

Електронний журнал «Ефективна економіка» включено до переліку наукових фахових видань України з питань економіки (Категорія «Б», Наказ Міністерства освіти і науки України № 975 від 11.07.2019). Спеціальності – 051, 071, 072, 073, 075, 076, 292. Ефективна економіка. 2025. № 2.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.2025.2.3>

УДК 336.71

I. Mihus,

*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher,
Scientific Center of Innovative Research*

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6939-9097>

O. Liashenko,

*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of
Management, Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University*

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7114-4501>

BUSINESS REPUTATION: ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION SOURCES FOR EFFECTIVE EVALUATION

I. P. Migus,

*д. е. н., професор, старший науковий співробітник,
Науковий центр інноваційних досліджень*

O. M. Lyashenko,

*д. е. н., професор, професор кафедри менеджменту,
Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка*

ДІЛОВА РЕПУТАЦІЯ: АНАЛІЗ ДЖЕРЕЛ ІНФОРМАЦІЇ ДЛЯ ЕФЕКТИВНОЇ ОЦІНКИ

In an era of dynamic competition and globalization, corporate reputation is an essential asset that profoundly influences business success, stakeholder relationships, and market positioning. However, accurately evaluating this intangible asset presents considerable challenges. This study explores the diverse information sources utilized in reputation evaluation, examining their respective strengths, limitations, and contributions to comprehensive reputation management frameworks. The primary aim of this study is to analyze and compare traditional and modern information sources in reputation evaluation, providing a nuanced understanding of how these sources influence reputational outcomes. The research adopts a qualitative approach, combining a detailed literature review with an analytical evaluation of traditional and modern information sources. The study reveals that traditional information sources remain indispensable for their structured, regulated, and verifiable nature, offering long-term insights into corporate stability and performance. Their inability to reflect dynamic public sentiment and emerging issues limits their effectiveness in the fast-paced digital environment. Modern information sources, such as social media platforms and real-time analytics tools, provide unparalleled immediacy and breadth of insights. They are particularly effective in capturing evolving stakeholder perceptions and addressing crises promptly. Nevertheless, these sources face challenges such as misinformation, bias, and data manipulation, which can undermine their reliability. The integration of traditional and modern sources emerges as a robust approach to reputation evaluation, allowing organizations to leverage the stability of traditional methods and the dynamism of digital tools. Additionally, the study identifies advanced methodologies like artificial intelligence and blockchain as promising solutions for addressing data authenticity and scalability issues. Predictive analytics and interdisciplinary frameworks are highlighted as pivotal tools for proactive reputation management. Future research should focus on integrating advanced technologies such as machine learning, blockchain, and the Internet of Things to refine reputation evaluation processes.

В епоху динамічної конкуренції та глобалізації корпоративна репутація є важливим активом, який глибоко впливає на успіх бізнесу, відносини з зацікавленими сторонами та позиціонування на ринку. Однак точна оцінка цього нематеріального активу представляє значні проблеми. У цьому дослідженні досліджуються різноманітні джерела інформації, які використовуються для оцінки репутації, досліджуються їхні відповідні сильні сторони, обмеження та внесок у всебічні системи управління репутацією. Основною метою цього дослідження є аналіз і порівняння традиційних і сучасних джерел інформації в оцінці репутації, надання детального розуміння того, як ці джерела впливають на результати репутації. У дослідженні використано якісний підхід, який поєднує детальний огляд літератури з аналітичною оцінкою традиційних і сучасних джерел інформації. Дослідження показує, що традиційні джерела інформації залишаються незамінними через їх структурований, регульований і перевірений характер, пропонуючи довгострокове розуміння корпоративної стабільності та ефективності. Їх нездатність відображати динамічні суспільні настрої та проблеми, що виникають, обмежує їхню ефективність у швидкозмінному цифровому середовищі. Сучасні джерела інформації, такі як платформи соціальних медіа та інструменти аналітики в реальному часі, забезпечують неперевірену миттєвість і широту розуміння. Вони особливо ефективні в фіксуванні мінливих уявлень зацікавлених сторін і оперативному вирішенні криз. Тим не менш, ці джерела стикаються з проблемами, такими як дезінформація, упередженість і маніпулювання даними, що може підірвати їхню надійність. Інтеграція традиційних і сучасних джерел постає як надійний підхід до оцінки репутації, що дозволяє організаціям використовувати стабільність традиційних методів і динамізм цифрових інструментів. Крім того, дослідження визначає передові методології, такі як штучний інтелект і блокчейн, як перспективні рішення для вирішення проблем автентичності даних і масштабованості. Прогностична аналітика та міждисциплінарні рамки виділяються як ключові інструменти для проактивного управління

репутацією. Майбутні дослідження мають бути зосереджені на інтеграції передових технологій, таких як машинне навчання, блокчейн та Інтернет речей, для вдосконалення процесів оцінки репутації.

Keywords: *business reputation; reputation evaluation; information sources; stakeholder perception; social media analytics; reputation management; blockchain technology; predictive analytics.*

Ключові слова: *ділова репутація; оцінка репутації; джерела інформації; сприйняття зацікавлених сторін; аналітика соціальних мереж; управління репутацією; технологія блокчейн; прогнозна аналітика.*

Statement of the problem in general terms and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks. In today's highly competitive business environment, a company's reputation serves as a critical asset, influencing its relationships with stakeholders, market position, and long-term success. Business reputation, often referred to as corporate reputation, encompasses public perceptions of a company's reliability, integrity, and overall value. However, effectively assessing and managing this intangible asset requires access to reliable and comprehensive information sources.

This article focuses on analyzing the diverse range of information sources that play a pivotal role in evaluating business reputation. From financial reports and customer feedback to media coverage and social media analytics, the availability and quality of data directly impact the accuracy of reputation assessments. By examining the strengths and limitations of these sources, the study aims to provide insights into how organizations can leverage information to enhance their reputation management strategies and make informed decisions.

In a world where perception can shape reality, understanding the tools and methods for analyzing information sources becomes indispensable for maintaining and strengthening a company's reputation.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Business reputation, a multifaceted concept, has gained significant attention in academic and professional spheres due to its impact on organizational performance, stakeholder relationships, and market competitiveness. Business reputation also has been extensively studied in various disciplines, reflecting its importance as a key intangible asset that influences organizational success. Researchers have explored various dimensions of reputation, including its definition, determinants, measurement approaches, and the role of information sources in assessing it. This literature review synthesizes key studies and insights that contribute to understanding the analysis of information sources for effective reputation evaluation.

The foundational studies on corporate reputation establish it as a multidimensional construct involving stakeholder perceptions of an organization's performance and values. Barnett et al. (2006) highlight reputation's definitional complexity, suggesting it combines social, financial, and operational dimensions. Fombrun and van Riel (2004) further emphasize that reputation emerges from consistent organizational behavior and effective communication with stakeholders.

Several studies link corporate social responsibility (CSR) to reputation. Brammer and Pavelin (2006) argue that alignment between CSR initiatives and stakeholder expectations enhances corporate reputation. Le (2023) explores this dynamic in small and medium enterprises, demonstrating how CSR positively affects corporate image and customer loyalty, thereby bolstering reputation and performance.

The measurement of corporate reputation remains a critical area of inquiry. Fombrun et al. (2015) introduce the RepTrak® system, which tracks stakeholder perceptions across multiple dimensions such as trust, admiration, and respect. Chun (2005) provides insights into quantitative and qualitative methodologies for assessing reputation, highlighting their respective advantages and limitations.

Social media's influence on corporate reputation has grown exponentially. Ahmed et al. (2019) demonstrate how social media facilitates knowledge sharing, which impacts perceptions of organizational credibility and transparency. Van den

Heever (2018) explores social media's role in reputation management frameworks, particularly for non-governmental organizations, emphasizing the need for proactive engagement and monitoring.

Emerging technologies, such as blockchain and social Internet of Things (SIoT), offer new paradigms for trust and reputation management. Alam et al. (2022) discuss blockchain's potential to provide transparent and immutable records, enhancing trust in decentralized systems. Salman et al. (2019) propose a blockchain-based reputation framework that integrates probabilistic models for knowledge validation, ensuring reliability in reputation systems.

The relationship between reputation and financial performance is well-documented. Roberts and Dowling (2002) establish that firms with strong reputations experience sustained superior financial performance. Neville et al. (2005) further explore how stakeholder management and social performance influence this relationship, underscoring reputation's role as a strategic resource.

In business-to-business contexts, reputation influences partner selection and long-term relationships. Xie and Haugland (2016) analyze how reputation is formed through consistent delivery of value and transparent communication. Cedrola et al. (2016) examine the interplay between country, brand, and company reputation, highlighting their importance in international markets.

Despite advancements in reputation research, challenges remain, particularly in addressing misinformation and the reliability of digital data. Fortino et al. (2019) explore the use of blockchain for addressing these issues in the Internet of Things, advocating for enhanced security and trust mechanisms. Teacy et al. (2006) propose models for managing inaccuracies in reputation systems, emphasizing the need for robust methodologies.

The literature underscores the multifaceted nature of corporate reputation and its critical role in organizational success. From traditional CSR initiatives to cutting-edge blockchain technologies, the mechanisms for building, measuring, and managing reputation continue to evolve. Future research should focus on

integrating interdisciplinary approaches and leveraging emerging technologies to address challenges in reputation management.

Formulation of the article's goals (task statement). The primary aim of this study is to analyze and compare traditional and modern information sources in reputation evaluation, providing a nuanced understanding of how these sources influence reputational outcomes. By identifying the methodologies used for data analysis and addressing current challenges, the research aims to propose future directions for improving reputation assessment and management practices. This study serves as a strategic guide for organizations striving to integrate reliable and effective tools for reputation enhancement.

The research adopts a qualitative approach, combining a detailed literature review with an analytical evaluation of traditional and modern information sources. Traditional sources, including financial reports, annual disclosures, and industry publications, are assessed for their credibility and stability. In contrast, modern sources such as social media, online reviews, and digital platforms are evaluated for their immediacy and ability to capture real-time public sentiment. Methodologies like content analysis, sentiment analysis, and blockchain-based verification are explored to highlight their application in reputation evaluation. Challenges such as data authenticity, privacy concerns, and algorithmic bias are critically analyzed to provide a balanced perspective on reputation management.

Results of the main research material. Information sources play a pivotal role in reputation evaluation as they provide the foundation for stakeholders to form perceptions and assess the credibility of an organization. Accurate and reliable information ensures that assessments are grounded in factual data, fostering trust and informed decision-making. Traditional sources, such as financial reports and official communications, offer structured insights into an organization's performance and compliance. Meanwhile, modern sources, including social media platforms, customer reviews, and online news outlets, provide real-time, unstructured data that reflect public sentiment and emerging trends. Together, these diverse sources enable comprehensive reputation

evaluation by combining quantitative metrics with qualitative narratives, highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement. However, the reliability, authenticity, and contextual interpretation of these sources are critical to ensure meaningful and unbiased evaluations.

Traditional Information Sources in Reputation Evaluation. Traditional information sources include structured and established channels such as annual reports, financial disclosures, corporate communications, and industry publications. These sources provide formal and verifiable data, often reviewed for accuracy and compliance with regulations. For example, annual reports highlight financial performance, governance practices, and corporate achievements, which are essential for evaluating trust and credibility. Traditional sources are typically stable and reliable, forming a consistent basis for long-term reputation assessment. However, they may lack immediacy and do not always capture dynamic public sentiment or emerging issues.

Traditional information sources refer to established, formal channels of communication and reporting that have historically been the primary means of assessing an organization's reputation. These include financial reports, annual corporate disclosures, official press releases, industry publications, and third-party audits. Each source contributes distinct insights:

- *Financial reports* - annual financial statements, balance sheets, and performance reviews are critical for stakeholders, such as investors, to assess the economic stability and reliability of an organization. Positive financial performance often correlates with trustworthiness and long-term viability, enhancing reputation.

- *Industry publications* - these provide context by benchmarking an organization against peers within the industry. Such publications often highlight rankings, case studies, or interviews that reflect the organization's standing and ethical practices.

- *Press releases* - official communications allow organizations to directly present their narrative, showcasing achievements, addressing concerns, or

announcing initiatives. The tone, frequency, and content of press releases contribute to the perception of transparency and accountability.

- *Awards and certifications* - endorsements from reputable organizations or compliance with international standards (e.g., ISO certifications) strengthen reputation by affirming quality, ethical practices, or innovation.

- *Traditional media coverage* - news articles and editorials often provide external validation or critique. Positive coverage in reputable outlets boosts credibility, while negative press can tarnish reputation.

Traditional sources are highly valued for their credibility, structure, and regulatory oversight, ensuring data reliability. However, their limitations include less frequent updates, potential delays in reflecting public sentiment, and restricted accessibility for all stakeholders.

Modern Information Sources in Reputation Evaluation. Modern information sources encompass digital and interactive platforms such as social media, online reviews, blogs, and real-time news outlets. These sources offer unstructured, user-generated content that reflects current public opinions and trends. For instance, social media platforms enable the rapid dissemination of information and allow businesses to gauge stakeholder sentiment and address concerns in real time. While modern sources provide immediacy and a wealth of data for sentiment analysis, they also pose challenges related to reliability, bias, and the potential spread of misinformation. Together, they complement traditional sources by offering a more dynamic and comprehensive view of an organization's reputation.

Modern information sources have emerged with the advent of digital technologies and the rise of interactive, user-driven platforms. These include social media platforms, online reviews, search engine results, blog posts, and data from real-time analytics tools. They are dynamic, offering insights into public sentiment and stakeholder engagement:

- *Social media platforms* - platforms such as Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, and Instagram provide real-time feedback on an organization's actions, products,

and policies. Social media sentiment analysis helps in understanding public perceptions, uncovering emerging trends, and responding to crises promptly.

- *Online reviews and forums* - platforms like Google Reviews, Trustpilot, and specialized industry forums serve as spaces where customers and clients share experiences. Positive reviews enhance credibility and attract new business, while negative ones highlight areas for improvement.

- *Search engine results* - search engine rankings and autocomplete suggestions reflect the online visibility and reputation of an organization. Negative search results can signal reputational risks, while positive visibility builds trust.

- *Influencer and community engagement* - influencers and bloggers, often seen as trusted figures, shape opinions through endorsements or criticisms. Their reach and influence amplify the impact of reputation-building efforts.

- *Digital media and user-generated content* - blogs, vlogs, podcasts, and other content formats offer unfiltered, often grassroots-level perspectives on an organization. These sources are essential for gauging how the broader community perceives the brand.

- *Real-time analytics and sentiment tools* - modern tools powered by artificial intelligence (e.g., social listening platforms like Brandwatch or Hootsuite) analyze vast amounts of unstructured data to provide actionable insights into trends, opinions, and reputational risks.

Modern sources are invaluable for their speed, breadth of insights, and ability to capture the evolving nature of public opinion. However, they pose challenges in terms of data authenticity, bias, and the potential for misinformation or manipulation (e.g., fake reviews or bot-driven campaigns).

While traditional sources excel in credibility and structure, modern sources provide real-time insights and broader reach. Effective reputation evaluation integrates both, combining the reliability of traditional data with the immediacy and richness of modern information. This hybrid approach ensures that organizations can address long-term reputation-building goals while staying agile in responding to emerging risks and opportunities (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative table of traditional and modern sources in reputation evaluation

Aspect	Traditional Sources	Modern Sources
Definition	Established, formal channels of communication and reporting.	Dynamic, user-driven platforms and digital tools for real-time insights.
Examples	Financial reports, annual disclosures, industry publications, press releases, traditional media coverage.	Social media, online reviews, search engine results, blogs, real-time analytics tools.
Key Strengths	Credible, structured, and regulatory-compliant data. Benchmarks performance over time.	Real-time feedback, broad reach, and ability to capture evolving public opinion.
Limitations	Less frequent updates, delayed reflection of public sentiment, restricted accessibility for all stakeholders.	Data authenticity issues, potential misinformation, bias, and manipulation risks.
Update Frequency	Low to Medium	High
Credibility	High	Variable (depends on the platform and data source).
Public Accessibility	Limited	High
Suitability for Real-Time Analysis	Not suitable	Highly suitable

Source: systematized by the authors

The methodologies for analyzing information sources in reputation evaluation are diverse, reflecting the multidimensional nature of reputation and the complexity of its contributing factors. These methodologies range from traditional qualitative approaches to advanced data-driven techniques, integrating structured and unstructured data from various sources (Table 2).

Each method has unique strengths and limitations, making them suitable for different contexts and objectives. Organizations benefit most by integrating multiple methodologies, ensuring a comprehensive and balanced approach to reputation management. This hybrid approach enables accurate monitoring, timely interventions, and proactive reputation-building in a dynamic, data-driven world.

Challenges in reputation analysis. Reputation analysis is a multifaceted process that faces several challenges, particularly in today's digital and data-driven environment. These challenges arise from the complexity of reputation as an intangible asset and the evolving nature of information sources. The proliferation of online platforms and user-generated content introduces the risk of misinformation, fake reviews, and biased data. Identifying and verifying reliable data sources is critical but increasingly difficult in the digital age. The sheer volume of data from structured (financial reports) and unstructured (social media posts) sources can overwhelm traditional analysis tools. Managing and integrating diverse data types require advanced technologies and expertise.

Table 2. Methodologies for analysing information sources in reputation evaluation

Methodology	Definition and Purpose	Applications	Strengths	Limitations
Content Analysis	Systematically evaluating text or media to identify themes, patterns, and sentiment.	Monitoring media coverage; evaluating corporate communication tone.	Provides rich contextual insights; adaptable for manual or automated analysis.	Labor-intensive for large datasets; subjective interpretations may affect reliability.
Sentiment Analysis	Measuring the emotional tone behind textual data using natural language processing (NLP).	Real-time monitoring of brand sentiment; crisis management.	Efficiently handles vast data; provides real-time insights.	May misinterpret nuanced or sarcastic statements; depends on training data quality.
Social Network Analysis (SNA)	Examining relationships and interactions within networks to evaluate influence and reputation.	Identifying key influencers; mapping reputational risks.	Visualizes relationships and influence; uncovers hidden connections.	Requires specialized software and expertise; may oversimplify interactions.
Big Data Analytics	Processing large volumes of structured and unstructured data to uncover patterns and trends.	Predicting reputation risks; combining diverse data for holistic evaluation.	Efficiently handles complex datasets; identifies trends traditional methods may miss.	High computational requirements; concerns around privacy and ethics.
Surveys and Stakeholder Feedback	Collecting direct feedback from stakeholders through surveys or interviews to assess perceptions.	Evaluating customer satisfaction; understanding internal stakeholder perceptions.	Offers subjective, firsthand insights; targets specific groups.	Time-consuming and resource-intensive; responses may be biased or incomplete.
AI-Powered Reputation Models	Using algorithms to synthesize data from multiple sources and predict reputational trends.	Proactive risk identification; real-time reputation tracking.	Highly scalable and adaptive; proactive in identifying risks and opportunities.	Requires high-quality data and expertise; risks of algorithmic bias.
Blockchain for Reputation Verification	Ensuring the authenticity and immutability of data through blockchain technology.	Verifying online reviews; preventing misinformation in digital systems.	Provides transparency and trust; reduces data manipulation risks.	Limited adoption and scalability; requires technical integration.

Source: systematized by the authors

Reputation is dynamic and can change rapidly, especially during crises or high-profile events. Organizations often struggle to monitor and respond to shifts in real-time effectively. Reputation is perceived differently across regions and cultures, leading to challenges in interpreting and standardizing assessments globally. Contextual nuances may skew analysis if not accounted for appropriately. The use of big data and AI in reputation analysis raises privacy issues, especially when analyzing personal opinions, behaviors, or sensitive information.

Ethical considerations in data collection and usage must be addressed. Advanced methodologies like AI and machine learning are prone to algorithmic bias, which can lead to inaccurate reputation assessments. Lack of transparency in these systems further complicates trust and adoption.

The challenges in reputation analysis underscore the need for innovative approaches that balance technological capabilities with ethical considerations. By embracing emerging technologies, adopting interdisciplinary methods, and addressing global and cultural contexts, organizations can build robust reputation management systems that are both dynamic and resilient.

Future directions in reputation analysis. Despite these challenges, advancements in technology and methodology present opportunities to enhance reputation analysis. Technologies like artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and the Internet of Things (IoT) can improve the accuracy, transparency, and efficiency of reputation analysis. For instance, AI can process vast data sets for real-time insights, while blockchain ensures data authenticity. Developing sophisticated dashboards and real-time analytics tools will enable organizations to track reputation dynamically and respond proactively to emerging trends or crises.

Combining insights from fields such as sociology, behavioral science, and marketing can provide a more holistic understanding of reputation dynamics. Interdisciplinary frameworks will enhance the depth and relevance of analysis. Establishing robust ethical guidelines and compliance measures will address privacy concerns and promote trust in reputation analysis processes.

Organizations should prioritize transparency in data usage and AI-driven decision-making. Creating standardized metrics and methodologies for reputation assessment will ensure consistency and comparability across industries and regions. Initiatives like the RepTrak® system already point towards this goal. Shifting from reactive to predictive reputation analysis will enable organizations to anticipate risks and opportunities. Predictive models based on historical data and machine learning can provide early warnings for potential reputational threats.

Leveraging digital platforms to engage stakeholders directly will help organizations gain valuable feedback and insights. This participatory approach fosters trust and improves the alignment between reputation strategies and stakeholder expectations.

Future advancements promise not only to overcome existing challenges but also to redefine how reputation is measured, monitored, and enhanced.

Conclusion. The analysis of information sources in reputation evaluation highlights the critical role both traditional and modern data channels play in shaping organizational perceptions. Traditional sources, such as financial reports, industry publications, and press releases, offer structured and reliable data, providing a strong foundation for long-term reputation assessments. However, they lack the immediacy and dynamic nature needed to capture real-time public sentiment and emerging issues.

Conversely, modern sources, including social media platforms, online reviews, and real-time analytics tools, excel in offering immediate insights into stakeholder perceptions and public trends. These sources, while invaluable for their speed and breadth, pose challenges such as data authenticity, misinformation, and bias.

The hybrid approach of integrating traditional and modern sources enables organizations to leverage the strengths of both while mitigating their limitations. By employing advanced methodologies such as AI, sentiment analysis, and blockchain, organizations can improve accuracy, transparency, and trust in reputation management. Furthermore, addressing challenges like ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, and cultural nuances will be pivotal in advancing reputation analysis frameworks.

Ultimately, reputation is an invaluable intangible asset, and its effective evaluation requires a balanced, innovative approach that combines reliable data sources, advanced technologies, and stakeholder engagement. Future advancements promise to refine reputation measurement and provide organizations with tools to proactively build, monitor, and enhance their reputational standing in a dynamic and interconnected world.

References

1. Ahmed, Y. A., Ahmad, M. N., Ahmad, N., & Zakaria, N. H. (2019). Social media for knowledge-sharing: A systematic literature review. *Telematics and informatics*, 37, 72-112.
2. Alam, S., Zardari, S., & Shamsi, J. A. (2022). Blockchain-based trust and reputation management in SIIoT. *Electronics*, 11(23), 3871.
3. Barnett, M. L., Jermier, J. M., & Lafferty, B. A. (2006). Corporate reputation: The definitional landscape. *Corporate reputation review*, 9, 26-38.
4. Božić, B., Kolić-Stanić, M., & Jurišić, J. (2021). The relationship between corporate social responsibility, corporate reputation, and business performance. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems: INDECS*, 19(2), 281-294.
5. Brammer, S. J., & Pavelin, S. (2006). Corporate reputation and social performance: The importance of fit. *Journal of management studies*, 43(3), 435-455.
6. Brammer, S., & Pavelin, S. (2004). Building a good reputation. *European Management Journal*, 22(6), 704-713.
7. Bromley, D. B. (2001). Relationships between personal and corporate reputation. *European journal of marketing*, 35(3/4), 316-334.
8. Cedrola, E., Battaglia, L., & Quaranta, A. G. (2016). Country reputation, brand reputation and company reputation: Their importance in business-to-business industries. In *Rediscovering the Essentiality of Marketing: Proceedings of the 2015 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) World Marketing Congress* (pp. 475-490). Springer International Publishing.
9. Chun, R. (2005). Corporate reputation: Meaning and measurement. *International journal of management reviews*, 7(2), 91-109.
10. Deephouse, D. L. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of management*, 26(6), 1091-1112.
11. Fombrun, C. J., & Van Riel, C. B. (2004). *Fame & fortune: How successful companies build winning reputations*. FT press.

12. Fombrun, C. J., Ponzi, L. J., & Newburry, W. (2015). Stakeholder tracking and analysis: The RepTrak® system for measuring corporate reputation. *Corporate reputation review*, 18, 3-24.
13. Fortino, G., Messina, F., Rosaci, D., & Sarné, G. M. (2019). Using blockchain in a reputation-based model for grouping agents in the Internet of Things. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 67(4), 1231-1243.
14. Gibson, D., Gonzales, J. L., & Castanon, J. (2006). The importance of reputation and the role of public relations. *Public relations quarterly*, 51(3), 15.
15. Kiambi, D. M., & Shafer, A. (2016). Corporate crisis communication: Examining the interplay of reputation and crisis response strategies. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(2), 127-148.
16. Kobrak, C. (2013). The concept of reputation in business history. *Business History Review*, 87(4), 763-786.
17. Le, T. T. (2023). Corporate social responsibility and SMEs' performance: mediating role of corporate image, corporate reputation and customer loyalty. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 18(10), 4565-4590.
18. Neville, B. A., Bell, S. J., & Mengüç, B. (2005). Corporate reputation, stakeholders and the social performance- financial performance relationship. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(9/10), 1184-1198.
19. Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic management journal*, 23(12), 1077-1093.
20. Salman, T., Jain, R., & Gupta, L. (2019, July). A reputation management framework for knowledge-based and probabilistic blockchains. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)* (pp. 520-527). IEEE.
21. Teacy, W. L., Patel, J., Jennings, N. R., & Luck, M. (2006). Travos: Trust and reputation in the context of inaccurate information sources. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 12, 183-198.
22. Vallens, A. (2008). The importance of reputation. *Risk Management*, 55(4), 36.

23. Van den Heever, J. J. (2018). *Investigating Social Media Conversations: Towards Designing an Online Reputation Management Framework for Ngo's*. University of Pretoria (South Africa).
24. Veh, A., Göbel, M., & Vogel, R. (2019). Corporate reputation in management research: a review of the literature and assessment of the concept. *Business research*, 12, 315-353.
25. Xie, C., & Haugland, S. (2016). Formation of reputation in business markets. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 23(1), 25-45.
26. Yoon, E., Guffey, H. J., & Kijewski, V. (1993). The effects of information and company reputation on intentions to buy a business service. *Journal of Business research*, 27(3), 215-228.

Література:

1. Ahmed, Y. A., Ahmad, M. N., Ahmad, N. and Zakaria, N. H. (2019), "Social media for knowledge-sharing: A systematic literature review", *Telematics and informatics*, Vol. 37, pp. 72-112.
2. Alam, S., Zardari, S. and Shamsi, J. A. (2022), "Blockchain-based trust and reputation management in SIoT", *Electronics*, Vol.11(23), pp. 3871.
3. Barnett, M. L., Jermier, J. M. and Lafferty, B. A. Corporate reputation: The definitional landscape. *Corporate reputation review*. 2006. Vol. 9, pp. 26-38.
4. Božić, B., Kolić-Stanić, M. and Jurišić, J. (2021), "The relationship between corporate social responsibility, corporate reputation, and business performance", *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems: INDECS*, Vol.19(2), pp. 281-294.
5. Brammer, S. J. and Pavelin, S. (2006), "Corporate reputation and social performance: The importance of fit", *Journal of management studies*, Vol. 43(3), pp. 435-455.
6. Brammer, S. and Pavelin, S. (2004), "Building a good reputation", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22(6), pp. 704-713.
7. Bromley, D. B. (2001), "Relationships between personal and corporate reputation", *European journal of marketing*, Vol. 35(3/4), pp. 316-334.

8. Cedrola, E., Battaglia, L. and Quaranta, A. G. (2015), "Country reputation, brand reputation and company reputation: Their importance in business-to-business industries", *Rediscovering the Essentiality of Marketing: Proceedings of the 2015 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) World Marketing Congress*, Springer International Publishing, Berlin, Germany, pp. 475-490.
9. Chun, R. (2005), "Corporate reputation: Meaning and measurement", *International journal of management reviews*, Vol. 7(2), pp. 91-109.
10. Deephouse, D. L. (2000), "Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories", *Journal of management*, Vol. 26(6), pp. 1091-1112.
11. Fombrun, C. J. and Van Riel, C. B. (2004), *Fame & fortune: How successful companies build winning reputations*, FT press, Upper Saddle River, USA.
12. Fombrun, C. J., Ponzi, L. J. and Newburry, W. (2015), "Stakeholder tracking and analysis: The RepTrak® system for measuring corporate reputation", *Corporate reputation review*, Vol. 18, pp. 3-24.
13. Fortino, G., Messina, F., Rosaci, D. and Sarné, G. M. (2019), "Using blockchain in a reputation-based model for grouping agents in the Internet of Things", *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, Vol. 67(4), pp. 1231-1243.
14. Gibson, D., Gonzales, J. L. and Castanon, J. (2006), "The importance of reputation and the role of public relations", *Public relations quarterly*, Vol. 51(3), p.15.
15. Kiambi, D. M. and Shafer, A. (2016), "Corporate crisis communication: Examining the interplay of reputation and crisis response strategies", *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(2), pp. 127-148.
16. Kobrak, C. (2013), "The concept of reputation in business history", *Business History Review*, Vol. 87(4), 763-786.
17. Le, T. T. (2023), "Corporate social responsibility and SMEs' performance: mediating role of corporate image, corporate reputation and customer loyalty", *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Vol. 18(10), 4565-4590.

18. Neville, B. A., Bell, S. J. and Mengüç, B. (2005), "Corporate reputation, stakeholders and the social performance- financial performance relationship", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 39(9/10), pp. 1184-1198.
19. Roberts, P. W. and Dowling, G. R. (2002), "Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance", *Strategic management journal*, Vol. 23(12), 1077-1093.
20. Salman, T. Jain, R. and Gupta, L. (2019), "A reputation management framework for knowledge-based and probabilistic blockchains", *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*, IEEE, July, pp. 520-527.
21. Teacy, W.L. Patel, J. Jennings, N.R. & Luck, M. (2006), "Travos: Trust and reputation in the context of inaccurate information sources", *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, vol. 12, 183-198.
22. Vallens, A. (2008), "The importance of reputation", *Risk Management*, vol. 55(4), p. 36.
23. Van den Heever, J.J. (2018), *Investigating Social Media Conversations: Towards Designing an Online Reputation Management Framework for Ngo's*, University of Pretoria, South Africa.
24. Veh, A. Göbel, M. and Vogel, R. (2019), "Corporate reputation in management research: a review of the literature and assessment of the concept", *Business research*, vol. 12, pp. 315-353.
25. Xie, C. and Haugland, S. (2016), "Formation of reputation in business markets", *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, vol. 23(1), pp. 25-45.
26. Yoon, E. Guffey, H.J. and Kijewski, V. (1993), "The effects of information and company reputation on intentions to buy a business service", *Journal of Business research*, vol. 27(3), pp. 215-228.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 16.01.2025 р.