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Introduction
What are the main factors influencing corporate identity management? and what are the key factors that influence corporate reputation favorably? Results showed that philosophy, vision, mission, and top management driving force positively influence corporate identity management.

Background
The role of Corporate identity management on corporate reputation
Corporate identity management and corporate reputation are today’s motto of marketing (Ageeva et al., 2019). In their search for continuous achievement in a marketplace, corporate identity management characterized by philosophy (Ghodeswar, 2008), vision (Harris and De Chernatony, 2001), mission (Urde, 2003), corporate history (Konecnik and Go 2008), country-of-origin (King, 2017), and top management driving force (Yin Wong and Merrilees, 2005)). Meanwhile diversity plays a great role between these variables and corporate identity management. Also, innovation adoption is related to corporate identity management and corporate reputation. With so-called ties, an increasing number of corporations seek to establish profound, purposeful, long connections with their customers.
What is the relationship between philosophy, vision and mission, corporate history, country-of-origin and top management driving force with corporate identity management? What is the connection between corporate identity management and corporate reputation? What is the connection between corporate identity management and innovation adoption? What is the relationship between innovation adoption and corporate reputation? A vast body of research, ranging from corporate identity management (Abdullah et al., 2013), philosophy (e.g., De Chernatony, 1999), vision (e.g., Harris and Chernatony, 2001), mission (e.g., Dermol and Širca 2018), corporate history (e.g., Blombäck et al., 2013), country-of-origin (e.g., Barbarossa et al., 201 Che-Ha et al., 2016), top management driving force (Melewar et al., 2018) and brand reputation (e.g., Foroudi, 2018), has attempted to recognise and describe how organizations, or the ‘individuals behind the corporate brands’ (McAlexander et al., 2002, p. 50), can make deeper, more faithful associations. Though, this paper has introduced brand new relationships: the moderation effect of diversity between corporate history and corporate identity management, and moderation effect of diversity between country-of-origin and corporate identity management. These relationships have not been examined before and it is the first time that they are pointed out in this article (Melewar et al., 2018).

This paper contributes to the growing study on employee–company associations by suggesting the opinion of gender diversity and equality as the essential managerial foundation for the kind of profound, promised, and purposeful associations which marketers are progressively seeking to establish with their customers. Furthermore, it depicts theories of corporate identity management (He, 2012; Hatch et al., 1997), innovation adoption (Gupta et al., 2016; Hillestad et al., 2010) and corporate reputation (Foroudi, 2018; Romenti, 2010) to bring an organized, general interpretation the situation with which consumers are likely to recognize and impression a sense of belonging (Mael and Ashforth, 992), with an organization and outcomes of reputation.

In the next sections, corporate identity and reputation are portrayed in extant research to develop the employee–company personalities and articulate the research model, which provides hypotheses concerning the main consideration and outcomes of reputation in the market. We then offer approaches to test these hypotheses. Finally, the paper ends with a discussion of the theoretical significance.
of employee–company reputation and its implications for companies seek diverse employees.

**Theoretical background**
Brand identity plays an important role for companies to distinguish themselves from their opponents in the market (Black and Veloutsou, 2017). A brand identity aids firms in building image with their internal and external stakeholders (Henderson and Cote, 1988), resulting in adding value to the firm’s reputation (Olins, 1989). Brand identity can be the first impression of a customer of a brand (Törmälä and Gyrd-Jones, 2017). Corporate identity has significant influence on the customer purchase decision (Godey et al., 2012).

Corporate identity is rooted in social identity theory. Social identity theory suggests customers seek their self-concept from being members in different social groups (Tajfel and Turner, 1985). According to Brewer (1991) and Tajfel (1981) social identity is the more an individual identifies the sameness with a specific group or product, the more it moves towards the sense of oneself with that group membership.

**Corporate identity management**
Leuthesser (2015) describes corporate identity as the manner by which corporate philosophy and strategy to internal and external stakeholders is shown via correspondence, behaviour, and symbolism. Also, brand identity management is the qualities, features, attributes or traits of an organization that are recognized to be key, long-lasting and specific through a company’s guidelines, nature and positioning (Balmer, 2001; He et al., 2005; 2009; Melewar, 2017; Knott et al., 2017; Van Riel et al., 1997). Foroudi et al. (2017) described corporate identity management as the collection of explanations by which people on the outside know a company and through those explanations people can explain, recall and connect to that company. Fisher et al. (2016) stated that with corporation’s growing strategy, corporation identity will wane. Companies struggle for a differentiating identity to grab the attention of stakeholders to show they can do things that their competitors could not. Corporate identity and its aspects are formed by values and beliefs of all personnel of an organization from top to bottom (King, 2017). In other words, corporate identity
management is established fundamentally through inside connections, including staff at different levels (Koporcic et al., 2018).

In order to become successful in the market companies need to manage corporate identity (Melewar et al., 2017). Identity gives power to employees to connect with a corporation and they can find out their roles in connection with the corporation (Chiang et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2016). Furthermore, another corporate identity definition is “organizational attributes that are central, enduring and distinct” (Skilton et al., 2017, p. 13). Corporate identity management includes different features of a corporation, such as business strategy, corporate culture, behaviour and corporate design, all of which collaborate together and its consequence is distinguishing one company from another (Foroudi et al., 2017; Melewar et al., 2017). It is evident that corporate identity management is completely different from changing a company’s name (Fetscherin et al., 2012). Balmer et al. (1999) suggested that people might have various understandings of the identity of a company according to their sentiments, feelings, and beliefs (Brown et al., 2006; Foroudi et al., 2018; Karaosmanoğlu et al., 2011). Hence, as corporate identity is seen by several people inside (Gioia et al., 2000; Rode and Vallaster 2005; Simões et al., 2005) and outside (Shymko et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2016) of a company, corporate identity management would be inevitable for each of those individuals (Karaosmanoğlu et al., 2010).

Corporation identity is formed by the founder’s experiences and outlook on the world (Koporcic et al., 2018). Graphic design was the origin of corporate identity management (Chajet and Schatman, 993; Schmidt, 1996) where it was connected to elements affecting organizational graphics and imagery that are utilized to encompass and depict a company’s characteristics to the outside world (Balmer, 1994; Melewar et al., 2001; Pérez et al., 2014).

Conceptual Framework

**Philosophy, Vision, Mission → Corporate Identity Management**

Philosophy is not only a strategic intention (Dermol and Širca, 2018). Furthermore, philosophy can have a strong effect on employee motivation (Taylor et al., 2010). Corporate philosophy can impact on corporate identity (Tuna et al., 2016) and
corporate branding (Balmer et al., 2017). As a result, we can observe all corporate branding and corporate identity management activities through the corporate philosophy framework (Balmer, 2017). Also, philosophy is the basic, distinguishing and persevering idea, belief, and feeling directing a business, which in turn is essential in preparing and writing a mission (Analoui and Karami, 2002, Wang, 2011). In other words, different execution and implementation outcomes rooted in philosophy and mission which finally benefit the company (Bart et al., 1998; Davis et al., 2007; Palmer and Short, 2008; Pearce and David, 1987, Wang, 2011). One of the usages of mission statements is informing and connecting stakeholders (Lin et al., 2018; Kemp and Dwyer, 2003). In addition, organizations obtain their meaning from the mission statement (Suvatjis et al., 2012). Besides, mission statement has a critical role in attracting customers by emphasizing company qualities and values (David, 2012).

The ultimate purpose of corporate philosophy is to express the essential values of a company, which is demonstrated in the vision and mission statement (Dessupoio et al, 2018). Corporate identity management is responsible for solidifying the corporate philosophy (Abdullah et al., 2013). Thus, understanding corporate identity means realizing the impact of cultural influence, because values and vision are affected by cultural elements (Abdullah et al., 2013; Dessupoio et al, 2018). It is the duty of the vision statement to prepare and empower the present and potential employees (Ramus and Steger, 2000), customers (Cova and Pace, 2016) and stakeholders (Li et al., 2018) of the company. In the tourism industry, vision is not only the identity of every hotel, but also the implementing unique management activities and service standards across the hotels (Edghiem and Mouzughi, 2018). Bart et al. (2001) stated employees enable putting into effect and carrying out the mission with deep interest. Essential messages are intended to connect a corporation with the external environment containing values and mission of the organization (e.g. through websites, yearly reports) (Moriuchi and Takahashi, 2018).

Van Riel (1995) suggested that leading corporate communications should be directed by the basic philosophy of “directing the company’s communications policies from within the corporate strategy-corporate identity-corporate image triangle” (p. 19). Vision statement is the main guidance of all company’s exercises (Kohles et al.,
2012; Locke et al., 1991). Also, if shared values and prescriptive mental models illustrate in a formal manner, it can be named vision statements that reveal a perfect future state (House, 1977; Kohles et al., 2012; Shipman et al., 2010; Strange et al., 2002; 2005). Furthermore, vision statement is associated with the company’s corporate identity management (Maitlis et al., 2010). Vision and mission are referred to the organization’s identity (Kohles et al., 2012) by all top managers. Corporate identity, at a strategic level, establishes the organization’s quality and uniqueness mirrored in its philosophy, mission, and values (He et al., 2013; Simões et al., 2017). However, there is a sufficient body of evidence that only writing a mission statement is inadequate (Kemp and Dwyer, 2003). Desmidt and Prinzie (2009) highlighted the significance of a written mission statement as a tool inside an organization. Company mission and organizational values are a crucial factor of giving strength to inner awareness of corporate identity management and its external broadcast (Chong, 2007; Dermol and Širca, 2018; Musek et al., 2008). As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

**H1: Philosophy, mission, vision positively influences corporate identity management.**

**Moderation effect of diversity between philosophy, mission, vision → corporate identity management**

Diversity has been a controversial subject for management scholars and managers at all levels (Tasheva et al., 2018, Gehman et al., 2017). In terms of demography, although diversity has wide outcomes both for staff and organizations, managing that diversity is not easily attainable (Chung et al., 2015). Companies take different strategic decisions toward better managing their increasingly diverse workforce (Gröschl, 2011). Researchers have concentrated on how to conduct teams and organizations that are diverse in terms of gender (Hogg et al., 2012). To differ between diversity management positions and the HR function, and to shape corporate identity that develops from top management level to all operational and managerial levels is of great importance (Gröschl, 2011). All factors of corporation life such as the company’s culture, philosophy, vision, mission, form corporate identity (Martins and Parsons, 2007). Combining elements like diversity in philosophy, vision and mission statement give the minority members of the
organization better feeling (Cole et al., 2013). So as discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H1a: \text{Gender diversity as a moderator has an effect between philosophy, mission, vision and corporate identity management.} \]

**Corporate History → Corporate Identity Management**

When employees together create a company’s history, the corporate identity would be shaped and maintained (Anteby and Molnar, 2012). Organizational memory is rooted in corporate history (Levitt et al. 1988; Mena et al., 2016; Rowlinson et al., 2014; Schrempf-Stirling et al., 2016). For instance, for universities the establisher is the one who has influence on the university identity (Melewar, 2003; 2016). History can be a competitive advantage that a company is able to use and refer to (Schrempf-Stirling et al., 2016). Realizing the relation between corporate identity and corporate history is of paramount importance (Blombäck et al., 2013). Researchers (e.g., Mena et al., 2016; Ravasi et al., 2016; Rowlinson et al., 2014) believe that all founded corporation have a history (Urde et al., 2015). On the other hand, some companies’ history are a prominent part of their identity and they employ it as a constituent of defined corporate heritage (Urde et al., 2015). In this regard, communicating company history appears to grow in popularity.

Ravasi et al. (2018) studied how corporate history legitimizes the day-to-day work of a company, such as corporate identity. History is one aspect that can have influence on identity in the marketing academic literature, and it seems to repeatedly contributes to corporate identity and branding (Blombäck et al., 2009, 2013; Melewar, 2003; Melewar et al., 2006; Moingeon and Ramanantsoa, 1997). Simultaneously, various scholars have discussed that corporate identity management is excessively internalized in organization history and culture can be used as a tool (Blombäck et al., 2009). Identity has several aspects that one of them is history (Micelotta et al., 2011).

The story of corporation can be conveyed in a way that preserves corporate history and corporate identity forever (Essamri et al. 2018). Natural uniqueness and imitation are two reasons for applying a corporation’s history to describe identity
(Barney, 1991). Scholars uncovered how building blocks of history are being used to establish corporate identity and the way that corporate identity can be conveyed to stakeholders outside of the company (Blombäck et al., 2013; Lundström, 2006; Urde et al., 2007). Furthermore, company founders become a constitutional part of corporate identity management (Fan et al., 2018). Thus, corporation identity could connect powerfully and sensitively with generations to come, and also this generation can clearly join in a company’s history (Hall, 2004).

H2: Corporate history positively influences corporate identity management.

**Moderation effect of diversity between corporate history → corporate identity management**

For a long time, diversity and equality have been a controversial subject that made different governments pass laws in favour of diversity in the workplace, and persuading organizations in the public sector to show impartiality and clarity both in the industry and recruitment processes (Senyucel and Phillpott 2011). By these laws, different people should have access equally to public services and fairly have the chance to be employed and go up the organization ladder apart from any bias. This ethical discussion is especially identified with public service, whereby the company as a privately based business responsible for enhancing quality of life, looking for supporting working force (Senyucel and Phillpott 2011).

Establishing equality policies that provide sufficient foundation to make sure legal compliance in companies is provided, so numerous organizations begin to offer an explanation to this moral discussion (Cornelius et al., 2001; Senyucel et al., 2011). A Company might improve its attraction to hire talented people from labour market by this beneficence (Cox et al., 1991; Senyucel and Phillpott 2011). Thus, lower absence rates (Diestel et al., 2014), higher retention (Kulik et al., 2016), expanded levels of morale (Fast et al., 2014) and effective responsibility (Kraimer et al., 2012) might be seen in the corporation. As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

H2a: Gender Diversity as a moderator has an effect between corporate history and corporate identity management.
Country-of-origin \( \rightarrow \) Corporate Identity Management

Country-of-origin is explained as the country to which a customer relates a specific product or brand as its source (Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Kim et al., 2013). In other resources the COO is defined as “a set of strengths and weaknesses related to the country-of-origin that incorporates or subtracts the value supplied by a brand or service to the manufacturer and/or its clients” (García-Gallego and Chamorro Mera, p. 17). Also, we can define COO as “the overall perception consumers form of products from a particular country, based on their prior perceptions of the country’s production and marketing strengths and weaknesses” (Roth et al., 1992, p. 480). The country-of-origin is used as an external signal by consumers to verify quality and features of a product (Maruyama and Wu, 2014). CoO’s aspects can affect quality of products and service, which are assessed by consumers. This influence can change purchase intention (Kim et al., 2017; Pharr, 2005).

Consumers’ assessment of a product and their perceptions will be satisfied by COO as an external informational key (Kim et al., 2017). The fact is that numerous companies are failing to keep all or a portion of their local corporate identity by these constant changes and mergers. García-Gallego and Chamorro Mera (2017) suggested that any economic and financial decision to incorporate with former rivals, there is an important thing called marketing decision which must be made: to keep the origins of brands or to let them to be lost. An extensive factor in corporate identity management is country-of-origin which impacts different aspects of a product such as consumer perceptions, quality perceptions, reliability differences, and performance (Melewar, 2003; Veloutsou and Taylor, 2012). A CoO is a powerful symbol and can considerably help the corporate identity management and also in the minds of consumers the product’s image (Aiello et al., 2008; Foroudi et al., 2016). In the world of tourism, there is a need for countries to promote their position to attract more customers and several are modifying the brands of places in the minds of main stakeholders to develop special and different identity (Foroudi et al., 2016; Middleton et al., 2012; Kumar, 2014).

\( H3: \) Country-of-origin positively influences corporate identity management.
Moderation effect of diversity between country-of-origin \(\rightarrow\) corporate identity management

In the preceding years the corporations have realised the importance of their employees’ diversity. For instance, problem-solving (Nishii, 2013), innovation (King et al., 2011) and creativity (Godart et al., 2015) are some benefits of diversity for each firm. As a diverse team can convey different and varied practices, opinions and implicit knowledge to the corporation (Bowen et al., 2003; Senyucel and Phillpott 2011). Besides, diversity assure stakeholders that the management board is performing their duty appropriately (Wahid, 2018). Also, diversity has an impact on the products’ feature as well due to cultural differences (Wyer Jr., 2011). Immigrants with racial diversity have appeared in different countries (Kalargyrou and Costen, 2017). As diversity is not essentially noticeable, it can be difficult to appreciate. Manoharan et al. (2017) stated that diversity is perception about being different from peers. Bowen and Blackmon (2003) stated that diversity is a hidden attribute as it is not easily understandable. Senyucel (2011) suggested that sexual diversity is significant for an organization due to its effect on effectiveness. When members of a team rival for promotion, generosity and amiability have to be characters in gender-diverse groups because philanthropy, and assistance are the human qualities that these groups very much needed (Apesteguia et al., 2012; Barclay, 2010; Farrelly, 2011; Lee et al., 2018; Ortmann et al., 1999; Williams and Polman, 2014). Furthermore, during working in mixed groups in terms of gender, members of a team prevent others from saying or doing things that may seem offensive and aggressive (e.g., Hirschfeld et al., 2005; Myaskovsky et al., 2005). Results show that people in groups which are gender-diverse do not greatly like to experience social stress and hostility among members in the workplace developing from disputes (Lee et al., 2018). As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H3a: \text{Gender diversity as a moderator has an effect between country-of-origin and corporate identity management.} \]

Top management driving force \(\rightarrow\) Corporate Identity Management

The main responsibility of senior managers is communicating inside and outside of a company (Madera et al., 2014). On the basis of their organizational power and
having knowledge to work, they know how to change the company in the right way, and according to research results, the role of top management in forming corporate identity is undeniable (He, 2012). Expressing the corporation’s main idea to the stakeholders (internal and external) is the approach of senior management that builds foundation of top management driving force (Jo Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Melewar et al., 2003; 2018). For instance, a university's main strategy is conveyed from top executives to its stakeholders and top executives are highly associated with the environment and take each opportunity to emphasize the university’s main values publicly (Melewar et al., 2018). On the other hand, investors draw more attention to companies whose board of directors consist of women. Moreover, it gives a good signal to society and stakeholders that they are perfect leaders and know how to deal with different groups in an organization (Cumming et al., 2015). In relation to top management, hotel managers use corporate identity to identify their rivals who want to present a threat against them (Mohammed et al., 2014).

Top management has a critical role in setting attitudes, values, and ideas, which expressed in administrative policies impacting corporate identity management (Suvatjis et al., 2012). The constant management of senior executives could guarantee that front staff perceive corporate identity management, acknowledge corporate values, create a high level of belief and certainty within the corporation, and subsequently improve positive thinking (Terglav et al., 2016; Vallaster and de Chernatony, 2006). Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2000) suggested that organizational role models are the leading technique to communicate corporate identity management. Studies on internal branding demonstrate that if the process is backed by top executives’ comments and deeds, staff have motivation and try their best. Hence corporate internal changes must begin at the top with the CEO and top managers and transfer to the lower organizational level (Burmann et al., 2005; Terglav et al., 2016). Executives have to highlight part of the corporate identity management that cannot be realized easily; such as corporate’s core values (Terglav et al., 2016). As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

**H4:** Top management driving force positively influences corporate identity management.
Moderation effect of Diversity between Top Management Driving Force → Corporate Identity Management

corporations should provide an organization that value different cultures and ensure people can work there with ease (Madera et al., 2013). Besides, companies seem to assign women to the board of directors or CEO when they encounter a ratio of women outsmarting men (Bugeja et al., 2012). Konrad et al. (1995) revealed that diversity and well-behaved individuals in different manner for the purpose of behaving correctly as identity-conscious structures. In the hospitality industry, employment should be based on identity-conscious practices by which a hotel effectively employs from various nations and/or provides English language classes for chosen employees. Konrad and Linnehan (1995) argued identity-conscious actions are normally backed by Asians as they believe that such acts support them to conquer negative racial stereotypes (being uncommunicative and passive) which prevent them from promotion. Black employees support identity conscious to identity blind when appraising their future managers (Highhouse et al., 1999).

There has been great progress in the hotel industry which offers considerable opportunity to women to be in higher positions (Marco, 2012). By diversity, not only the board of directors can be easily controlled but also the interests of shareholders will be preserved (Cumming et al., 2015). In reference to effectiveness, identity conscious diversity programs like affirmative action plans (Leslie et al., 2014), diversity committees and workforces (Baum et al., 2016), diversity managers (Kong et al., 2018), diversity training (Reynolds et al., 2014), diversity evaluations for managers (Tatli, 2011), networking programs (Madera et al., 2013), and mentoring programs (Kim et al., 2015) are effective in increasing management diversity. Some diversity management methods, which try to be identity-conscious, are connected to more powerful managers’ opposition (Linnehan and Konrad, 1999). Working in an atmosphere with “different cultures has been a very significant aspect of diversity in countries which welcome immigrants” (Shen et al., 2009, p. 235). Because of that, identity-conscious actions could contribute to corporations to a great degree drawing attention, expand and retain diverse employees (Manoharan et al., 2014). As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:
H4a: Gender diversity as a moderator has an effect between top management driving force and corporate identity management.

Corporate Identity Management ➔ Corporate Reputation
Corporation reputation is an instant image of a brand relying on the collective different pictures held by both its internal and external stakeholders over the long term (Foroudi, 2018 et al.; Fombrun, 1996). Corporate reputation is explained as a perception of an organization in the minds of present and future stakeholders (Koporčić et al., 2018). Past and present deeds of a company have an effect on corporate reputation (Akdeniz, 2013). It may be a product signal that buyers repeatedly utilize to deal with ambiguity when they want to make a decision (Akdeniz, 2013; Baek et al., 2010; Dodds et al., 1991; Gammoh et al., 2006; Washburn et al., 2004).

Understanding the relationship between the chief executive officer and corporate reputation is important. While reputation is not a tangible asset for the company, it can result in tangible benefits (Love et al., 2017, Zavyalova et al., 2016). Researchers (Li et al., 2015; Su et al., 2015; Weigelt et al., 2016) have found that customers prefer to buy a product/service from a particular corporation when the corporation reputation is perceived to be high (Sun, 2014). As individuals choose products/services that suit them, corporate reputation has an impact on the brand image (Cretu and Brodie, 2003) transferred by brand signature (Foroudi et al., 2017, 2018). Additionally, employee recruitment and retention depend on the corporate reputation (Kuo and Kalargyrou, 2014). Corporation reputation results in employee self-esteem (Akgunduz, 2015), employee job satisfaction (Song et al., 2015), and employee emotional commitment (Tanford, 2013). Individuals consciously measure the corporate reputation when assessing an organization; though, they try to base their assessments on the emotional appeal that corporation holds for them (Karaosmanoğlu et al., 2011).

Corporate identity management is a crucial means to impact corporate reputation (Balmer, 2008; Flint et al., 2018). However, there is similarly strong understanding that corporate identity and corporate reputation are interconnected (Aaker, 2004;
Fombrun et al., 2004; Kapferer, 2012; Roper et al., 2012; Urde et al., 2016). Despite these relationships, corporate reputation and identity are distinctive (Balmer, 2010). While corporate reputation refers to the external stakeholder perception (Xie et al., 2015), corporate identity is based on the employee (Urde et al., 2016). An Organization employs its reputation to modify its identity for the purpose of legitimizing its existence (Podnar and Golob, 2017). This process is called adaptation and flows from identity to reputation (Podnar and Golob 2017). Accepting feedback on reputation is necessary for corporate identity management (Podnar and Golob, 2017). When it is lacking of it, corporate top managements are ‘flying blind’ (Gray et al., 1998, p. 700). Reputation provides information that leads to the company’s identity, process, activities, communications. As discussed above, reputation is characterised by through retention and adaption (Podnar et al., 2017). As discussed above we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H5: \text{Corporate identity management positively influences corporate reputation} \]

**Corporate Identity Management \(\rightarrow\) Innovation Adoption \(\rightarrow\) Corporate Reputation**

Innovation plays an important role in many developed and developing countries. Innovation is conceptualised as an approach to making a proper, flexible business model, and plain, which can assist the benefits of consumers or managers in a competitive marketplace (Foroudi et al., 2016), makes firms to be distinguished (Gupta et al., 2013) and produce better products/services (Foroudi et al., 2016). The results of Adner and Kapoor's (2010) research revealed that positive innovations are highly context-specific and should be strategic to enable the smooth functioning of actors contributing in the brand. Adopting these new innovations not only can result in high uncertainty for top managers (De Massis et al., 2015) but is also a difficult process (Holt and Daspit, 2015). Innovation adoption is implementation of new products/services in an organization (De Massis et al., 2015). Through innovation adoption, consumers assess new products based on their relative advantages, compatibility, and complexity (Rogers, 1962, 2003; Sääksjärvi and Samiee 2011; Sarmah et al., 2017). Innovation enables firms to be distinguishable from their opponents in a market (Gupta et al., 2013).
Having a proper innovation strategy in a company can result in corporate identity enhancement (Beverland et al., 2010). The Results of Micheli et al. (2018) revealed that long-term thinking is more effective than short-term thinking styles for supporting innovation strategy. Additionally, his results showed that innovation implementation should be in the shade of corporate identity. Findings of Amable et al. (2016) suggested that each innovation has a value and this value will change with corporate identity management.

Different studies show that reputation score is dependent on some factors such as innovation adoption (Abratt and Kleyn, 2011; Himme and Fischer, 2014). Gaining such invaluable reputation is a very daunting task for firms (Brexendorf et al., 2017). Consumers are able to convey the attempt to build reputation for innovation to a new product/service (Brexendorf et al., 2015). Bearden and Shimp (1982) suggested that manufacturer reputation and quality improvement, help to decrease the risk. As discussed, we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H6a: \text{Corporate identity management positively influences innovation adoption} \]

\[ H6b: \text{Innovation adoption positively influences corporate reputation} \]

**Methodology**

**Sampling and survey administration**

This study used offline surveys in Tehran, Iran. Small and medium sized hotels as there is no large hotel in Iran. Iran is a country which presents cultural glory and a varied, seductive scenery; though, Iran is a destination with low number of tourists and is under-researched country in the aspect of place branding. Iran has an affluent cultural and historical background with diverse climate and environment, which is not participated in the global market (Foroudi et al., 2016), thus, offers tremendous possible to follow the growth of the country’s tourism industry from perspective of place branding. Investigating on place branding activities in Iran therefore emphasizes the challenges untouched by indigenous managers and policy makers. The hospitality industry is growing its operations in global market (Kim et al., 2017) and according to Foroudi et al. (2016) Iran desires to advance branding policies that allow them to answer diverse marketplace segments.
For data collection, we employed two research assistants. We examined the items for reliability by eight researchers in similar field. The items were initially in the English language. We have translated the questionnaire into Persian. To inspect the phraseology and terms, Ageeva et al. (2019) and Harpaz et al. (2002) suggested for translation of the items and translation of the transcriptions in a non mechanical way and we discussed “each question and the alternatives in a small group of persons fluent in both languages… until an agreement was reached” (p. 236). As a result, there were some alterations to improve the survey respondents’ understanding. We also examined the dimensionality, acceptance level, validity, and reliability of the measurement among postgraduate hospitality management programs in Iran (89) to avoid employing hotels which might take part in this research (Table 1). After the validation process, 332 valid questionnaires were conducted offline over five months in 2017 from medium size hotels (56.9%) and small size hotels (43.1%). Of the 332 participants, 192 were female with an average age of 45 to 54 years (34.6%), and 35 to 44 years old (32.5%) and 51.8% were postgraduate and 36.4% were undergraduate. Table 1 illustrates 43.4% were working as middle managers and senior management (33.1%).

The survey measures
The survey was divided into two sections. The first section contained measures based on previous research. There were two main constructs (i) corporate identity management which was measured via six items (Cole and Bruch, 2006; Gioia and Thomas, 1996) and (ii) corporate reputation with seven item measurements (Foroudi, 2019; Foroudi et al., 2014; 2016). Based on the contexts four antecedents for corporate identity management were recognized for this study as (i) philosophy, vision, mission (Sinkula et al., 1997; Baker and Sinkula, 1999; Simoes et al., 2005), (ii) corporate history (Melewar et al., 2003; 2018), country-of-origin (Melewar et al., 2003; 2018), and top management driving force (Balmer and Stotvig, 1997; Melewar, 2003; Melewar and Saunders, 1998; Olins, 1990). Diversity was measured as a
moderator with nine items based on study by Melewar et al. (2018). Also, this study identifies innovation adoption as an outcome of corporate identity management and antecedents of corporate reputation. Innovation adoption was examined based on previous studies (Avlonitis et al., 1994; Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Pallister and Foxall, 1998; Tang, 1999; Wang and Ahmed, 2004). The second section was comprised of questions on the demographics of the sample (e.g., education, age, gender, etc.). We used seven-point Likert-type scale to measure the model’s constructs.

**Data analysis**

We employed Anderson and Gerbing (1988) and Hair et al. (2006) two-stage approach using structural-equation-modelling based on the suggestions. In the first stage, we examined the measurement-model by employing AMOS24 which is to categorise the causal-relationships between the observed variables and the unobserved variables to evaluate Cronbach’s α, composite reliability and convergent and discriminant validity of the model. The outcome displays a high degree of reliability (.859>.70) (De Vaus, 2002; Hair et al., 2006). The composite reliability was recommended to be greater than .7 (Hair et al., 2006). We also used discriminant and convergent validity. Table 3 demonstrated that the outcome of average variance extracted (0.619 to 0.859> .5) which is greater than the squared correlation estimates, which supports discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2006). The results illustrate the good rule of thumb and adequate convergent validity. The correlation matrix for the constructs illustrated in Table 3.

According to researchers (Lambert and Harrington, 1990; Malhotra et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2003), we used non-response-bias by measuring the difference through the Mann-Whitney U-test among 50 early and 50 late participants. The results presented that significance value in any variable is equal or not less than .5 probability value that is insignificant. So, there was no statistically major difference amongst early and late participants. So, there was non-response bias in this research.
The current research used the common method-variances which refer to “possibility arises from the method variance to inflate the observed correlations between the variables artifactually, are the frequently mentioned concern of researchers in empirical study” (Zhang and Chen, 2008, p. 245). We used Harman’s one-factor examination to inspect the common-latent-factor and common-method-bias based and chi-square difference amongst the primary and fully-constrained model by the suggestions of previous studies (Harman, 1967; Lindell and Whitney, 2001; Malhotra et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2003). The results were suggested that two models are statistically different and share a variance. Additionally, we used four categorization sources of CMVs according to recommendation by Podsakoff et al. (2003). Hereafter, the extent of common-method-variance in this research was mostly involving measurement context effects.

In the second stage, we assessed the structural model (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007) which estimations the expected covariance and causal linear relationship between the independent and dependent latent variables. The structural model fit was examined throughout goodness-of-fit to measure how well the model fits with its data. The comparative fit index (CFI) (.942>.90 designates good fit) and the root-mean-squared-approximation-of-error (RMSEA) .066 (<.08 indicates acceptable fit) are an incremental-index that assesses the fit of a model with the null baseline model. The incremental fit index (IFI), Tucker-Lewis-index (TLI), and the normed-fit-index (NFI) were .943, .935, and .907 respectively. The results were greater than the recommended threshold of .90, thus, the results identified the unidimensionality of the item measurements (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Hair et al., 2006).

The finding demonstrated that the t-values and structural-path-coefficients for each constructs’ association and with squared-multiple-correlations (R2) for each endogenous construct. H1 proposed the direct effect of philosophy, vision, mission on corporate identity management (H1: β=.579, t=6.359) was statistically supported. With regard to research Hypothesis 2 (corporate history -> corporate identity management) and hypothesis 3 (country-of-origin -> corporate identity management), the unexpected results show the relationship between the constructs (β=.064, t=1.267, p=.205; β=.089, t=1.622, p=.105, respectively) were non-significant. H4 addresses the impact of top management driving force on corporate
identity management (H3: \( \beta = 0.239, t = 2.579 \)) and a significant relationship was confirmed. The findings signify that the relationship between corporate identity management and corporate reputation (H5) and innovation adoption (H6) were significant (\( \beta = 0.311, t = 5.761; \beta = 0.417, t = 6.927 \), respectively). The result of H7 shows the relationship between innovation adoption and corporate reputation (\( \beta = 0.120, t = 2.466 \)) was significant.

To examine the moderation impact of diversity between philosophy, vision, mission (H1a), corporate history (H2a), country-of-origin (H3a), and top management driving force (H4a), we use interaction moderations (Figure 2). The results show that diversity strengthens the positive relationship between philosophy, vision, mission and corporate identity management (H1a). Diversity dampens the positive relationship between corporate history (H2a) country-of-origin (H3a) and corporate identity management. In addition, the results illustrated that diversity dampens the negative relationship between top management driving force and corporate identity management (H4a).

Discussion

This paper introduces the concept of corporate identity management, defined as the qualities, features, attributes or traits of an organization that are recognized to be key, long-lasting and specific through a company’s guidelines, nature and positioning (Balmer, 2001; He et al., 2005; 2009; Melewar, 2017; Van Riel et al., 1997). Irrespective of the industry which company is involved in or what type of companies they are fighting with, it is crucial that top management determine corporate identity management to show staff, customers and stakeholders what the corporate’s nature is. Based on the research gap which has been identified by academic writers (Anteby and Molnar, 2012; Garrett et al., 2017; Kohles et al., 2012, Suvatjis et al., 2012) this paper has initiated a study on corporate identity management and elements which have an effect on it.
The results of the research demonstrate that corporate identity management based on the research model consists of two factors, philosophy, vision, mission and top management driving force. Philosophy, vision, mission shows the direction of corporate, from where comes from, what it is doing and where it goes. Top management driving force reveals the power of top management in communication with internal and external stakeholders. This issue builds the basis of top management (Jo Hatch et al., 1997; Melewar et al., 2003; 2018). This study showed that successful corporate identity management is in the hands of top managers and their decisions. As they decide what philosophy, vision, mission should be, and how to communicate with staff, how to build relationship with outsiders.

Unfortunately, in this study the hypothesis about the relationship of corporate history and corporate identity management is not accepted. Also, the paper does not support the idea of there being relationship between country-of-origin and corporate identity management.

Moreover, there is a mediating factor, gender diversity, in this research. As can be seen in the charts, diversity strengthens the positive relationship between philosophy, vision, mission and corporate identity management. It means that in a diversified corporation, staff serve more efficiently and effectively in the direction of future goals. In addition, diversity weakens the positive relationship between corporate history and corporate identity management. It can be seen in the relationship between country-of-origin and corporate identity management. Diversity weakens the negative relationship between top management driving force and corporate identity management.

Corporate identity management on the other side of the model has a relationship with innovation adoption. Additionally, it is related to corporate reputation as proved in previous researches (Flint et al., 2018; Foroudi et al., 2014; Ingenhoff and Fuhrer, 2010; Urde et al, 2016).

**Solution and recommendations**

This research suggests that, in order to improve corporate reputation, corporations should have a vivid understanding of favourable corporate identity management, which is influenced by two important factors, mainly, philosophy, vision, mission, and
top management driving force. The results revealed that top management driving forces have slightly more influence compared to philosophy, vision, and mission. Tourism managers should note that the philosophy vision and mission are the backbone of corporate identity management and shape what identity is. Besides, top management driving forces should pay close attention to the way they influence on the corporate identity.

Additionally, diversity was found to weaken the relationship between top management driving forces. On the other hand, diversity strengthens the relationship between philosophy, vision, mission and corporate identity management. The more diverse an individual participates in forming the philosophy, vision, and mission, the better corporate identity management is possible for the corporations. However, having more diversity can lessen the relationship of top management driving forces and corporate identity management. This result suggests that a corporation can benefit from having more top management driving force due to diverse perspective. Also, with mixing gender diversity in a corporate, top managers should improve or amend key documents according to new situations. They have to identify new shift by discussing gender diversity to know this topic. They have to know different cultures, traditions, behaviors and generally seek new people. What is more, Top managers and policy makers should know that having different staff, especially in the hospitality industry, is a normal phenomenon and even an advantage. Being ready for this phenomena in developing countries is vital. Developing new strategies both for female and male employees can make it simple to face new challenges and in competition with rivals.

The results showed that there is no meaningful relationship between corporate history, and country-of-origin with corporate identity management. What is more, the results revealed that diversity weaken the relationship between corporate history, country-of-origin and corporate identity management. It falls to managers to familiarise all employees with history of the corporation and show them what their achievements are and what their failures are, how they can make these achievements in the future and beyond that, encourage them to innovate.
The results also shown that there is a positive relationship between corporate identity management and corporate reputation, suggesting that the way a company present its identity to its customers has positive influence on its reputation. In this respect, a corporation should closely monitor corporate identity management as it shapes their corporate reputation. Also, the results indicated that corporate identity management positively impacts on innovation adoption. Because identity is what a corporation is in terms of its attributes (Foroudi et al., 2019), innovativeness and innovation adoption can be influenced by corporate identity management. Tourism managers should consistently concentrate on corporate identity management as it shapes the innovativeness of their corporation.

Finally, innovation adoption was found to have a positive influence on corporate reputation. In this respect, a corporation can have a reputation for adopting innovative ways to accommodate its customers’ needs. In this regard, managers should place emphasis on innovation adoption as it makes their corporation become well-known for being innovative. Encouraging innovative culture or imitating one is the top managers’ authority. Thus, is the responsibility of managers to encourage and motivate employees to think and present innovative product or maintain this morale to adopt innovation from outside and decrease resistance. Top managements and executives have a critical role not only in corporate identity management, but also in corporate reputation.

Future research directions

Like all the research, the current research has a number of limitations. To authors’ knowledge, this is the first research investigating the antecedents of corporate identity management, including philosophy, vision, mission, corporate history, country-of-origin, top management driving force and corporation reputation. The first implication of this study is the context of the research. The concerns of this study is Tehran (Iran), however, the results can be different in other places like the USA due to different culture. To overcome this problem, future studies can investigate the moderating role of culture as well. Besides, future studies can also analyze and investigate the model in bigger and more diverse countries. Also, future researchers can investigate the proposed model in other industries and compare the results with
the following results. In conclusion, the model examines the antecedents of
corporation identity management.

**Conclusion**
Corporate identity has gained considerable attention and has been under
investigation for a long time. However, there is limited understanding of corporate
identity management in the tourism industry. The main theoretical implication of this
research is of concern to corporate identity management. Previous researchers
have analysed the antecedents of corporate identity management, mainly job
involvement and organizational citizenship behaviour (Wang, 2011), job satisfaction
and decision making (Kohles et al., 2012), corporate sustainability (Simões et al,
2017), managerial perceptions (He, 2012), brand loyalty (Pratihari et al., 2018), and
culture (Dessupioio et al., 2018). However, no researchers have investigated the
influence of philosophy vision, mission, corporate history, country-of-origin, and top
management driving force on corporate identity management.

**Case study**
*The University of West London (UWL): corporate identity management and
corporate reputation in a higher education context*
All organisations have responsibilities to both their clients and other stakeholders.
Corporate identity management and corporate reputation are crucial factors for every
organisation that help organisations to reach more profit. The case discovers how
UWL (uwl.ac.uk/about-us/how-university-works/history, 2020) has a constructive
approach toward corporate identity management and corporate reputation in a
hospitality context. Also, this case study put a light on that positive working strategy
and responsible actions which are focused on corporate identity management.

The University of West London (UWL), is one of the UK public Universities that has
two campuses in London, Berkshire and Reading. The UWL draws on 150 years of
heritage, history and experience in professional education. The UWL has origins
back to 19 centuries when the first school was originated in 1860 and named as
Lady Byron, some years after its name changed to Ealing College. The Ealing
colleague became a university in 1992 and after 18 years it was changed to the UWL.
In January 1912, a secondary school under the name of the Slough campus was founded. This campus becomes Slough College by 1960s. After that in the 1980s, the Slough College nominated as Thames Valley College for Higher Education but it was shut down in 2011.

In 1990, all colleges including Queen Charlotte’s, Thames Valley, Music and Ealing Colleges were merged together under the name of Polytechnic of West London (PWL). With regard to under the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, the PWL improved to the Thames Valley University (TVU). The Reading College and Arts and Design School was joint to the Thames Valley University. The Paragon is one of the Campuses of the UWL that is located in Brentford was Former TVU Branding. Finally, the university name was changed to the University of West London. Regarding a massive growth from 1860 to 2009, the UWL corporate identity management was improved sharply.

Now, there are eight schools in the UWL which are including: Computing and Engineering, Nursing, Business School, midwifery and Healthcare, the London Geller College of Hospitality and Tourism, the School of Music and Law and Criminology, London College of Music, the School of Human and Social Sciences, Media and Design, and the London School of Film. Also, UWL offers PhD programmers and Professional Doctorates. In 2018, The UWL was ranked in Sunday Times as Good University in 56th place nationally in 2017 and 52 in 2020. The UWL has jumped 31 places in The Times and The Sunday Times Good University Guide 2020 which is the biggest rise in the UK. Also, 98% of the UWL is employed or started further study within six months after graduation. The Complete University Guide in 2020 ranked the UWL as 7th in the UK for facility spending. Following are the more corporate identity management and corporate reputation in the UWL

- “The UWL was recognised with a Silver award for a high standard of teaching in the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)
- The UWL ranked top for teaching quality and student experience in London by The Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide 2018.
- The University's Vice-Chancellor, Professor Peter John, was made a Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE) in the Queen’s 2020
New Year honours list for his outstanding work and service to higher education.

- The UWL won the Outstanding Financial Performance Award at the Times Higher Education Awards 2019.
- The UWL Leadership was recognised as an 'Outstanding Leadership and Management Team' at THE Leadership and Management Awards 2017.
- The University of West London has recorded the best results of any university in Greater London in the annual National Student Survey (NSS) in 2016 ...

Case questions
1. What the UWL does while putting into practice its approach to continuing progress, analyses what this issue has to offer to the UWL.
2. What the main features of the UWL approach to improving corporate reputation are, including all of its benefits, analyses what this strategy has to offer to communities, the society, and to the student market as well.
3. What approach (and model) to corporate identity management is, analyses other related activities that internationals

Key terms and definitions

Corporate identity management is the collection of explanations by which people on the outside know a company and through those explanations people can explain, recall and connect to that company.

Corporate reputation is explained as a perception of an organization in the minds of present and future stakeholders.

Philosophy is the basic, distinguishing and persevering idea, belief, and feeling directing a business, which in turn is essential in preparing and writing a mission.

Vision is the main guidance of all company’s exercises which share values and prescriptive mental models illustrate in a formal manner, it can be named vision statements that reveal a perfect future state.

Mission as a tool inside an organization and refers to the organization’s identity by all top managers. It is a crucial factor of giving strength to inner awareness of corporate identity management and its external broadcast.

Corporate history: is history of the company and ownership.
**Country-of-origin**: is explained as the country to which a customer relates a specific product or brand as its source

**Topic management driving force**: is expressing the corporation’s main idea to the stakeholders (internal and external) is the approach of senior management that builds foundation

**Diversity**: is perception about being different from peers

**Innovation adoption** is implementation of new products/services in an organization
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Table 1: The main scale dimensions, item sources, reliability measures and for each construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate identity @ .913</strong></td>
<td>Cole and Bruch (2006); Gioia and Thomas (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top management team has a strong sense of the Hotel's history.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>5.2801</td>
<td>1.29716</td>
<td>Removed - The top management team members do not have a well-defined set of goals or objectives for the Hotel. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees have sense of pride in the Hotel's goals and missions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>5.2169</td>
<td>1.35127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees feel that the Hotel has carved out a significant place in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>5.4759</td>
<td>1.23495</td>
<td>All employees are knowledgeable about the Hotel's history and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees identify themselves strongly with the Hotel.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>5.1596</td>
<td>1.39327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophy, mission and value @ .865</strong></td>
<td>Sinkula et al. (1997); Baker and Sinkula (1999); Simoes et al. (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees are committed to achieving the company’s goals in this Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>5.4910</td>
<td>1.16465</td>
<td>Removed - Employees view themselves as partners in charting the direction of the hotel unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Hotel has a clear concept of who we are and where we are going</td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>1.17662</td>
<td>We do not have a well-defined mission. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company’s values and mission are regularly communicated to employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>5.6235</td>
<td>1.18135</td>
<td>Managers periodically discuss corporate mission and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management shares the corporate mission with employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>5.9578</td>
<td>1.14164</td>
<td>All employees are aware of the relevant values (norms about what is important, how to behave, and appropriate attitudes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate History @ .909</strong></td>
<td>Melewar et al. (2003; 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel’s core values are established by its history</td>
<td></td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>5.4458</td>
<td>1.35756</td>
<td>Removed - The character of the founder(s) has formed the building blocks of the core values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the Hotel’s corporate history</td>
<td></td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>5.7319</td>
<td>1.22307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel’s corporate history is aligned with the Hotel’s corporate identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>5.6898</td>
<td>1.26186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country-of-Origin @ .895</strong></td>
<td>Melewar et al. (2003; 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values of the Hotel’s home country are one of the determinants of what the Hotel stands for.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.886</td>
<td>5.6235</td>
<td>1.30989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotel’s country-of-origin imagery is the picture, reputation and the stereotype that consumers attach to its products and services.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.918</td>
<td>5.6867</td>
<td>1.28367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotel’s country-of-origin has positive influence on the Hotel’s brand.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.910</td>
<td>5.3705</td>
<td>1.39640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Management Driving Force @ .859**

Balmer and Stotvig (1997); Melewar (2003); Melewar and Saunders (1998); Olins (1990)

The top manager of our Hotel is not pushing the corporate identity topic in our Hotel at all. (R)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.799</td>
<td>5.9157</td>
<td>1.06813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Removed - The top manager of our Hotel regularly gives out new tasks reading the use of our identity guideline have to be considered as one element of corporate identity management.

The top manager of our Hotel is very passionate when it comes to identity of our company and other types of in our places.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.858</td>
<td>5.8163</td>
<td>1.13152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top manager of our Hotel is of the view that identity and other types of identity of our communication activities.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.815</td>
<td>5.5934</td>
<td>1.26073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Reputation @ .960**

Foroudi et al. (2014; 2016; 2019)

I have a good feeling about the Hotel

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.834</td>
<td>5.7410</td>
<td>1.22625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Removed - The Hotel offers products and services that are good value of money The Hotel has excellent leadership The Hotel is an environmentally responsible Hotel.

I admire and respect the Hotel

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.924</td>
<td>5.9608</td>
<td>1.23701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I trust the Hotel

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.923</td>
<td>5.9759</td>
<td>1.23372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotel is well managed

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.904</td>
<td>5.9518</td>
<td>1.23302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diversity @ .917**

Carters and Jennings (2004); Sawyerr et al. (2005)

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of gender

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.883</td>
<td>5.3163</td>
<td>1.35061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Removed - The Hotel is committed to creating an environment where diversity is celebrated.

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of disability

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.776</td>
<td>5.4789</td>
<td>1.27117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of religious or belief.

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of ethnic origin

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.903</td>
<td>5.4608</td>
<td>1.16662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of sexual orientation.

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of marital status.

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of age

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.919</td>
<td>5.4307</td>
<td>1.24785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel everyone is treated fairly, regardless of...
Innovation Adoption @ .912

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If our competitor adopts an important innovation, our Hotel reacts immediately by adopting the innovation too.</td>
<td>.872 4.9910 1.33619 Removed - We are usually one of the last hotels in our industry sector to accept something new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are suspicious of new inventions and new ways of thinking</td>
<td>.769 5.1928 1.39882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are reluctant about adopting new ways of doing things until we see them working for Hotels around us</td>
<td>.903 4.9880 1.40129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do consider new innovations even before other hotels are using them</td>
<td>.895 5.0090 1.34071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of the company</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Senior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Middle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>Pre university</td>
<td>Junior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>ASV</th>
<th>Corporate Reputation</th>
<th>Corporate Identity</th>
<th>Philosophy, mission and value</th>
<th>Corporate History</th>
<th>Top Management Driving Force</th>
<th>Country-of-Origin</th>
<th>Innovation Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Reputation</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate identity</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy, mission and value</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate History</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management Driving Force</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-of-Origin</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Adoption</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>6.359</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>5.761</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>6.927</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001

Notes: Path = Relationship between independent variable on dependent variable; β = Standardised regression coefficient; S.E. = Standard error; p = Level of significance.
Figure 1: The research conceptual Model
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Figure 2: Results of moderation influences

Diversity strengthens the positive relationship between Philosophy, Vision, Mission and Corporate Identity Management.

Diversity dampens the positive relationship between Corporate History and Corporate Identity Management.

Diversity dampens the positive relationship between Country-of-Origin and Corporate Identity Management.

Diversity dampens the negative relationship between Top Management Driving Force and Corporate Identity Management.