International Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management

Vol.3 Issue 2 March-April 2019

www.ijrbem.com

Corporate Reputation Strategies and Organisational Success Paint Manufacturing Firms in Rivers State, Nigeria

Dr. (Mrs) A.E. Bestman
Department of Office and Information Management,
Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University,
Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Abe, Baridor Torka
M.Sc. Student, Department of Office and Information Management,
Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University,
Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between corporate reputation strategies and organisational success in selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study adopted adescriptive survey designwhich enabled the researcher to solicit responses from participants in the selected firms studied. Primary data was collected with the use of structured and self-administered questionnaire. The population of the study consisted of 15 companies with 120 members of staff. Sample size of 92 was achieved from the four selected firms using the TaroYamen's formula for probability sampling at 0.05 level of significance. The researcher randomly distributed copies of the questionnaire to participants based on the sample size. Experts validated the research instrument by vetting and approving of all the items on the instrument while its reliability was achieved using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient with all items abovethe 0.70 acceptance benchmark. The data was analysed with the use of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version. Descriptive statistics with tables, charts, mean and standard deviation were used while the Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient tool was used for testing the hypotheses. The study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between corporate reputation strategies and organisational success in the selected firms. The study showed that the dimensions of corporate reputation used (social responsibility, quality consistency) are positively correlated with the two measures of organisational success (profitability, customer satisfaction). The study recommends that manufacturing firmsin general and especially small and medium enterprises should involve host community in their business activities and engage the youths positively as stakeholders.

Key words: Corporate Reputation, Social Responsibility, Quality, Organisational Success, Product, Stakeholder, Trust

INTRODUCTION

Reputation is often mentioned with regards to both individual personalities and corporate organisations.Reputation refers to a particular characteristicthat is possessed by an individual or an organisationand is synonymous with such words as standing, status, character etc., which means that reputation is a mental evaluation or an opinion about one's character.When used in relation to organisations, it is known as corporate reputation and for the purpose of this work, we shall be concerned with corporate reputation, that is, reputationbuilt and earned by corporate organisations. Reputation is built and earned by individuals, stakeholders and the organisation per say, as opposed to being assigned. For an organisation to earn the trust of the public – being key to continued patronage, such organisation must consistently built and earn a reputation for business qualities that are endearing. Since reputation is earned by business organizations over time, it will then be closely associated with or even built on business ethical standards. That is to say, organisations are perceived to have a reputation and are trusted when they have consistently shown that they have established and worked daily by such ethical standards.

It follows that an organization with reputation should adopt business ethical standards that guide both conducts of its employees and its internal relationships. Corporate ethics also establishes a culture of right and wrongpracticesin business and social responsibilities towards the other actors, so that businessethics is synonymous to productivity. In his view, Kelchner (2013) noted that an organisation's understanding of ethical concepts, its administration and eventual incorporation into its business procedures can build or damage its corporate reputation, integrity, output and its ultimate goal. This establishes the fact that there exists a strong relationship between reputation and ethical standards and practices, and therefore, organisations that run on ethical standards seam to easily earn the trust of the public and be held as a reputable company especially if in addition, it engages in social responsibilities towards its hosts.Businessethics specifies the framework that an organization may choose to follow if it wants to gain public acceptance. Public acceptance here becomes a (positive) long term effect of reputation building.

Corporate reputation is the judgment by the organisation's customers. So an organisation with reputation will have created that mental impression in the minds of customers and would have a place in public esteem.de Castro, Lopez and Saez (2006)posed that corporate reputation is the result of the process of "social legitimization" of the firm. In that sense,they continued,"corporate reputation can be understood as the collective representation of actions and outcomes of the past and present of the organisation, that describe its capability to obtain valuable outcomes for different stakeholders". So we recognise that reputation is a matter of perception- from the point of view of the organisation herself, and also a function of its reputation among its core stakeholders. According to Eccles, Newquist and Schatz(2007), the sum of positive reputation among stakeholders – whether internal or external - will result in a general positive reputation for the company herself. Reputation they see, as something detachable which means can be separated from the actual character or behaviour of the company. In this wise, they identified what they called reputation-reality gap –this is used to explain when the reputation of a company is promoted than its underlying reality, and opines that to close this reputation-reality gaps, such an organization must either improve to be able to meet stakeholder/societal expectations or reduce their expectations by making realizable promises.

These efforts are worthwhile when the organisation records some success. Sustainability or business continuity is the overriding goal of any organisation. This informs the reason why a business organisation adopts various and different business strategies including luring adverts; build, possess, and values intangible assets such as reputation. Moss Kanter (2011) rightly puts it that anorganisationthat is sustainable will conduct its business in a careful manner such that the possibility of its own sustained existence and its capability to meet its future needs is not at risk. When ethical values are generally accepted throughout the organisation, the workforce becomes united by a common organisational goalso they do not just existto pursue profit. Thiscommon goal becomes a unifying factor that strengthens their relationship which helps the business organisation stand even in turbulent markets, thus grow sustainably.Put it differently, the degree to which organisations adhere to ethical standards, determines the organisation's productivity and the subsequent profitability (Adeyeye, Adeniji, Osinbanjo and Oludayo, 2015).

All organisations work hard to gain a competitive advantage over the others, but this is not just left in areas such as innovation, technology, knowledge management, for example, that many will think matters, but more so in buildingcorporate reputationin other to earn the trust of the public.In the first place, when an organisation builds reputation it will earn the trust needed to attract a talented workforce and in turn will be trusted to have the capacity to provide more value in their products which can lead to customerloyalty. In effect, the competition that exists between organisations is not first for profitability but for trust and reputation status which is the basis for business patronage since much of market value is as a result of the organisation holding on to intangible assets such as intellectual capital, trust and reputation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework: Stakeholder Theory

This study is anchored on the stakeholder theory by Richard Edward Freeman. Itis generally credited to Freeman because he popularisedthe stakeholder concept in his book: Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (1984).It specifies how management can meet the various expectations of stakeholders in a business. The theory says that a company has much more stakeholders than just the shareholders. This being true, Richard Edward Freeman then argued that managers will then not just be answerable to shareholders. Rather, they need to put into considerationany group or individual who in any way can affect or is being affected by the company's operations.

Stakeholder theory further claims that whatever bethe ultimate goal of the business, managers and entrepreneurs need to consider the genuine interests of those groups and individuals who is either affected or can affect the company activities (Donaldson and Preston, 1995).EconomistMilton Friedman promoted a long-held shareholder theory and said that in capitalism, the only stakeholders a company has and should be concerned about are the shareholders. By this, companies must be profit-oriented, to satisfy their shareholders, and to continue positive growth.Away from this, stakeholder theory claims that a company's stakeholders include all those without their support the organisation would not function properly. These include employees,customers, suppliers, local communities, financial institutions, governmental groups, and more. This view presents the corporate environment as one with interdependency of related groups, who all need to be considered and genuine interests satisfied to maintain a healthy and sustainable company(Freeman, 1984). Freeman's stakeholder theory strongly believes that a company's real success lies in her satisfying all the stakeholders, not just the shareholders.

The frameworkis built on the principle of fairness, and it has a clear explanation and approach to promoting corporate reputation by recognising that organisations have supporting units and organisations are dependent on those groups (stakeholders) for their success, much more so by having a fair treatment of all of the organisations' stakeholders whose existence affect or is affected by the operations of the organisation.

Concept of Corporate Reputation

In literaturethereis no generally acceptable definition of the concept of reputation. However, there is a consensus among scholars and practitioners alike that the way in which the public perceives a company influences its corporate success (Fombrun, 1996). From the marketing or strategy view reputation is seen as the long-held opinion that stakeholders have about the firm,as a result of their previous interactions with andinformation gathered about the firm (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). Here, it is seen from the perspective of the general public and concentrating on the way in which reputations are formed; and strategically, viewed as assets and mobility barriers since they are perception based and difficult to manage (Fombrun and Van Riel, 1997). Fombrun and Van Riel (1997) also say that "it is viewed as the sense-making experiences of employees or the perception of the organisation held by an organisation's internal stakeholders". Fombrun and Van Riel (1997) proposed an all-encompassing definition of corporate reputation as "a collective representation of a firm's past actions and results that describes the firm's ability to deliver multiple stakeholders."They also stated that corporate reputation determines a firm's standing with both internaland externalstakeholdersin its competitive environments.The terms 'image' and 'identity' are most times used interchangeably with the word reputation(Whetten and Mackey, 2002).We can believe, as literature proposes, thatifany gap exists between image, identity or desired identity, this will affect the firm's reputation(Chun, 2005).Trust helps the leadership create and instil an identity that is consistent in the organisationbased on ethical behaviour, and values that guide the daily actions and decisions of all within the organisation (Cartwright and Craig, 2006; Marsden and Andriof, 1998), this in turn, will provide the organisation with a corporate identity and culture of sustainability and trustworthiness (Pirson, 2009; Vanneste, Puranam and Kretschmer, 2011).Trust, therefore, is inseparable and becomes the connecting duct between corporate reputation and organisational success.

Trust is defined as a relationship between a commitment (promise or oath) and its expected realization (Ng, 2012).Trustis also seen as a mental state that comprises an intention of one to accept vulnerability based on brighter prospects or behaviour of another (Rousseau,Sitkin, Burt andCamerer, 1998). While discussing the nature of trust, Nirmalya (1996) said that trust involves dependability. Customersare assumed to trust an organisation that consistently delivers quality products (and have built a reputation)since it takes many small pieces of evidence to convince a person than a single big fact. Involving dependability also will meanthat when a customer trusts a product manufacturer, he sees the manufacturer to be reliable, consistent and one that honours his promise.So in creating trust an organisation pursues what is fair by being sincere with product quality as to product information – which are all reputation building strategies.

The terms reputation and trust are therefore correlated since an organisation that truly adopts and live by ethical, value-based identity will not only build a strong reputation, but will in addition earn the trust of its stakeholders, who in turn will demonstrate some level of support and commitment to the organisation.

Dimensions of Corporate Reputation

Social Responsibility

Social responsibility also known as corporate social responsibility (CSR)is understood to be socially responsible and will mean what the business/organisation gives back to society.The term corporate social responsibility (CSR)is encompassing within which the ethical rights and duties existing between companies and society is debated(Velentzas and Broni, 2010). Corporate Social Responsibility has emerged in recent times as a business approach for addressing the (negative) impact of company activities on the environment and community dwellers. Yet there are calls on companies to go beyond this and assist the society in addressing many of the world's most pressing problems, including climate change and poverty (Frynas, 2009). While it is not as much as in the oil and gas operations, paint manufacturing also involves considerable potential negative effects ranging from environmental pollution, employee health and safety concerns, etc. and this calls for organisations to be socially responsible. Ethical obligations demands that organisations should refrainfrom polluting the environment where there operations exist. Inrecent times, corporate organisations have been expected to be greatly involved in developmental projects for their host communities. Most companies in the paint manufacturing industry in Rivers State whether internationally acclaimed or still operating in the local scene, may not be financially buoyant to engage much in gigantic projects as expectedabove. This is even more likely so for small and medium scale enterprises who are new startups; but at the same time it is reasonable on their part to conform to existing rules of the society, whether entrenched in the local law or in ethical custom.

This helps us to appreciate a new understanding of corporate social responsibility, which can be met by even the small and medium scale enterprises. According to Kyriazoglou (2017) social responsibility also involves at least three things:

a) providing high quality products to people every day because such has an impact on the society, economy and environment.

b) to develop positive relationships with stakeholders to benefit both the company and the community.
c) to return benefits to both society and employee.

With this, corporate social responsibility takes on a broader meaning, and if well managed will send the right signal, help build corporate reputation and automatically transform to customer loyalty and patronage. For example, paint manufacturers have to be sincere and responsible to the communities in which they operate by protecting the environment. Protecting the interests of locals, as stakeholders, demands that they put up efforts to refrainfrom polluting the environment. It is, however, worthy of mention here that in course of our research we discovered that the issue of pollution of the environment matter less to customers because, in most cases, production factories are located in separate locations from the sales point.

Quality Consistency

An organisation builds a reputation for being consistent when such organisation has a predictable pattern of behaviour and can therefore be reliable. Product quality is the most contributory factor for product patronage and concerns of customers especially in decoration as we have for paint's use. When an organisation's product line is consistent in the market it creates some sense of reliability and trust. Product, here, could be goods or services. But an organisation cannot just earn the trust from customers, for example, simply because it consistently provides such goods or services except it has built a reputation for consistently providing "quality" goods or services. Products are seeing to be of quality when customer's needs or expectations are met, and therefore, is a customer perspective and also to varying degree (of satisfaction) since customers' taste differs. From this angle, quality consistency by an organisation pictures one that is reliable and whose product(s) are highly valued thereby promoting customer loyalty. Guiltinan, Paul and Madden (1997) believed that when customers are satisfied they are more likely to call back. And the relationship between customer satisfaction and loyalty changes overtime. While the relationship between customer satisfaction and loyalty more depends on the quality of the goods and services (Mittal, Kumar and Tsiros, 1999).

In the paint manufacturing industry, product effects are immediately felt and very visible on application so only organisations that have the reputation for providing consistent quality products are seeing to be reliable and are trusted. An organisation that is reliable is trustworthy, and the more reliable you are, the more trust you will receive. Trustworthy organisations earn the confidence of their stakeholders because they have the reputation to abide by the rules of the industry, keep their promises – in relation to product quality (as indicated in leaflets, labels etc.). What distinguishes reliance from trust is that to rely on someone depends on his demonstrated capability while trust depends on stated commitment (Blois, 1999:200) – these are both guaranteed by earning a reputation for providing consistent quality products.

Stakeholders' perception about an organisation's ability (to provide consistent quality product) can be influenced by such issues as its economic history; employees qualifications, work skills and related experience in the market; effective management of available resources, and competences required to deliver a promised result to a stakeholder (Ingenhoff & Sommer, 2010; Sichtmann, 2007). Mayer, Davies and Schoorman (1995) noted that an organisation can only attain set goals, such as profit maximisation, excellent service delivery, superior quality, when the workforce coordinate their efforts with a view to achieving the quality objectives. The relationship between the employees will then be characterised by interdependency, and together contribute to the realisation of the organisational goals. Emphasising the relevance and criticality of product quality, records show that having trust and confidence in the organisation is one thing that is important to stakeholders, second only to the organisation's quality of goods and services (King, 2009). Consistent quality productpays off since it brings about customer loyalty, and helps preserve the relationship in any case there is batch defect. Therefore when a manufacturer has a one off product defect it does not totally mare its sales ifpreviously has built a reputation and has consistently been delivering quality products.

Concept of Organisational Success

The overriding goal for any organisation is to be successful in a sustainable way. That is, to be successful and the success achieved to be sustained for business continuity. What constitutes success is being assessed on various timeframes-ranging from the very short, to the very long term.In the short term, organisational success could be seen as one profitable and delivering (financial)value to its shareholders. However, to survive and prosper in the long-term, companies should not just be satisfied with delivering values to shareholders, a successful organisation is one that is sustainable, one that achieves increased and sustainable results and ensures business continuity by satisfying the multiple interests that exists in the organisation.A sustainable organisation ensures that its present business is conducted in a manner that its own continual growth and its capacity to meet its future needs is not put at risk (King, 2009; Moss Kanter, 2011).

Away from the traditional view such as held by economists Milton Friedman that a successful business is only one that is able to maximise profits for its shareholders, stakeholder theory holds the viewthat for an organisation to maximise profits,it needs quality and readily available goods and services that appeals to customers, better managed company-suppliers relationships, motivated and dedicated employees who stand behind the company and push the company forward, and supportive communities that allow businesses to flourish (Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Parmer and De Colle, 2010; Mackey, 2009).For an organisation to record maximum success, the managers of such organisation needed to consider and meet the genuine needs and demands of both internal and external stakeholders of the business. When this is not done, the organisation's corporate reputation will likely suffer.Impliedly, any of the organisation's stakeholders (whether seeing as internal or external) can affect the achievement of its long-term goal - economic sustainability. A successful organisation, therefore, is ethically responsible towards multiple stakeholders (Gaoand Zhang, 2006; Stout and Blair, 2001) by being socially responsible to host communitiesand delivering quality products that provides comfort and improves living standards.

Statement of the Problem

Available records show that many business outfits be it large (MNC) or small and medium scale enterprises (SME) struggle for survival for as long as ten years after establishment. In fact, there is claim that out of every 100 SMEs not less than 90 fail within the first 5 years of establishment, while 9 out of the remaining 10 start winding up after the 5^{th} year (Adeyiga, 2016). This failure rate is alarming and is irrespective of the size of startup capital, and those that endure, today than ever before, work very hard to gain competitive advantage over the others to remain in business, so over the years, competition has been characterising business operations and this is no less in the manufacturing industry. What is particular about the paint manufacturing industry is that sustaining efforts only comes from the volume of sales of a particular manufacturer's product line(s). Sales are resultant effect of large patronage by customers in the market. The Nigeria market in turn is an open market, which suggests that consumers/customers are presented with varieties of products to choose from. Choices will be made for products that meet the consumer's needs, return value for money, and eventually bring customer satisfaction.

Byvirtue of today's open market in the paint manufacturing sector, product consumers areonly appealed to by way of persuasive advertorials, but are not under any obligation to patronise a product since there are choices to make. Choice to be made here is based on trust arising from reputation built by a product manufacturer, for every buyer wants first, the maximum benefit and value for his money.So for any manufacturing outfit to succeed and maintain patronage, it must pay attention to its market value by building, improving and holding on to her intangible assets such as reputation. It is in this wise that this research work looks at how organisations in the paint manufacturing sector can prioritise social responsibility and product quality consistency as corevalues of corporate reputation and how these influence organisational success.

Purpose of the Study

Thisresearch has the purpose of investigating the relationship existing between corporate reputation strategies and organisational success of selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, this study will examine the following:

1. To examine the relationship between social responsibility and organisational success of selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.
2. To examine the relationship between quality consistency and organisational success of selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

Research Questions

Considering the specific objectives of this study, answers to the following questions will be provided:

1. To what extent does social responsibility enhances organisational success of selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State?
2. To what extent does quality consistency enhances organisational success of selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and profitability in selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and customer satisfaction in selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship between quality consistency and profitability in selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

H_{04}: There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and customer satisfaction in selected paint manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive survey design that allows for easy collection of information demonstrating the relationship betweencorporatereputation strategiesand organisational success of the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State, Nigeria. We had 15firmswithin the scope of this study out of which 4 firms were selected. The population size consisted of120members of staff from the four selected firmsnamely: AdbenColors Paint; Apex Paints Limited; Berger Paints Nigeria Plc;Dulux Paints.The instrument for data collection was a structured and self-administered questionnaire. The research instrument was designed in 3 sections. Section A was designed to generate information about the respondents. Section B was designed to obtain data on Social Responsibility and Quality Consistency (as dimensions ofcorporate reputation). Section C was designed to produce responses and generate data on the measures of organisational success. A modified five point Likert scale with response categories: Greater Extent (GTE) = 5 Points, Great Extent (GE) = 4 Points, Moderate Extent (ME) = 3 Points, Low Extend (LE) = 2 Point, and Very Low Extend (VLE) = 1 Pointwas used.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Reliability Coefficients of variables

S/No	Dimensions/Measures of the study variable	Number of items	Number of cases	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Social Responsibility	5	77	0.777

2.	Quality Consistency	5	77	0.786
3.	Profitability	3	77	0.709
4.	Customer Satisfaction	3	77	0.564

Table 2: Response rates and descriptive statistics for Social Responsibility (n=77)

	Social Responsibility	**VLE**	**LE**	**ME**	**GE**	**GTE**	**Mean**	**Std.**
1	Level of community involvement, understanding, friendliness by host community	8	9	9	16	35	3.79	1.398
2	Operates within established environmental protection and regulations	6	6	9	31	25	3.81	1.200
3	We carry out operational risk assessment and hazard reduction activities	5	4	8	18	42	4.14	1.199
4	Carryout awareness on corporate social responsibility within the company	4	2	7	33	31	4.10	1.033
5	Programmes aimed at Improving leaving condition of locals (in area of operation)	4	5	5	37	26	3.98	1.069

Source: *Research Survey Data, 2018*

Respondents'response to item oneaffirmed their level of community involvement, understanding, friendliness by host community. This resulted to a high mean score of 3.79. Similarly, it was agreed thatoperating within established environmental protection and regulations is proper. This is also the reason for the high mean score of 3.81. The table also shows that item three got similar approval as respondents agreed that they carry out operational risk assessment and hazard reduction activities. The mean score of 4.14confirms this status. Furthermore, fourth item got an affirmative response that theycarryout awareness on corporate social responsibility within the company. This is backed by a mean score of 4.10. Finally, it was agreed that programmes aimed at improving leaving condition of locals (in area of operation) are carried out. This is confirmed by a high mean score of 3.98.

Table 3: Response Rates and descriptive statistics for Quality Consistency (n=77)

	Quality Consistency	**VLE**	**LE**	**ME**	**GE**	**GTE**	**Mean**	**Std.**
1	Products are affordable and available in the market	2	8	7	17	43	4.18	1.132

2	Products are durable and dependable	1	12	5	35	24	3.50	.846
3	The company keeps to rules of the industry (quality standards)	1	14	-	19	43	3.35	.809
4	Our employees have high technical skills and expertise	8	8	-	26	35	3.28	.951
5	Individual staff and functional groups across the company depend on each other	8	9	9	16	35	3.29	.842

Source: *Research Survey Data, 2018*

Table 3 above shows response to item one where respondents affirmed that products are affordable and available in the market. This accounted for a high mean score of 4.18. Similarly, it was accepted that the products are durable and dependable. This also gave rise to a high mean score of 3.50. More so, the third item got similar approval as respondents agreed that the company keeps to rules of the industry (quality standards). The mean score of 3.35 also confirmed this status. Also, respondents agreed that employees have high technical skills and expertise. The mean score of 3.28 also pointed to that fact. Finally, it was agreed thatindividual staff and functional groups across the company depend on each other. This is confirmed by a high mean score of 3.28.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Corporate Reputation Strategies

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Responsibility	77	1.80	5.00	3.9688	.86333
Quality Consistency	77	1.80	5.00	3.9922	.90347
Valid N (listwise)	77				

Source: *Research Data November 2018 and SPSS output version 23.0*

Table 4 illustrates the descriptive statistics for Corporate Reputation Strategies which are social responsibility, and quality consistency with mean scores of 3.96 and 3.99respectively.

Analysis on Organisational Success

Table 5 Response Rates and descriptive statistics for profitability (n=77)

	Profitability	**VLE**	**LE**	**ME**	**GE**	**GTE**	**Mean**	**Std.**
1	There is good market value for our products (i.e. our products appeals to customers)	10	8	9	32	18	3.51	1.314
2	There is consistent sales (income)	8	9	9	16	35	3.79	1.398
3.	Growth in the size of company investment	6	6	9	39	17	3.71	1.133

Source: *Research Survey Data, 2018*

From table 5 in response to item one, respondents affirmed that there is good market value for their products (i.e. their products appeals to customers). This is accounted for by the high mean score of 3.51. More so, it was agreed for the second item thatthere is consistent sales (income). This is also confirmed by the high mean score of 3.79. Finally, it was agreed in the third item that growth in the size of company investmentis a sign of profitability. This has a mean score of 3.71.

Table 6Response Rates and descriptive statistics for Customer Satisfaction (n=77)

	Customer Satisfaction	**VLE**	**LE**	**ME**	**GE**	**GTE**	**Mean**	**Std.**
1	We carry out customer satisfaction survey (either by words of mouth or other available means)	5	4	8	18	42	4.14	1.199
2	Cordial relationship exists between the company and suppliers/customers	4	2	7	33	31	4.10	1.033
3	Availability and effectiveness of product user guides	6	7	9	31	24	3.77	1.209

Source: *Research Survey Data, 2018*

Responses in table 6shows that for item one, respondents admitted that they carry out customer satisfaction survey (either by words of mouth or other available means). This accounted for a high mean score of 4.14. Similarly, it was agreed for the second item that cordial relationship exists between the company and suppliers/customers. This is also confirmed by the high mean score of 4.10. Finally, it was agreed for the last item that there is availability and effectiveness of product user guides. This is also confirmed by the high mean score of 3.77.

Table 7:Descriptive Statistics for Organisational Success

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Profitability	77	1.33	4.67	3.6753	1.02309
Customer Satisfaction	77	1.67	5.00	4.0087	.84115
Valid N (listwise)	77				

Source: *Research Data November 2018, (SPSS output version 23.0)*

Table 7 above illustrates the descriptive statistics for profitability and customer satisfaction which are with mean scores of 3.67 and 4.00.

Presentation of Results on Tests of Hypotheses

Table 8: Correlations Matrix for Social Responsibility and Organisational Success

			SocialResponsibility	Profitability	CustomerSatisfaction
Spearman's rho	Social Responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.744**	.837**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	77	77	77
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.744**	1.000	.870**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	77	77	77
	CustomerSatisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.837**	.870**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	77	77	77

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: *Research Data November 2018 and SPSS output version 23.0*

Table 8 illustrates the test for the two previously postulated bivariate hypothetical statements. The results show that for

H_{01}: ***There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and profitability in selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State.***

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between social responsibility and profitability. The *rho* value 0.744 indicates this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus,there is a significant relationship between social responsibility and profitability in selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State.

H_{02}: ***There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and customer satisfaction in selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State.***

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between social responsibility and customer satisfaction. The *rho* value 0.837 indicates this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus,there is a significant relationship between social responsibility and customer satisfaction in selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State.

Table 9: Correlations Matrix for Quality Consistency and Organisational Success

			Quality Consistency	Profitability	Customer Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Quality Consistency	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.826**	.671**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	77	77	77
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.826**	1.000	.870**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	77	77	77
	Customer Satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.671**	.870**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	77	77	77

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: *Research Data 2018 and SPSS output version 23.0*

Table 9 illustrates the test for the two previously postulated bivariate hypothetical statements. The results show that for

H_{03}: ***There is no significant relationship between quality consistency and profitability in selected firms in the manufacturing industry of Rivers State.***

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between quality consistency and profitability. The *rho* value 0.826 indicates this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus,there is a significant relationship between quality consistency and profitabilityin selected firms in the manufacturing industry of Rivers State.

H_{04}: ***There is no significant relationship between quality consistency and customer satisfaction in selected firms in the manufacturing industry of Rivers State.***

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between quality consistency and customer satisfaction. The *rho* value 0.671 indicates this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus,there is a significant relationship between quality consistency and customer satisfaction in selected firms in the manufacturing industry of Rivers State.

Discussion of Findings

This study using descriptive and inferential statistical methods investigated the relationship between corporate reputation strategies and organisational success in selected firms in the paint manufacturing industry of Rivers State, Nigeria.The findings revealed that asignificant relationship does exist between corporate reputation strategies and organisational success in selected firms using the Spearman Rank Order correlation tool and at a 95% confidence interval. The findings of this study confirmed that corporate reputation has an effect on organisational success in the selected firms and implies that success of organisations lie in the reputation of the firm, because customers have a habit for distrusting a manufacturing firmthat has no sense of responsibility.In recent times, there seem to be high demands on corporate organisations to be greatly involved in developmental projects for their host communities (Frynas, 2009) but organisations can reduce this tension by being socially responsible and gain the trust of stakeholders by providing high quality products, developing positive relationships with core stakeholders like employees and host community, and to return benefits to both society and employee (Kyriazoglou, 2017). When an organisation does not have a reputation and is not trusted, they cannot maintain any positive relationship with customers and host community which has the capacity to negatively affect production and sales. This is in line with the view of Casson and Della (2006:332) that trust does not only improve the general quality of life, it also improves productivity and economic performance.

Organisations, especially small and medium enterprises, operate in a turbulent market with ups and downs thereby putting trust and reputation in the forefront for organisational success. An organisation will have a bad reputation locally and internationally, if it is not socially responsible towards its host and therefore need to create a relationship based on trust, since leadershipthrives on relationships based on trust (Dupont, 2014) and its absence will affect growth and success even in the short term.

Conclusion

Organisations today as noted earlier, operate in a turbulent market with ups and downs thereby putting trust and reputation in the forefront for organisational success in times of crises. When organisations are socially responsible, they build a positive corporate reputation. The benefits include community support and understanding thereby creating a business environmentthat is friendly and conducive. Corporate social responsibility on the part of the organisation also compels them to deliver quality products that satisfy the needs of customers. The result again is customer loyalty, increased customer base, and eventual profitability.

Recommendations

Based on the discussions and conclusions above, the following recommendations are hereby made:

Manufacturing firms should actively involve their host community in their business activities and engage the youths positively as stakeholders.The study clearly proves that an organisation that is fully involved in social responsibility has a more possible chance of becoming successful even in the era of moderate economic turbulent market.

Quality consistency should be highly considered in rendering services to the customers/consumers. The organisation should be quality driven, either on product, services, or internal processes. This is also a way of being socially responsible and will not only have a positive impact on the society and attract customers but it will be a trademark in the success of the organisation.

REFERENCES

Adeyeye, J.O., Adeniji, A.A., Osinbanjo, A.O. &Oludayo, O.A. (2015). Effects of workplace ethics on employees and organisational productivity in Nigeria.

Adeyiga, S. (2016). Why small businesses fail in Nigeria-Melvit Africa. Business growth, business strategies, startups.

Blois, K.J. (1999). Trust in business to business relationships: an evaluation of its status. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(2), 197-215.

Cartwright, W.& Craig, J.L. (2006). Sustainability: aligning corporate governance, strategy and operations with the planet. *Business Process Management*, 12(6), 741-750.

Casson, M. & DellaGiusta, M. (2006). The economics of trust. 19:332-354. In: Bachmann, R. &Zaheer, A. (eds.) handbook of trust research, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Chun, R. (2005). Corporate reputation: meaning and measurement. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(2), 91–109.

De Castro, G.M., Lopez, J.E. &Saez, P.L. (2006). Business and social reputation: Exploring the concept and main dimensions of corporate reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 361-370.

Donaldson, T.&Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications'. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65–91.

Dupont, S. (2014). Leadership: Trust is critical to an organisation's success. Retrieved on 28th June, 2018 from https://Stephendupont.co/trust-critical-organizations-success

Eccles, R.G., Newquist, S.C. & Schatz, R. (2007). Reputation and its risks.

Fombrun, C. J. (1996). Reputation, realizing value from the corporate image, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Fombrun, C.J.&Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(2), 233–258.

Fombrun, C.J.& Van Riel, C.B.M. (1997). The reputational landscape.*Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(1/2), 6–13.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston, MA: Pitman.

Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., Wicks, A.C., Parmar, B.L. & De Colle, S. (2010). Stakeholder theory: The state of the art. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Frynas, J.G. (2009). Corporate social responsibility in the oil and gas sector. *Journal of World Energy Law & Business* 2(3), 178-195.

Gao, S.S., & Zhang, J.J. (2006). Stakeholder engagement, social auditing and corporate sustainability. *Business Process Management*, 12(6), 722-740.

Guiltinan, J.P., Paul, G.W. & Madden, T.J., (1997). *Marketing management: strategies and programs.* 6th ed., New York, McGraw-Hill

Ingenhoff, D. &Sommer, K. (2010). Trust in companies and CEOs: a comparative study of the main influences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95:339-355.

Kelchner, L. (2013). The importance of ethics in organizations. Retrieved on 12th March, 2018 from http://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-ethics-organizations- 20925.html.

King, M.E. (2009). King report on corporate governance in South Africa. Institute of Directors in Southern Africa.

Kyriazoglou, J. (2017). Managing your SME more effectively part ii: provide operational support to production. Retrieved on 10th April, 2018 from

Mackey, J. (2009). Conscious capitalism: creating a new paradigm for business. In: Strong, M. (ed.) *Be the solution: How entrepreneurs and conscious capitalist can solve all the world's problems.* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Marsden, C., & Andriof, J. (1998).Towards an understanding of corporate citizenship and how to influence it.*Citizenship Studies*, 2(2), 329-352.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. & Schoorman, F.D. (1995).An interactive model of organizational trust.*The Academy of Management*, 20(3), 709-734.

Mittal, V., Kumar, P. &Tsiros, M. (1999).Attribute-level performance, satisfaction and behavioral intentions over time: A consumption-system approach.*Journal of marketing* 63(2), 88-101

Moss Kanter, R. (2011). How great companies think differently. *Harvard Business Review*, November:66-78.

Ng, T. (2012). Business ethics and sustainability. Amazon Digital Services, Inc.

Nirmalya, k. (1996). The Power of Trust".Harvard Business Review.

Pirson, M.(2009). Facing the trust gap - measuring and managing stakeholder trust. In: Friedland, J. (ed.) Doing well and good: the human face of the new capitalism. Information Age Publishing.

Rousseau, D.,Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.&Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy Of Management Review*, 23:393-404.

Sichtmann, C.(2007).An analysis of antecedents and consequences of trust in a corporate brand.*European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9/10):999-1015.

Stout, L.A.& Blair, M.M. (2001). Trust, trustworthiness, and the behavioral foundations of corporate law. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, June 2001. Social Science Electronic Publishing© 2012.

Vanneste, B.S., Puranam, P. &Kretschmer, T. (2011). When does trust increase over time? Meta-analysis and theory. Social Science Electronic Publishing© 2012.

Velentzas, J.&Broni, G. (2010). Ethical dimensions in the conduct of business: business ethics, corporate social responsibility and the law.The "ethics in business" as a sense of business ethics (International Conference on Applied Economics-ICOAE 2010 795-805).

Whetten, D.& Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business & Society*, 41(4), 393–414.