.297	.086	3.444	***	par_6

Table 12.56 Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
er5 <--> er4	.263
er6 <--> er4	.205
er6 <--> er5	.163

Table 12.57 Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	5.526	.519	10.642	***	par_26
EI1	6.868	1.157	5.937	***	par_27
DC1	10.720	.990	10.825	***	par_28
er6	2.241	.150	14.955	***	par_29
er5	1.493	.095	15.773	***	par_30
er4	5.289	.371	14.274	***	par_31
ek3	7.821	.511	15.302	***	par_32
ee4	3.474	1.075	3.230	.001	par_33
er3	1.085	.093	11.719	***	par_34
er2	1.865	.153	12.218	***	par_35
er1	3.360	.258	13.033	***	par_36
ee1	9.194	.692	13.278	***	par_37
ek2	2.613	.460	5.675	***	par_38
ek1	3.906	.565	6.917	***	par_39

Table 12.58 Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
EventInfluence	.409
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.033
Leadership	.622
ProductsService	.667
SQtotal	.334
DirectFacetoFace	.782
DirectOnline	.739
Performance	.690
EmotionalPerceptions	.770
IndirectCommunication	.352
Institutionalbehaviour	.506
PhysicalAttributes	.260
Workplacebehaviour	.413

Table 12.59 Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.905	.010	.090
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.103	.115	.010

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
Leadership	1.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.822	.000	.000
SQtotal	.570	.636	.057
DirectFacetoFace	.094	.105	.927
DirectOnline	.103	.115	1.010
Performance	.661	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.905	1.010	.090
IndirectCommunication	.064	.071	.626
Institutionalbehaviour	.990	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.308	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.535	.000	.000

Table 12.60 Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.624	.010	.088
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.072	.117	.010
Leadership	.789	.000	.000
ProductsService	.817	.000	.000
SQtotal	.361	.584	.051
DirectFacetoFace	.064	.104	.893
DirectOnline	.062	.101	.869
Performance	.831	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.548	.886	.077
IndirectCommunication	.043	.070	.600
Institutionalbehaviour	.711	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.510	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.643	.000	.000

Table 12.61 Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.896	.000	.089
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.000	.113	.000
Leadership	1.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.822	.000	.000
SQtotal	.000	.630	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.000	.000	.918
DirectOnline	.000	.000	1.000
Performance	.661	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.000	1.000	.000
IndirectCommunication	.000	.000	.619
Institutionalbehaviour	.990	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.308	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.535	.000	.000

Table 12.62 Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.618	.000	.087
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.000	.116	.000
Leadership	.789	.000	.000
ProductsService	.817	.000	.000

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
SQtotal	.000	.578	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.000	.000	.884
DirectOnline	.000	.000	.860
Performance	.831	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.000	.877	.000
IndirectCommunication	.000	.000	.594
Institutionalbehaviour	.711	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.510	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.643	.000	.000

Table 12.63 Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.009	.010	.001
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.103	.001	.010
Leadership	.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.000	.000	.000
SQtotal	.570	.006	.057
DirectFacetoFace	.094	.105	.009
DirectOnline	.103	.115	.010
Performance	.000	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.905	.010	.090
IndirectCommunication	.064	.071	.006
Institutionalbehaviour	.000	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.000	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.000	.000	.000

Table 12.64 Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.006	.010	.001
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.072	.001	.010
Leadership	.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.000	.000	.000
SQtotal	.361	.006	.051
DirectFacetoFace	.064	.104	.009
DirectOnline	.062	.101	.009
Performance	.000	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.548	.009	.077
IndirectCommunication	.043	.070	.006
Institutionalbehaviour	.000	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.000	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.000	.000	.000

Appendix 22 – AMOS results tables: SEM model 2

Table 12.65 Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
EventInfluence	<---	Reputation	.908	.071	12.760	***	par_12
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<---	EventInfluence	.183	.050	3.677	***	par_13
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.309	.026	11.680	***	par_1
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.994	.058	17.058	***	par_2
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.619	.044	14.106	***	par_3
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	1.000				
Performance	<---	Reputation	.663	.032	20.448	***	par_7
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	1.000				
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.915	.051	17.912	***	par_8
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.613	.067	9.220	***	par_9
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.825	.041	20.076	***	par_10
Leadership	<---	Reputation	1.000				
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.536	.035	15.146	***	par_11

Table 12.66 Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
EventInfluence	<---	Reputation	.615
KnowledgeFamiliarity	<---	EventInfluence	.190
PhysicalAttributes	<---	Reputation	.511
Institutionalbehaviour	<---	Reputation	.712
IndirectCommunication	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.594
EmotionalPerceptions	<---	EventInfluence	.890
Performance	<---	Reputation	.831
DirectOnline	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.861
DirectFacetoFace	<---	KnowledgeFamiliarity	.883
SQtotal	<---	EventInfluence	.571
ProductsService	<---	Reputation	.817
Leadership	<---	Reputation	.787
Workplacebehaviour	<---	Reputation	.644

Table 12.67 Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Workplacebehaviour	10.853	.083	130.812	***	par_14
PhysicalAttributes	8.146	.060	135.136	***	par_15
Institutionalbehaviour	22.739	.139	163.686	***	par_16
IndirectCommunication	9.676	.148	65.595	***	par_17
EmotionalPerceptions	28.212	.165	171.046	***	par_18
ProductsService	14.559	.100	144.909	***	par_19
Leadership	14.223	.127	112.408	***	par_20
Performance	10.971	.079	138.101	***	par_21
SQtotal	26.817	.158	170.058	***	par_22
DirectFacetoFace	7.957	.147	54.212	***	par_23
DirectOnline	11.698	.164	71.173	***	par_24

Table 12.68 Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
er5	<-->	er4	.735	.139	5.284	***	par_4
er6	<-->	er4	.700	.174	4.019	***	par_5

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
er6 <--> er5	.295	.086	3.416	***	par_6

Table 12.69 Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
er5 <--> er4	.262
er6 <--> er4	.204
er6 <--> er5	.161

Table 12.70 Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Reputation	5.501	.519	10.608	***	par_25
EI1	7.435	1.196	6.215	***	par_26
DC1	10.720	.981	10.926	***	par_27
er6	2.237	.150	14.946	***	par_28
er5	1.491	.095	15.768	***	par_29
er4	5.277	.370	14.260	***	par_30
ek3	7.817	.511	15.299	***	par_31
ee4	3.130	1.116	2.805	.005	par_32
er3	1.082	.093	11.699	***	par_33
er2	1.863	.153	12.206	***	par_34
er1	3.384	.259	13.075	***	par_35
ee1	9.297	.698	13.329	***	par_36
ek2	2.642	.461	5.735	***	par_37
ek1	3.874	.566	6.840	***	par_38

Table 12.71 Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
EventInfluence	.379
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.036
Leadership	.619
ProductsService	.668
SQtotal	.326
DirectFacetoFace	.779
DirectOnline	.742
Performance	.691
EmotionalPerceptions	.793
IndirectCommunication	.353
Institutionalbehaviour	.507
PhysicalAttributes	.261
Workplacebehaviour	.414

Table 12.72 Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.908	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.166	.183	.000
Leadership	1.000	.000	.000

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
ProductsService	.825	.000	.000
SQtotal	.557	.613	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.152	.168	.915
DirectOnline	.166	.183	1.000
Performance	.663	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.908	1.000	.000
IndirectCommunication	.103	.113	.619
Institutionalbehaviour	.994	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.309	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.536	.000	.000

Table 12.73 Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.615	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.117	.190	.000
Leadership	.787	.000	.000
ProductsService	.817	.000	.000
SQtotal	.352	.571	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.103	.168	.883
DirectOnline	.101	.164	.861
Performance	.831	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.548	.890	.000
IndirectCommunication	.069	.113	.594
Institutionalbehaviour	.712	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.511	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.644	.000	.000

Table 12.74 Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.908	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.000	.183	.000
Leadership	1.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.825	.000	.000
SQtotal	.000	.613	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.000	.000	.915
DirectOnline	.000	.000	1.000
Performance	.663	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.000	1.000	.000
IndirectCommunication	.000	.000	.619
Institutionalbehaviour	.994	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.309	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.536	.000	.000

Table 12.75 Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.615	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.000	.190	.000
Leadership	.787	.000	.000
ProductsService	.817	.000	.000
SQtotal	.000	.571	.000

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
DirectFacetoFace	.000	.000	.883
DirectOnline	.000	.000	.861
Performance	.831	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.000	.890	.000
IndirectCommunication	.000	.000	.594
Institutionalbehaviour	.712	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.511	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.644	.000	.000

Table 12.76 Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.000	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.166	.000	.000
Leadership	.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.000	.000	.000
SQtotal	.557	.000	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.152	.168	.000
DirectOnline	.166	.183	.000
Performance	.000	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.908	.000	.000
IndirectCommunication	.103	.113	.000
Institutionalbehaviour	.000	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.000	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.000	.000	.000

Table 12.77 Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Reputation	EventInfluence	KnowledgeFamiliarity
EventInfluence	.000	.000	.000
KnowledgeFamiliarity	.117	.000	.000
Leadership	.000	.000	.000
ProductsService	.000	.000	.000
SQtotal	.352	.000	.000
DirectFacetoFace	.103	.168	.000
DirectOnline	.101	.164	.000
Performance	.000	.000	.000
EmotionalPerceptions	.548	.000	.000
IndirectCommunication	.069	.113	.000
Institutionalbehaviour	.000	.000	.000
PhysicalAttributes	.000	.000	.000
Workplacebehaviour	.000	.000	.000