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This study provides empirical support for the positive power of a CEO’s reputation as a strategic resource during and after a corporate crisis. Specifically, it demonstrates that a CEO’s favorable reputation relieves many stakeholders’ negative perceptions in a postcrisis situation. In addition, this study tests whether a particular type of CEO reputation will be more effective than another in dealing with different types of threats that a crisis poses to corporate reputation. This study introduces a resource-based approach to crisis that provides a wide, comprehensive set of strategies based on a variety of an organization’s competitive resources.

It is hard to conceive of Microsoft separate from its founder and former chief executive officer, Bill Gates. This being the case, it seems a wise move for Microsoft to sell its CEO’s philanthropic reputation in a bid to fix a tarnished name, which has long haunted the company in the aftermath of its violation of antitrust laws. By capitalizing on Gates’ good reputation, Microsoft attempted to tackle lingering problems of its unfavorable reputation. And this strategy seems to have paid off. The Wall Street Journal reported that Bill Gates’s personal philanthropy helped foster favorable public opinion of Microsoft (Alsop, 2007). This example demonstrates that a company can benefit from actively managing the public image or reputation of its CEO. This halo effect of a CEO’s good name on the company tied to the CEO is not a new topic of research (“A network of global CEOs,” 2010). Researchers sometimes argue that the fame of a so-called celebrity CEO or a star CEO can enable his/her ability to access resources such as human capital, capital market and raw materials, thus increasing the firm’s competitive advantage (Ranft, Zinko, Ferris, & Buckley, 2006). Gaines-Ross (2003) referred to these premiums as CEO capital, or “the asset created by a CEO’s reputation... when it is harnessed to advance a company’s success” (p. 11).

The effect of CEO capital then arouses intriguing questions: Will the halo effect of a CEO’s favorable reputation also work for a company that is struggling with a bad reputation as the result of an unfortunate event, or crisis? If so, is there a way to strategically utilize a CEO’s reputation more effectively? Unfortunately, review of existing literature reveals limitations in providing answers to those questions. First, studies of CEOs are concentrated mostly on leadership styles...
and attributes research within organizational boundaries. Research on management of CEOs’ reputations is underdeveloped—especially in the context of a CEO’s reputation as perceived and evaluated by consumer stakeholders. Subsequently, few studies examine how to strategically utilize a CEO’s reputation. Second, crisis communication literature provides ample studies on message repertoires for repairing tarnished reputations, but seldom extends beyond rhetoric-based approaches.

Against this backdrop, this study explores an uncultivated research topic—what is the potential of a CEO’s reputation as an instrument to overcome a tarnished corporate reputation in the aftermath of a crisis? This study taps a new research stream in crisis communication literature by proposing the resource-based approach to crisis as its theoretical frame, which will add value to crisis communication literature by expanding the border of crisis communication research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Resource-Based View and Crisis Discourse

Researchers who advocate a resource-based view have long sought to identify a strategic resource that can lead to an organization’s sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Black, Carnes, & Richardson, 2000; Hall, 1992; Weigelt & Camerer, 1988; Wry, Deephouse, & McNamara, 2006). Primarily rising from the strategist tradition, researchers who explore this resource-based view focus on three major concepts: strategic resource, competitive advantage, and sustained competitive advantage.

Organizational resources refers to “all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm attributes, information, knowledge, etc, controlled by a firm that enable the firm to conceive of and implement strategies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness” (Barney, 1991, p. 101). Resources are considered strategic if they distinguish a firm’s competitive position relative to its competitors, therefore leading to superior performance of the firm (e.g., Carmeli & Tishier, 2005; Leonard-Barton, 1992; Reed & DeFillippi, 1990; Rumelt, 1984). Hence, strategic resources are firm-specific. Carmeli and Tishier (2005) stated that “different firms are expected to possess different profiles of resources and this heterogeneity of organizational resources—both tangible and intangible—accounts for differences in firms’ competitive advantage and variability in performance” (p. 15). Second, a competitive advantage reflects that the organization is “implementing a value-creating strategy not simultaneously being implanted by any current and potential competitors” (Barney, 1991, p. 102), and a sustained competitive advantage interprets that the competitive advantage derived from the firm-specific resources are unable to be duplicated by the firm’s current and potential competitors (Barney, 1991).

One such example of an organization’s strategic resources is reputation, or “a cognitive representation of a company’s actions and results that crystallizes the firm’s ability to deliver valued outcomes to its stakeholders” (Fombrun, Gardberg, & Barnett, 2000, p. 87). Fombrun (1996) stated that “a reputation is valuable because it informs us about what products to buy, what companies to work for, or what stocks to invest in” (p. 5). Reputation is also rare in a sense that only a few competing companies can have such reputations (Barney, 1991). In addition, reputation is imperfectly imitable because it depends on a “specific, hard-to-imitate historical setting” (Barney, 1991, p. 115). Therefore, competitors cannot quickly neutralize the benefits of a positive
reputation. Further, as a firm-specific strategic resource, reputation cannot be traded in factor markets (Cool, Costa, & Dierickx, 2002, p. 55). Finally, a firm’s reputation cannot be substituted for other types of resources (Barney, 1991, p. 115).

This resource-based view provides important insights into discourse of crisis, or “a major unpredictable event that has potentially negative results” (Barton, 1993, p. 2). First, it can be argued that firms should resort to different strategic resources when responding to crisis situations due to the heterogeneity of its resource configuration. This insight then challenges some existing crisis communication approaches such as *apologia, impression management*, Benoit’s *image restoration* (1995, 2004), and Coombs’ (2011) *situational crisis communication theory* (SCCT). These established message-centered approaches consider only stakeholders’ interpretations of crisis factors in recommending organizational crisis responses. That is, according to SCCT, to decide upon an effective crisis response strategy, an organization is supposed to answer questions of whether the firm is responsible for the crisis; whether damage caused by the crisis is serious; whether the firm had the same crisis history; and whether the firm overall had behaved well in the past. Answers to these questions are derived from analyses of stakeholders’ points of view. The unique profile of the organization’s strategic resources is not considered in selection of crisis responses. Therefore, by imprinting stakeholders’ viewpoints on the organization’s decision-making, SCCT and other existing crisis responses are limited in practically guiding organizations through the crisis communication process. The resource-based view suggests that a good policy needs to consider not only the nature of a crisis but also the organization’s strategic standings including its competitive resource profiles.

Second, SCCT and other largely rhetoric-based approaches unwittingly treat reputation as a unidimensional construct. Basically, these approaches see that a crisis can pose a major threat to the organization’s reputation, but seldom go the next step to explicate the *nature* of the reputation under threat. In contrast to this unidimensional view, reputation research points to complexity of the concept and documents that reputation is more than one dimension (e.g., Brown & Dacin, 1997; de Castro, Lopez, & Saez, 2006; Etzioni, 1988; Goldberg, 1999; Mahon, 2002). Additionally, extending the resource-based view, it can be argued that companies should be heterogeneous in configuration of the reputational dimensions. To illustrate, a computer memory chip-maker may consider its ability to offer quality products as the core of its reputation due to its tech-intensive business nature, whereas a firm that has built its image based on green marketing—like Body Shop—may highly value its reputation as a socially responsible firm. Therefore, not all reputational dimensions may have the same value as the firm’s core strategic resource. Knowing what is the core driving force of its reputation is important in managing reputation through crisis communication.

Finally, SCCT and the other widely used approaches narrow the focus of crisis communication largely to message prescriptions, which guide managers regarding “how to say something” in a crisis situation, but hardly advise on “what to talk about.” This weakness is apparent in, for example, a situation where a firm has long been suffering from lingering side effects of a crisis. In the aftermath of the *Valdez* oil spill in 1989, for example, Exxon suffered from an unfavorable reputation pertinent to environmental issues and often became a textbook example of poor crisis management. Here the rhetoric-based approaches provide little help for the firm’s overcoming lingering crisis effects. In addition, these message-focused approaches are criticized by public relations scholars who urge public relations managers to go “beyond the technical descriptions and applications” in crisis discourse (Marra, 2004, p. 312). Marra (2004) argued that crisis public relations practitioners should shift their emphasis from “technicians who prepare crisis communication
materials to managers who apply predictive and explanatory crisis public relations theory” to the role of “strategic management of an organization’s communication function” (pp. 312–313). However, to facilitate the shift in focus, a new conceptual approach to crisis is necessary.

Potential Strategic Resources for Crisis Responses

The resource-based view not only enriches crisis discourse with its conceptual guidance, it also suggests some strategic resources that can be utilized in a crisis situation. Hall (1992) classified intangible resources into two types: assets and skills. An example of skill-type intangible resources is know-how of employees or other key stakeholders, which result in “instinctive competences,” or competencies with regards to “capabilities which the organization possesses which set it apart from its competitors” (Hall, 1992, p. 139).

Asset-type intangible resources include corporate reputation and network. Networks are “those personal relationships which transcend the requirement of organizational structure, commercial relationships, etc.; they are to do with sharing information and purpose to mutual advantage” (Hall, 1992, p. 138). For instance, Ulmer (2001) saw the potential instrumentality of a well-established precrisis relationship between an organization and its stakeholders to leverage a crisis situation.

Meanwhile, Fombrun (1996) suggested the benefits of favorable corporate reputations such as “premium prices for products, lower costs of capital and labor, improved loyalty from employees, greater latitude in decision making, and a cushion of goodwill when crises hit” (p. 57). An organization’s good reputation is also known to have a positive impact on building relationship with its public (Fombrun, 1996; Kim 2001; Knox, Maklan, & Thompson, 2000), which in turn contributes to enhancing consumer loyalty (Sohn, 2009). With regards to corporate reputation, scholars have explored factors that influence reputation formation. Fischer and Reuber (2007) suggested reputation-enhancing variables such as founders’ track records, prestige of partners and affiliates, contest wins, stakeholders’ direct experience with a firm’s products or services, financial statements, and media reports (p. 57). Watson (2007) proposed such reputation enhancers as leadership, management, quality of products and services and relationships with stakeholders (p. 372). Of the reputation factors, this study focuses on the CEO’s reputation as a potential strategic resource for an organization.

CEO’s Reputation as a Strategic Resource

According to Barney’s (1991, p. 115) standards of determining the value of a source of sustained competitive advantage, CEO reputation is a good candidate to be an organization’s strategic resource. First, a CEO’s favorable reputation is valuable. This value is often described as CEO capital. Second, CEO reputations are rare, given that only a few CEOs by industry have good

---

1According to Ulmer (2001), a valued relationship with stakeholders benefits crisis-affected organizations because “stakeholders may serve as advocates for organizations in crisis by providing political support and crisis-mitigating resources” (pp. 593–594). His argument was demonstrated in the case of Malden Mills, a textile manufacturer in Massachusetts. When the firm was stricken by a factory fire, which resulted in injuring 36 workers and placing 3,000 employees out of jobs, the stakeholder network that was cultivated before the crisis allowed Malden Mills to recover from the crisis. Its stakeholders served as advocates for the firm and supported it in significant ways (Ulmer, 2001, p. 610).
reputations. Third, how the CEO has earned a favorable reputation is difficult to explain by several causes. Besides, even though a competitor may imitate a CEO possessing a good reputation, he/she may not perfectly replicate the same qualities of reputation, because a positive CEO reputation is accumulated over a long time and is historically specific. Therefore, a CEO’s reputation may be imperfectly imitable. Fourth, a CEO’s reputation is nonsubstitutable by any other resources. Even though a CEO’s vision for the firm may be replaced by a good management team, the favorable perceptions held by external stakeholders (e.g., consumers, investors, and media) of the CEO are unlikely to be replaced by the management team.

HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The resource-based approach to crisis urges crisis scholars to go beyond boundaries of existing research and search for potential resources that can be utilized to help buffer harmful effects from a reputational crisis. Thus, this study explores the instrumental values of a well-established reputation of a CEO in improving the reputation of the firm associated with that CEO, as well as the firm’s relationships with stakeholders, particularly in a crisis situation. As the literature suggested a close link between a CEO and the firm tied to him/her exists, and a CEO’s good name is expected to have a positive impact on the firm’s reputation. Additionally, we view reputation as a multidimensional construct. Once communication managers recognize divergent types of threat to reputation, organizations may approach crises more effectively by prescribing correct strategic options according to reputational crisis type. Therefore, hypotheses are proposed as follows:

H1: Favorable information about the CEO will have a positive influence on reputation of a company afflicted by a crisis.

Research on reputation suggests multiple dimensions of reputation. In particular, many studies have postulated a two-dimensional system of reputation. Following suit, this study suggests two dimensions of reputational crisis: corporate ability (CA) crisis and corporate social responsibility (CSR) crisis. CA crisis is defined as a critical event that primarily affects corporate reputation and is associated with expertise of product and service, technological innovation, customer orientation, industry leadership. CSR crisis is conceptualized as a major event that will pose a threat to reputation pertinent to environmental friendliness, commitment to diversity in employment, community involvement, corporate philanthropic activities, and other issues related to social obligations facing organizations.

The two-dimensional system of reputation can also be extended to CEO’s reputation. To illustrate, some CEOs may be well known for their abilities of leading to superior performances of their firms, and other CEOs may earn good names for their integrity or supports for social causes.

For instance, Brown and Dacin (1997) proposed two types of corporate associations (i.e., what a person knows about a company)—corporate ability (CA), or “expertise in producing and delivering product and/or service offerings”; and corporate social responsibility (CSR), or the “character of the company, usually with regard to important societal issues” (p. 70). These two dimensions have been proposed by many other authors with different labels: for instance, economic performance and social responsibility (Etzioni, 1988); economic performance and social conduct (Chew, 1992); business competency and social conscience (Goldberg, 1999); organizational effectiveness and social performance (Riahi-Belkaoui & Pavlik, 1992); and business and social reputation (de Castro et al., 2006). Even though the labels differ slightly by authors, the core ideas do not differ in that one trait points to a company’s competence in delivering its products and services and the other trait reflects the expectation of a firm’s social obligations.
Based on this notion, this article suggests two types of CEO’s reputation: competent and ethical. To distinguish the components of CEO reputation from the CA and CSR dimensions of the company, this study labels the CEO’s competent reputation as C-type reputation, and the ethical component as E-type reputation. C-type or E-type CEOs labels are applied to persons whose reputations are dominated by the corresponding reputational components. In investigating the influence of CEO reputations on corporate reputations, our study also explores whether the CEO’s reputation type interplays with the crisis types (CA v. CSR crisis). Therefore, additional research questions are as follows:

RQ1a: For corporate reputation, which type of CEO reputation will be most effective in overcoming a CA crisis?
RQ1b: For corporate reputation, which type of CEO reputation will be most effective in overcoming a CSR crisis?

With regard to effects, a reputation crisis can bring about potentially devastating consequences not only to the corporate reputation, but also to mutually favorable relationships between the firm and its stakeholders (Heath & Millar, 2004, p. 4). These two concepts—reputation and relationships—are distinct, but closely connected with each other. For instance, Knox, Maklan, and Thompson (2000) argued that a reputation is built through customers’ understanding of a firm’s values, commitment and their experiences of the firm’s products and services, which are conveyed through the relationship that the company builds with customers (p. 141). Noting the interconnection between these two managerial properties, Sohn (2009) also contended that separately monitoring and measuring corporate reputations and relationships should fail to capture their true natures. Therefore, exploring effects of a reputational crisis on a firm’s relationships with stakeholders will add rich insight to the crisis literature.

As for relationships with stakeholders, public relations scholars have proposed four dimensions of relationships: trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction (Huang, 1997). Of the four constructs, control mutuality, which is defined as “the degree to which parties agree on who has rightful power to influence one another” (Hon & J. E. Grunig, 1999, p. 19), may be most limited in terms of general applicability because it posits that a relationship should be built on stakeholders’ first-hand experiences with the firm. However, stakeholders can enter into relationships with a firm through indirect, second-hand experiences (J. E. Grunig & Hung, 2002). Besides, considering that the scope of this research is limited to customer publics, this study adopts perceived customer care as a measure of relationships and replacing it for control mutuality. Therefore, the second set of hypotheses and research questions are as follows:

H2: Favorable information about a CEO will improve stakeholders’ perceived relationships with the company afflicted by a reputational crisis.

Competent reputation reflects the perceptions or assessments of a CEO’s ability to achieve goals pertinent to organizational performances. In a qualitative study on professionalism, Svensson (2006) showed that respondents put strong emphasis on knowledge, competence, and skill. As such, the competency dimension of CEO’s reputation is depicted by such words as capable, experienced, knowledgeable, and expertise. The ethical dimension of CEO’s reputation involves conformity to social norms and moral values, and commitment to integrity. Therefore, the ethical component is often depicted in literature by such words as honesty, sincerity, integrity, morality, and fairness. For instance, Chun (2006) associates a reputation for integrity with such words as honesty, sincere, trustworthy, openness, fairness, benevolence, and being socially responsible.
H2a: Favorable information about a CEO will have a positive influence on perceived customer care.
H2b: Favorable information about a CEO will have a positive influence on satisfaction.
H2c: Favorable information about a CEO will have a positive influence on trust.
H2d: Favorable information about a CEO will have a positive influence on relational commitment.
RQ2a: Which type of CEO’s reputation will be most effective in relieving stakeholders’ perceived relationship with the company in a CA crisis situation?
RQ2b: Which type of CEO’s reputation will be most effective in relieving stakeholders’ perceived relationship with the company in a CSR crisis situation?

Literature on relationships also suggests that stakeholders in a quality relationship with a firm will show “extra-role behaviors,” which involve world-of-mouth, product improvement suggestions, recruitment of other public members, and proactive communication of anticipated problems (Ahearne, Bhattacharya, & Gruen, 2005, p. 577). And a latent construct that drives these extra role behaviors is loyalty (Sohn, 2009). Within the relationship frame, loyalty is represented by a long-term, committed, and emotion-oriented relationship; and it can be engendered by offering quality products or services beyond the publics’ expectation level and fostering committed relationships through empathic interchange (Kim, 2001, p. 800). Therefore, the third set of hypothesis and research question are as follow:

H3: Favorable information about a CEO will have a positive influence on stakeholders’ loyalty to the company.
RQ3a: Which type of CEO’s reputation will be most effective in relieving stakeholders’ loyalty to the company in a CA crisis situation?
RQ3b: Which type of CEO’s reputation will be most effective in relieving stakeholders’ loyalty to the company in a CSR crisis situation?

METHODS

The objective of this study is to tap CEO reputation as a potential strategic resource to overcome corporate crisis. Will a CEO’s reputation be able to offset a negative company reputation afflicted by a reputational crisis? Will there be a more effective strategic match between type of crisis and CEO’s reputation? An experimental method is employed to best achieve this study’s objectives. Experimental method is the most appropriate to explain the relationships among the variables of interest. An experimental design allows researchers to manipulate variables, exercise a high degree of internal control, and establish causal relationships (Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000; Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).

Participants and the Stimulus Product Category

Research participants were recruited from a population of undergraduate students at a large public university. In a variant of snowball sampling, each participant was asked to recruit a friend. Incentives were provided by random drawings of 10 names from the participant pool, each who received $30. IRB approval was obtained prior to data collection, which was completed between March 2008 through April 2008.
Originally, a total of 221 participants completed all experiment sessions. To prevent potential introduction of a systematic error stemming from the wide range of ages of participants, the test for detecting outliers was conducted by calculating Mahalanobis distance ($D^2$) statistic in SPSS version v.17. Resulting from the test, a total of 20 outliers with an excessive Mahalanobis $D^2$ value were deleted from the sample pool. Of the total 201 participants retained after deleting outliers, 150 (74.6%) were women and 47 (23.9%) were men. Gender of four participants was unverified. Majority of participants were White (84.9%), with a mix of African Americans (5.5%), Hispanics (1.0%), Asians (5.5%), and others (3.0%). The mean age was 20.5 years old ($SD = 2.3$).

Given that this study is designed to examine hypothesized relationships among variables to tap a rather universal judgment process, this youth bias withstands sampling criteria (Bae & Cameron, 2006, p. 147). In addition, to strengthen external validity, these experiments used the online casual game business as the stimulus manipulation. According to the Nielsen Television Index for the fourth quarter of 2006, two-thirds of all men aged from 18 to 34 played video games in their home, and about 60% of women in the same age range accessed video games ("The state of the console: Video game console usage," 2007). In particular, in the online casual game business, the majority (63%) are female gamers (Tinney, 2005). Therefore, the gaming industry as the topic of manipulation has relevance to participants in the experiment. In addition, online gaming industry was chosen as the treatment, considering that participants in this study are categorized into the Net Generation, born between 1977 and 1997. This age cohort has been the major force of growth in internet usage and is characterized by a high level of literacy in online activities (Comegys, Hannula, & Väisänen, 2006). This age group is speculated to have a more positive attitude toward online shopping (Rajamma & Neeley, 2005) and be more inclined to purchase products online than older shoppers (Cowart & Goldsmith, 2007). Lester, Forman, and Loyd (2005) found that 91% of markets targeting college-age consumers are online-based. Due to the fit, many studies of online consumer behaviors intentionally employ young adult samples (e.g., Chen & Chang, 2005; Comegys et al., 2006; Cowart & Goldsmith, 2007; Elliott & Speck, 2005; Lester et al., 2005; McCluskey, 2003; Rajamma & Neeley, 2005; Seock & Chen-Yu, 2007; Seock & Marjorie, 2007; Yang, Lester, & James, 2007).

Experimental Design and Manipulations

This study utilized a 2 (CA vs. CSR crisis) × 2 (C-type vs. E-type CEO) × 3 (order of presentation of CEO news) mixed design. Of the 12 experimental cells, the variable of presentation order was absorbed into the design by combining the cells of different presentation orders within the same type of news, therefore retaining four experimental conditions (i.e., 2 crisis types × 2 CEO types). All participants were randomly assigned to each experimental condition.

---

4 Ages of the 221 participants ranged from 18 to 31, with a mean age of 20.5 years ($SD = 2.38$). Mahalanobis distance statistic ($D^2$) was calculated separately. A value of $D^2$ with a relatively low $p$ value in the appropriate chi-square distribution may lead to rejection of the null hypothesis that the case comes from the same population as the rest (Kline, 2005). Following Kline’s (2005) recommendation, a conservative level of statistical significance ($p < .001$) was used for determining the outlier. Resulting from the test, a total of 20 outliers with an excessive Mahalanobis $D^2$ value were deleted from the sample pool.

5 According to MSN Games, one of the leading online casual game providers, 21% of the site’s users came from the age group between 25 to 34, and 71% of the users were in the age range between 25 and 54. Of the users, 63% were women and 37% were male users (Tinney, 2005).
For the experimental treatments, a fictitious online casual game developing company (GameNetworks, Inc.) and a CEO (Bob Glase) name were used as the treatments. By using an imaginary company and CEO, potential compounding effect stemming from prior attitudes toward and relationships with the target objects was controlled. Instead, to increase believability of the manipulations, participants were instructed that all information was real and extracted from online news articles. The news story format is deemed highly credible among young adults in the United States (Park & Berger, 2004). Furthermore, Fombrun and Shanley (1990) claimed that publics use information about firms’ activities, which could come either directly from firms themselves or indirectly from media, and assess the firms’ successes or failures from their individual interpretations of the information. Therefore, it is assumed respondents will use the stimulus treatments as a signal of reputations of the target objects of the experiments, thereby forming their own individual opinions and beliefs about targets.

For manipulation of crises, two crisis scenarios were developed. In the CA-crisis scenario, the Web site of GameNetworks, an online casual game developer, was breached by hackers and individual information of game users (including credit card information) was stolen. Also, the focal firm’s server system was disrupted twice due to system failure a month before the outbreak. In this story, the firm was described as a victim, implying the firm’s lack of malicious intentionality, thus restricting a potential for negative attribution to the firm’s integrity. Instead, the story emphasized the firm’s history of failures in providing reliable products and services. In the CSR-crisis scenario, GameNetworks was accused of selling its customers’ private information without permission to other marketing companies. The firm was also charged with manipulating its accounting books to conceal numerous illegal sales, thus evading taxes. At the same time, to minimize participants’ inference of the performance of the target company based on its poor CSR activities, the focal firm’s superior performance history was emphasized by using such words as “a rising star” and “unprecedented growth.” All of the crisis news stories were written based on actual media reports to achieve the ecological validity.

The CEOs’ reputations were manipulated by creating three versions of news stories, respectively, for each type of CEO. For the C-type CEO reputation, stories included such information as business-wide recognition for the CEO’s successful career path, outstanding entrepreneurship, prize-winning history for managerial excellence, and remarkable educational background. The story utilized descriptive words pertinent to competence, which included such words as expert, informed, knowledgeable, innovative, and skillful. For the E-type CEO, the CEO’s personal philanthropic activities were reported. In each version of the stories, CEO Bob Glase donated

---

6According to Carroll (1979), CSRs have four parts: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary responsibilities. Economic responsibilities are pertinent to the productive role of firms; legal responsibilities refer to the obligation of abiding by laws and regulations; ethical responsibilities are relevant to expectations imposed by social norms that go beyond laws or regulations; and discretionary or volitional responsibilities refer to expectations responsibilities that are left to individual judgment and choice such as philanthropic contributions and programs for employees’ well-being (Carroll, 1999). Of the four categories of social responsibilities, legal and ethical obligations were manipulated for the CSR-crisis treatment in this experiment.

7Philanthropy fits with Carroll’s (1999) discretionary category of social responsibilities. Choi and Wang (2007) view that corporate philanthropy is an outlet for top managers’ concern for the welfare of others to community, and that those top managers are more likely to have a high level of values such as benevolence and integrity, the values which contribute to trusting firm-stakeholder relationships. In our experiment, CEO’s individual philanthropic activities were manipulated. CEO’s charitable donations have been spotlighted by the media as in the case of Warren Buffett’s donation to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Therefore, the real-world evidence of CEO’s personal philanthropic activities was supposed to increase the believability of the stimulus story (Sohn, Lariscy, & Tinkham, 2009).
money to a cancer support center to help cancer patients and medical research; universities historically affiliated with minority student to financially support minority students in need; or New Orleans City Council to push a post-Katrina neighborhood planning effort. The presentation order of the stories varied by group membership.

All of the stories about the CEO and the crises were written based on actual media reports with a view to obtain ecological validity and increase believability of the stories. Before the main test, a series of pilot tests were conducted with 58 undergraduate/graduate students, who were not part of the sampling pool for the main study. The pilot test results showed that the treatment stories were manipulated as intended; the between-condition differences were statistically significant and the within-condition differences were negligible.

Experiment Procedures

All experiment sessions were conducted online. All instruments including stimulus stories were uploaded to a controlled server with different links determined by the experimental design. All survey sites were open 3 days a week to control the flow of participation. After being randomly assigned to one of experimental conditions, each of the participants received a private invitation e-mail, which contained the link to his/her unique condition survey site. All participants were exposed to news about either a CA or CSR corporate crisis in the first session of study, and positive information of either C-type CEO or E-type CEO in the second session. The same outcome variables (i.e., perceptions of corporate reputation, organization–public relationships and loyalty) were measured immediately after exposure to each of the treatments, whereas the perceptions of CEO’s reputation were measured only in the second session. The time lag between the sessions was 1 week. The type of crisis story and CEO information was determined by the participants’ group membership. After completion of all experimental sessions, the participants were debriefed.

Measures

The participants’ responses were measured in such outcome variables as corporate reputation, organization–public relationships, and loyalty.

Corporate Reputation

One of the standardized measures of reputation that is often quoted in the reputation literature is the reputation quotient (RQ). Developed by Fombrun, Gardberg, and Sever (2000), this multidimensional scale consists of six dimensions: (a) emotional appeal (i.e., trust, good feeling, respect); (b) quality products and services; (c) vision and leadership; (d) workplace environment (e.g., a good company to work for); (e) social and environmental responsibility; and (f) financial performance. The RQ is considered a valid measure of reputation particularly among the general public (Kiousis, Popescu, & Mitrook, 2007). Considering the fact that this article paper limits its scope to the consumer stakeholders, this article extracts from the RQ only the items that belong to the dimensions of emotional appeal, quality products and services, and social and environmental
responsible; and the items of emotional appeal dimension were modified to form the variable of attitudes toward company. All of the items were quantified on 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 being very strongly disagree and 7 being very strongly agree. Cronbach’s alpha for CA reputation ranged from .843 to .886; that for CSR reputation ranged from .907 to .908; and that for attitudes ranged from .917 to .923.8

**Relationships and loyalty.** Of the relationship measures, trust is conceptualized as “one party’s level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party,” and satisfaction is defined as “the extent to which one party feels favorably toward the other because positive expectations about the relationships are reinforced” and commitment as “extent to which one party believes and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote” (Hon & J. E. Grunig, 1999, pp. 19–20). Relationship measures were adopted from Hon and J. E. Grunig’s organization–public relationships measures. Of the original items, those for measuring satisfaction, trust, and commitment were used with marginal change. In contrast, the items for mutual controllability were adjusted to reflect the fact that the participants in the experiments had no direct experiences with the focal firm, which is an imaginary object. Therefore, the variable that was created by combining these adjusted items was labeled as perceived customer care. All the items were measures on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 being very strongly disagree and 7 being very strongly agree. Several items were flipped in scale before being collapsed into each of the relationship variables, therefore rearranging the scales created from 1 (unfavorable) to 7 (favorable). Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .903 to .914 for the perceived customer care scale; from .816 to .760 for satisfaction; from .869 to .769 for trust; and from .891 to .919 for commitment.

The scale of loyalty was created by adopting from DeRuyter, Wetzel and Bloemer’s (1998) scale. Four items were used an each of them was quantified on a 7-point bipolar scale, ranging from 1 (unfavorable) to 7 (favorable). Cronbach’s alpha for the scale ranged from .917 to .925. All the measures are presented in Table 1.

**Manipulation and Random Assignment Check**

To check whether the goals of manipulation and random assignment were achieved, a series of tests were run by using SPSS v.17. For the tests, the data collected at the first time point were used. First, the manipulation check was conducted by testing the grouping effect on the dimensions of corporate reputation through between-group t-test. As expected, CA crisis caused heavier damage on the CA dimension ($n = 99, M = 3.66, SD = 1.048$) than on the CSR dimension ($n = 98, M = 3.79, SD = .781$); CSR crisis had a stronger effect on the CSR dimension ($n = 99, M = 3.07, SD = .895$) than on the CA dimension ($n = 94, M = 4.01, SD = 1.025$). These differences were statistically significant at the .05 level; $t(191) = -2.347, p = .020$ for CA reputation; $t(195) = 5.956, p = .000$ for CSR reputation.9 These test results confirmed that the manipulations

---

8A series of reliability tests were conducted for each experimental condition, based on the data set from the first session.

9The Levene’s test results was $F = .498, p = .481$ for CA reputation; and $F = 2.278, p = .133$ for CSR reputation, therefore showing no sign of the violation of the equal error variance assumption.
for crisis type were successful. The tests of random assignment were conducted by comparing mean differences between the experimental groups that belong to the same type of manipulation cluster. A series of ANOVA tests were run and none of the tests were statistically significant, suggesting successful accomplishment of random assignments.
RESULTS

First, to examine the effect of positive reputation of the CEO on corporate reputation (H1), a series of repeated-measure analyses were computed for the CA and CSR crisis conditions, respectively. As hypothesized, the positive information about a CEO had a significant effect on corporate reputation in both CA and CSR crisis situations. In the CA crisis environment, a CEO’s favorable reputation had significant impact on corporate reputation for both CA and CSR dimensions, as well as on the overall attitudes about the company with p-values for all three outcome variables less than .001. The effect sizes for the CEO’s influence were also large, ranging from .123 to .253. In the CSR crisis environment, the influence of the CEO’s reputation was also significant at the .05 level on corporate reputation for the CA dimension, and at the .01 level on both the CSR reputation and overall attitudes. The effect size for the main effect on the CA reputation was small (.052), but those for the CSR reputation and overall attitudes were large (.293 for the CSR reputation and .178 for attitudes). As these results support H1, it is concluded that a CEO’s favorable reputation may help restore corporate reputation tarnished by a crisis.

For the test of RQ1, the mixed-model analyses were conducted for the CA and CSR crisis environments, respectively. First, tests of the CEO’s impact on corporate reputation measures in the CA crisis environment indicated a significant interaction effect between time points and the CEO type; $F(1, 91) = 7.105, p = .009$, effect size $\eta^2_p = .072$. Therefore, interpreting the main effect (i.e., the grouping effect by CEO type) was not deemed appropriate. Such being the case, to simultaneously compare the CEO impact on CA corporate reputation, the between-group $t$-test based on data collected at the second time point was conducted, which confirmed a significant difference between CEO reputation types in their effects on CA reputation; $t(91) = 3.492$, $p = .001$, effect size $\eta^2_p = .118$. The effect of C-type CEO on the CA corporate reputation ($M = 4.6$, $SD = .82$) was significantly stronger that the effect of E-type CEO ($M = 3.9$, $SD = .91$). The test result demonstrates that, in a CA crisis situation, C-type CEO reputation may be more effective than E-type CEO reputation in restoring corporate reputation for the CA dimension. In contrast, the tests of the influence of CEO’s reputation on corporate reputation measures in the CSR crisis situation detected no significant main and interaction effects. These test results suggest that a CEO’s reputation should help improve the reputation of the company afflicted by a crisis, but the type of CEO’s reputation may not make a substantial difference in a CSR crisis situation. In terms of the effects on the CSR corporate reputation and overall attitudes to company, there was no significant difference between CEO’s reputation types. Table 2 shows the statistics summary of the test for H1 and RQ1.

To test H2, a series of repeated-measure analyses were conducted. The test results indicated that both in the CA and CSR crisis environments, CEO’s impact on perceived relationships with the target company was evident, as increases in mean scores after the presentation of favorable news about CEO were statistically significant in all conditions for all outcome measures, and the effect sizes were large ranging from .087 to .321. Therefore, as hypothesized in H2, favorable...
### TABLE 2
CEO Effects on Corporate Reputation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA Crisis</th>
<th></th>
<th>CSR Crisis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1 (Crisis News)</td>
<td>Time 2 (CEO News)</td>
<td>Time 1 (Crisis News)</td>
<td>Time 2 (CEO News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>47 3.7 .98</td>
<td>4.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; .82</td>
<td>47 4.0 1.05</td>
<td>4.4 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>46 3.6 1.06</td>
<td>3.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; .91</td>
<td>42 4.0 .97</td>
<td>4.1 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93 3.7 1.01</td>
<td>4.3** .91</td>
<td>89 4.0 1.01</td>
<td>4.3* 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>47 3.8 .78</td>
<td>4.1 .85</td>
<td>46 3.0 .86</td>
<td>3.8 .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>47 3.8 .78</td>
<td>4.1 .88</td>
<td>45 3.2 .88</td>
<td>3.7 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94 3.8 .78</td>
<td>4.1** .86</td>
<td>91 3.1 .87</td>
<td>3.8** .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>47 3.1 .99</td>
<td>4.0 1.08</td>
<td>46 2.9 .98</td>
<td>3.6 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>47 3.3 .99</td>
<td>3.8 1.06</td>
<td>46 3.0 .97</td>
<td>3.5 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94 3.3 .98</td>
<td>4.0** 1.07</td>
<td>92 3.0 .97</td>
<td>3.5** 1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CA = Corporate ability. CSR = Corporate social responsibility.

<sup>a</sup>The figures represent the mean scores across CEO types; and significant test results reflect a mean difference between the two time points of measurement.

<sup>b</sup>The figures represent the mean scores within each type of CEO reputation; and significant test results reflect a mean difference between responses to C-type and E-type CEO.

<sup>/C3/</sup>Significant at the .01 level. <sup>/C3/</sup>Significant at the .05 level.

### TABLE 3
Statistics Summary: CEO Effects on Relationships Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA Crisis</th>
<th></th>
<th>CSR Crisis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1 (Crisis News)</td>
<td>Time 2 (CEO News)</td>
<td>Time 1 (Crisis News)</td>
<td>Time 2 (CEO News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
<td>n M SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>46 4.0 1.06</td>
<td>4.4 .99</td>
<td>47 3.5 1.00</td>
<td>4.1 .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>47 3.9 1.11</td>
<td>4.2 .93</td>
<td>45 3.5 1.00</td>
<td>4.0 .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93 3.9 1.08</td>
<td>4.3** .96</td>
<td>92 3.5 .99</td>
<td>4.1** .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>47 3.3 .98</td>
<td>4.1 .74</td>
<td>48 3.5 .76&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.1 .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>46 3.3 .76</td>
<td>3.8 .94</td>
<td>47 3.2 .82&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.6 .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93 3.3 .87</td>
<td>4.0** .86</td>
<td>95 3.4 .81</td>
<td>3.9** .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>47 3.7 .94</td>
<td>4.1 .80</td>
<td>47 3.2 .92</td>
<td>3.8 .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>48 3.6 .76</td>
<td>3.9 .98</td>
<td>46 3.0 .93</td>
<td>3.7 .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>95 3.6 .85</td>
<td>4.0** .90</td>
<td>93 3.1 .92</td>
<td>3.7** .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Type</td>
<td>45 2.6 1.03</td>
<td>3.2 1.01</td>
<td>49 2.6 1.06</td>
<td>3.3 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Type</td>
<td>46 2.6 1.00</td>
<td>2.8 1.06</td>
<td>47 2.7 1.06</td>
<td>2.9 .99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>91 2.6 1.01</td>
<td>3.0** 1.01</td>
<td>95 2.7 1.06</td>
<td>3.1** 1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CA = Corporate ability. CSR = Corporate social responsibility.

<sup>a</sup>The figures represent the mean scores across CEO types; and significant test results reflect a mean difference between the two time points of measurement.

<sup>b</sup>The figures represent the mean scores within each type of CEO reputation; and significant test results reflect a mean difference between responses to C-type and E-type CEO.
information about CEO had a significant effect on making people feeling better about the company of which reputation was tarnished in the aftermath of a crisis.

To test RQ2, the mixed-model analyses were employed. The results of the tests for RQ2 showed that none of the main and interaction tests were statistically significant, except the main effect on satisfaction in the CSR crisis environment; $F(1, 93) = 10.403, p = .002$, effect size $\eta^2_p = .101$. In the CSR crisis situation, the mean score of satisfaction for the C-type group increased by 0.6 points from 3.5 ($SD = .76$) to 4.1 ($SD = .61$) after the presentation of CEO’s information; that for the E-type group increased by 0.4 point from 3.2 ($SD = .82$) to 3.6 ($SD = .73$). To sum, just as the reputational variables, the relationships outcomes significantly improved over time in both the CA and CSR crisis environments. However, the impact of the type of CEO’s reputation did not make a notable contribution to the outcome variables. Table 3 presents the statistics summaries.

To test the effect of CEO reputation on loyalty, a series of repeated-measure analyses (i.e., tests for H3) and the mixed model analyses (i.e., tests for RQ3) were conducted. The test results indicated that favorable reputation of CEO boosted loyalty in both the CA and CSR conditions, as hypothesized in H3; $F(1, 91) = 24.88, p = .000$, effect size $\eta^2_p = .215$ for the CA crisis condition; $F(1, 93) = 28.69, p = .000$, effect size $\eta^2_p = .236$ for the CSR crisis condition. However, the test of RQ3 yielded no significant results at the .05 level, reflecting a negligible effect of the type of CEO reputation. The test results are summarized in Table 4.

### DISCUSSION

In a bid to highlight the uniqueness of every organization facing a crisis situation and explore crisis strategies that can leverage an organization’s diverse competitive resources, this study has introduced the resource-based approach to crisis. In particular, this study tapped into the CEO’s reputation as a potential strategic resource and empirically demonstrated that favorable reputation of a CEO relieved negative perceptions of stakeholders in a post-crisis situation. With the findings, this study adds a piece of evidence that the transfer of values and meaning of a CEO to the company or brand associated with the CEO can benefit the organization or the brand when it faces hard times.
With this significant finding, this study contributes to the crisis literature in several ways. First, this study draws researchers’ attention to exploring crisis communication strategies other than the short-term, rhetoric-based message strategies. In our study, an asset-type resource (i.e., CEO’s reputation) is suggested as the potential strategic resource to be communicated to mitigate a negative impact of a crisis. Other examples may include identifying and tailoring crisis messages to well-established consumer advocate groups (e.g., brand community) and consumer opinion leaders favorable to the organization. These network assets are also deemed valuable, rare, and nonsubstitutable by other resources. Therefore, by urging organizations to further develop creative strategies by cashing in on their own strategic resource bases, the resource-based approach to crisis provides researchers with a theoretical stepping stone, from which research on potential strategic resources for crisis communication will continue to thrive. In this way, this study makes practical contributions by presenting rationales for public relations practitioners to move beyond the technical role and assume a more strategic role within an organization, which includes nurturing and managing potential corporate resources and strategically communicating by leveraging them.

It does not mean that this resource-based approach to crisis will replace the existing crisis response strategy theories. Rather this new approach should be considered to fill a void that the existing theories have not taken care of. That is, because existing crisis response strategies mainly focus on short-term strategies to solve the problems at hand, they often fail to provide effective solutions to the potentially lingering effects after the crisis is tentatively settled. For instance, if a firm suffers from a negative impact of a crisis—such as negative reputation—even long after the crisis itself stopped making a news headline, how could the existing repertoire-based crisis response strategies help the company to get over the lingering crisis effect?

The crisis of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, which has haunted the oil company for about 20 years and left the firm a bad name, is the case in point. In this case, Exxon cannot rely on any of the message repertoires that the existing crisis literature recommends. Simply Exxon cannot say that “back then 20 years ago, we were very sorry” to resolve the lingering crisis effect. This is the moment when the resource-based approach can play its role and fill the vacuum that the existing message-based crisis response strategies can be of little help. That is, this new approach recommends finding a resource on which the company can anchor its communication to improve its reputation and relationship with its stakeholders. In another case, Microsoft, which has long suffered from an unfavorable reputation even after the issue of its violation of antitrust law faded away from the media focus, provides a successful real-world example that the resource-based approach has been paid off. As illustrated in the opening of this article, Microsoft successfully relieved the negative impact of the legal crisis by actively managing the firm’s unique resource—Bill Gates’ reputation. Therefore, it can be argued that the resource-based approach has valuable potential for post-crisis strategies.

In addition, this study also urges researchers to take a multidimensional approach to crisis communication. Before this study, crisis communication researchers have paid attention to such crisis factors as crisis severity, stability, and responsibility. The nature of reputation that is damaged by a crisis has seldom been the focus of crisis communication studies. Diverging from this existing trend, this study starts from the proposition that a crisis will not equally damage the dimensions of organizational reputation and identifying the reputational dimension that is hit most severely by the crisis will determine the direction of crisis response strategies. Therefore, this study tested whether a particular type of CEO reputation will be more effective than another
in dealing with a CA or CSR crisis. And the result showed that matching the type of CEO’s reputation with the crisis type may be more effective in restoring corporate reputation, at least in a crisis that poses threat primarily to the CA dimension of the company. In a CA-related crisis condition, communicating about a CEO with strong reputation of performance was more effective in restoring CA dimension of corporate reputation than communicating about a CEO with a strong reputation of social responsibility.

In the CSR crisis situation, on the other hand, there was no significant difference between the CEO types in improving corporate reputation. This may be because people tend to expect that a CEO with good leadership—no matter whether the leadership is based on competence or morality—has the ability to fix problems related to ethical issues. As to this result, it is worthy of mentioning that the C-type CEO (i.e., CEO with a good reputation of competence) was considered to be ethically neutral or moderately ethical in this study. If the C-type CEO was manipulated as unethical, the test result might be different. This result stresses the significance of considering the properties of resources, in addition to the nature of crises, in selecting crisis response options.

It is also noteworthy that this study introduces a new direction for research on the roles of leadership in a crisis situation. In crisis communication literature, leadership research has emphasized the CEO’s role as a spokesperson (e.g., Ferns, Emelianova, & Sethi, 2008). It is reasonable to expect that if a CEO is admired and preferred by audiences, his or her claims are likely to be perceived as more credible and more persuasive than those of CEOs who are less respected and liked. In this vein, the empirical findings in this study urge CEOs not to be just spokespersons, but to be spokespersons of good reputation. Even further, this study advocates that CEOs will nurture their good reputations and actively utilize them as a resource to overcome a crisis.

Taking a step further, this study has demonstrated the value of CEO’s reputation as a means of enhancing the corporate–public relationship. Reputation literature has been sprinkled with the studies on the associations between corporate reputation and public’s perceptions and behaviors. However, the relationship between CEO reputation and public’s responses has been supported by little empirical evidence. By linking the reputation literature to the stakeholder relationships research and demonstrating an empirical support for the correlation between CEO reputation and stakeholder relationships, this study inspires a new promising research stream.

On the reputation literature front, this research also makes a significant contribution. So far, the reputation literature has focused on the nature of reputation, its formation and its impacts to consumer responses. But the discourse on how to overcome the negative effects of an unfavorable reputation is seldom in the core of the examinations. At this juncture, it seems meaningful for this study to enter into the discourse on the traits of negative reputation and the strategies to overcome it. By doing so, this study also provides a good example of how a multidisciplinary approach can enrich research streams. This study demonstrates how connecting different research disciplines—that is, resource-based views, which have grown out of reputation literature, and crisis communication—can bring new insights into each of the research fields.

Meanwhile, the research design of this study may limit its implication to the value of post-crisis information of a CEO’s reputation in mitigating negative corporate reputation. Further studies on the effect of prior knowledge of CEO’s reputation in overcoming corporate crises will surely enhance our understanding of the association between the reputations of a CEO and the company. In addition, this study placed a gap of a week between study sessions. Varying the time gaps between exposures may yield new insights. For further enrichment of
research streams in these areas, other future research agenda may include such questions as what other strategic resources can be utilized in crisis situations, what criteria can be applied in selecting specific resource for crisis communication and determining its effectiveness, what other third variables will come into play and meditate or moderate the effectiveness of these resources, and whether there are situational factors or conditions that make certain resources more effective than others.
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