

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICES AND CORPORATE REPUTATION IN THE TURKISH MEDIA INDUSTRY¹

DINÇER ATLI*

ABSTRACT

Business interest in CSR has increased significantly in recent years. But CSR is still under explored in developing countries like Turkey. The objective of this study is to explore the relationship between corporate social responsibility and corporate reputation in the context of Turkish Media Industry. This is realized by investigating the use of CSR activities by the Turkish media companies to develop corporate reputation. Furthermore, the strategic aspects of CSR and the increasing role of reputation in the corporate world have also been explored in our study. In addition, the structure of media ownership, CSR project number and percentages, CSR categories and CSR topics of 84 newspapers and TV channels in the Turkish media sector are also analyzed. Also the Capital Magazine's "CSR Leaders in Turkey and Most Admired Companies in Turkey" rankings among the media companies are compared within a duration of five years. The results of this study demonstrate that there is a positive correlation between CSR and corporate reputation in the media industry of Turkey.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, corporate reputation, media industry

INTRODUCTION

Companies have to express their principles and prioritize their activities deliberately in order to efficiently meet the economic, environmental, and social needs of the society. Therefore modern companies use CSR initiatives as both essential management tools and ways to accept corporate social responsibility (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013). Corporate social responsibility is viewed as a voluntary extra legal responsibility implemented by companies to serve community wellness and environmental protection. Consequently, companies have become reputable for doing

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented as a conference proceeding at the Penn State University, 2nd Global Conference of International Human Resource Management in Pennsylvania USA on 15th May 2015.

* Post-Doctoral Visiting Scholar, Penn State University USA, & Asst. Prof. Uskudar University Turkey. Author is partially supported by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) 2219 Postdoctoral Research Grant

it well. In return, stakeholders - including customers and employees - develop a positive attitude towards the company (Ali, Khan, & Rehman, 2013). Therefore, CSR is implemented by companies to contribute to society's wellness and also to boost a company's reputation (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Cited in Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

There is a positive correlation between CSR and a company's reputation (Brammer & Millington, 2005; Khan, Majid, Yasir, & Arshad, 2013; Curran M. , 2005). In the Harris-Fombrun Reputation Quotient, CSR is presented equally as one of the dimensions impacting company reputation (see, e.g., Fombrun & Wiedmann 2001, p.48; as cited in Figge & Schaltegger, 2000; Weber, 2008).

Additional research results show that independent CSR ratings are indicative of a companies' reputation and appeal as potential employers. Therefore, a company's CSR may provide a significant benefit in attracting new applicants (Turban & Greening, 1997). CSR is among the fundamental building blocks for creating an advantageous corporate reputation which is a significant tactical resource that impacts a company's competitive advantage (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

Corporate reputation provides a significant advantage for a company. A company's financial performance can be influenced by its overall reputation directly or indirectly (Rose & Thomsen, 2004). On the other hand, the opposite may be true as well: The financial performance of the company can impact its overall reputation. So the question then becomes whether a company's reputation can be influenced by non-economic factors such as positive contributions to society and the environment (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

CSR is still under explored in developing countries like Turkey. In the literature, studies examining CSR practices, particularly in Turkey, are limited. The media industry is an emerging area in the Turkish academic sphere. There is no comprehensive study that examines the CSR and Corporate reputation relationship with Turkish media organizations. Hence, corporate social responsibility practices and corporate reputation in the Turkish media industry was chosen as a topic by the author. This paper will be the very first study in the field regarding Corporate Social Responsibility Practices and Corporate Reputation in the Turkish media industry.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The Concept of CSR

Ancient Egyptian scriptures and codes of conduct from China, Greece, and Babylonia clearly provide guidance for behavior of organizations that are socially responsible. The Bible, Talmud, and other religious scriptures recommend us to be oriented towards the well-being of others and "compassion for one's fellow beings" (Anderson, 1989; Ray, 2006). As far back as the 19th century, corporations were participating in building schools, housing and libraries (Holliday, Schmidheiny, & Watts, 2002). Since the Great Depression of 1929, in order to address social issues, society has turned towards businesses as well as governments (Holliday, Schmidheiny, &

Watts, 2002; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003; Ray, 2006). In the gradually 'corporate period,' the corporations began to be perceived as institutions, like the government, that had social obligations to fulfill (Eberstadt, 1973; as cited in Carroll, 2008). In our times, companies operate in sync with their adjacent communities. As a matter of fact their success is prominently dependent on the distinct features of the communities where they operate (Porter & Kramer, 2002).

CSR was referred to as social responsibility (SR) rather than CSR in the early literature. Maybe this was because the age of the modern corporation's importance and dominance in the business sector had not yet occurred or been noted. In the field of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), the first study was initiated by Howard R. Bowen, the author of "Social Responsibilities of the Businessman" (1953). This concept received a great deal of attention from companies since then (Carroll, 1999).

CSR, as a definitional construct, intends to describe the relationship between business and the larger society around it, and if needed, to redefine the role and obligations of private businesses within that society (Keinert, 2008).

According to Carroll, CSR is a multi-layered concept and it can be differentiated into four interrelated aspects: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities. After all the key goals are achieved CSR comes into focus. These different responsibilities are depicted as consecutive layers within a pyramid, and according to Carroll 'true' social responsibility requires the meeting of all four levels consecutively (Carroll, 1991).

It is still not easy to say that there is a universal agreement on the definition of CSR (Scherer & Palazzo, 2007). CSR has been defined by some as a business entity's allegiance to and fulfillment of the responsibilities to the greater community (Albinger & Freeman, 2000). The term CSR is used to define the behavior of businesses in their approach to creating a wider philosophy of service which extends beyond economic criteria like creating products, employment, profits, etc. and fulfill social and environmental demands (Pomeroy & Johnson, 2009). Although CSR is a relatively recent term, the concept of corporate reputation has been used since the early 1980s in the literature of marketing and management. This fact demonstrates that scholars have been interested in this concept for a long time. It would be wise to define corporate reputation as the addition of stakeholder opinions combined with an open conveying of collective organizational image (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001; Toplu, Yaslioglu, & Erden, 2014).

CSR also has internal and external dimensions both of which are quite important. While internal dimensions are about the internal environment of the business organization, external ones involve stakeholders which are external to the organization (EU Green Paper, 2001). Among the internal dimensions are socially responsible practices which focus primarily on employee health and safety as well as the management of change. Environmentally oriented responsibilities are also part of these internal dimensions, and they attend to the management of natural resources used in production processes. Practices which concern the external stakeholders are classified

under external dimensions. As a concept, CSR goes above and beyond the company's premises and is involved in with a variety of stakeholders such as customers, suppliers, NGOs representing the local community and environment in addition to shareholders and employees (Khan, Majid, Yasir, & Arshad, 2013). In an effort to fulfill the needs of the stakeholders and to forge their business strategy, organizations have been integrating social responsibility objectives into their service framework (Inyang, Awa, & Enuoh, 2011).

The Concept of Corporate Reputation

Reputation signifies how positively, or negatively, a company or similar organization is perceived by its key stakeholders—the people or entities that the company or institution depends on for success. Typical stakeholders might include customers, employees, suppliers, or financial analysts for many for-profit companies (Gaines-Ross, 2008).

A simple version of the idea of reputation is “that over time an institution can become well known, can form a generalized understanding in the minds of observers as to what it is known for, and can be judged favorably or unfavorably by its observers”. (Lange, Lee, & Dai, 2011, p. 154). Corporate reputation represents an impalpable asset for a corporation (Rose & Thomsen, 2004). Since the 1990s the study of reputation has grown rapidly, bringing together scholars and practitioners from marketing and branding, organizational studies, communications and strategic management (Dowling, 2001; Hatch and Schultz, 2001; Davies et al., 2003; Fombrun and Van Riel, 2003) as cited in Martin & Hetrick, 2006). There is research that studied corporate reputation in association with the fields of accounting, economics, sociology (T.J.Brown, Dacin, Pratt, & Whetten, 2006; Abratt & Kleyn, 2012), financial performance (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; as cited in Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013) and Corporate Social Responsibility (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013; Hond, Rehbein, de Bakker, & van Lankveld, 2014).

Reputation has its roots in the accumulated perceptions of the organization's stakeholders (Fombrun, Gardberg, & Sever, 2000). Moreover, organizations with good reputations attract positive stakeholder engagement (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012). Reputation therefore involves an external overall evaluation of firms' actions and past performance in creating stakeholder value (Hond, Rehbein, de Bakker, & van Lankveld, 2014). A favorable corporate reputation results in business survivability and profitability. It is an effective mechanism to maintain a competitive advantage, and it can aid in building customer retention and satisfaction and in obtaining favorable media coverage (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012; Fombrun, Gardberg, & Sever, 2000; Fombrun & van Riel, 2003).

Corporate reputation is also an intangible asset for a corporation (Rose & Thomsen, 2004). Various organizations have come to recognize that one of their few unique and matchless assets is their ability to create reputational capital, because other forms of capital, including their products and services, and many of their internal management processes, including financial engineering, supply chain management and purchasing

strategies, are all tangible and, therefore, open to imitation by any firm willing to dig deep enough into their operations (Martin & Hetrick, 2006).

Literature reaffirms that a company must build up its reputation by managing both the economic (i.e. "product and service quality", "capabilities and competences", "economic and financial performance") and non-economic (i.e. "corporate social responsibility and governance" and "media presence and media relations") factors which may be either internal or external to the organization. One of the constituents that has a strong effect on a company's reputation is the quality of its products and services. Capabilities and competences is another economic parameter on company reputation. It is found that there is a correlation between these concepts and corporate reputation (Srivoravilai & Melewar, 2008). Particularly relational competence (i.e. corporate character, social sensitivity, and social utility) can sustain and forge corporate reputation and indirectly improve organizational performance (Long, 2000). Other criteria that have significant and positive association with corporate reputation is the corporation's capabilities (e.g. innovation, management skill, and strong leadership). Strategic management has given the largest amount of evidence about the effect of economic performance on reputation. Besides that we can not evaluate a company's reputation solely by considering its economic dimensions. Non economic factors such as "corporate social responsibility and governance" in addition to "media presence and media relations" have also been evidenced to sustain and forge corporate reputation in both for-profit and not-for-profit organizations (Srivoravilai & Melewar, 2008).

The Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Reputation

CSR is a fundamental component of reputation. Being an intangible asset, it is difficult to measure. We can illustrate this by thinking about how, in the 21st century, you can spread information about a company's activities, positive or negative, instantly by e-mail or telephone from anywhere to anywhere in the world to opinion-formers and activists. Nevertheless, CSR has many facets and there may be some aspects of CSR that are more crucial to reputation than others. These should be the components that are in the public eye and that can have the most beneficial or harmful effect on reputation. As an example, corporate governance is a component of CSR (Curran, 2005).

Corporations manage CSR in order to improve a society's well-being and to build and enhance their reputation. Corporate reputation refers to the extent to which a corporation is respected by its consumers (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013). Society expects corporations to satisfy their consumers with quality products and to generate sufficient profits for their investors. Fulfilling these economic responsibilities enhances corporate reputation (Fombrun C. J., 1996; Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

Corporate social responsibility should also be fundamental to a company's activities in order to form and maintain its reputation and value. The necessity to protect and develop brands and corporate reputation and the necessity to attract and retain

talented staff can be harnessed to improve business behavior. A company with insufficient CSR has poor credibility and will suffer (Curran, 2005). Moreover, Van Tulder states that social responsibility is one of the six components of a good corporate reputation alongside other factors; financial performance, emotional appeal, vision and leadership, workplace environment and quality products and services (Wessels, 2003).

From the reputational point of view, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been evidenced as being related to corporate reputation. The contributions of companies to social welfare (e.g. charitable contributions and foundations) are positively linked with corporate reputation (Fombrun. & Shanley, 1990; Hond, Rehbein, de Bakker, & van Lankveld, 2014). Dowling's (2004) study shows that social accountability is considerably and positively associated with companies' reputation (Hond, Rehbein, de Bakker, & van Lankveld, 2014).

The benefits driven by accumulated favorable reputation reflect a potential path to maintain the competitive advantage (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Black et al., 2000; Branco and Rodrigues, 2006; Orlitzky, Schmidt and Rynes, 2003; Fan, 2005). When you look at the concept of reputation it is intangible (Brown, 1997; Roberts and Dowling, 2002; Gardberg and Fombrun, 2006; Heikkurinen, 2010), which is the most important since it is hard to imitate (Drejer, 2000; Cited in Melo & Morgado, 2012).

Corporate Social Responsibility can provide companies the opportunity to assess and improve their profile and relationships with all their stakeholders: employees, consumers, investors and society at large (Curran , 2005).

Furthermore, businesses must realize their economic mission within the legal framework. The financial scandals in a large number of big companies have led to demands for greater financial transparency and accountability on the part of corporations. The Enron and Arthur Anderson are just a few examples of corporations that committed operations out of the legal framework. As a result of these corporate wrongdoings, once prominent corporations vanished. Because of illegal corporate behaviors, consumers' attitudes towards a company are negatively affected in an unequivocal way (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

Turban and Greening (1997) demonstrated that employee relations, community relations, and the treatment of the environment are positively associated with corporate reputation. The social identity theory suggests that companies with positive social performance are more favorable and more attractive for future employees because employees expect to have more positive self-concepts when becoming the workers for these institutions (Srivoravilai & Melewar, 2008). Baucus and Baucus (1997) demonstrated that when corporations were convicted of illegal acts, their sales growth considerably decreased compared to those of unconvicted ones (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

The evidence suggests that consumer perceptions of an institution's ethical activities, as well as company's philanthropic activities, have a positive effect on its reputation (Bendixen & Abratt, 2007). According to Brammer & Millington (2005), 'Britain's most admired companies' survey demonstrated a similar result. There is more than sufficient evidence that marketing the consumers' attitudes towards the corporation are enhanced by philanthropic activities, and as a result strengthen its competitive advantage (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Yoon, Zeynep, & Schwarz, 2006, Cited in Park, Lee, & Kim, 2013).

In addition, research results demonstrate that independent CSR ratings are indicative of companies' reputation and appeal as potential employers. Thus the CSR of a company may provide a significant benefit in attracting new applicants (Turban & Greening, 1997; Curran 2005).

After the recent events in the USA (Enron, WorldCom etc.), it can be proposed that corporate governance is an extremely valuable ingredient of corporate reputation. The Shell Brent Spar and Exxon Valdez reputation crises demonstrated that environmental awareness is another valuable aspect of CSR in reputation. (Curran , 2005).

CSR in Developing Countries and Turkey

Regarding the developing world, CSR is generally implemented at the micro level, observing what specific campaigns and companies are doing. Also, theoretical work has been conducted in which CSR and national competitive advantage have been found relevant to developing countries (Swift & Zadek, 2002; Blowfield & Jedrzej, 2005).

In developing countries, CSR has some distinctive characteristics. For example; In developing countries, CSR is usually related to philanthropy or charity through corporate social investment in education, health, sports development, the environment, and other community services. Formal CSR is generally practiced by large, high profile national and multinational companies, especially those with popular international brands or those aspiring to global status. For businesses, making an economic contribution is often seen as the most important and effective way to make a social impact, i.e. through investment, job creation, taxes, and technology transfer (Visser, Matten, Pohl, & Tolhurst, 2007; Visser(b), 2009).

CSR is not a new concept in philanthropist practices (Ersöz, et al., 2009). In the history of modern Turkish Republic, the state has always had a close relationship with philanthropists (CSR Turkey, 2010). During the Ottoman Empire, foundations were undeniably the most influential charitable institutions (Ersöz, et al., 2009). Another example of engagement between philanthropies and the Turkish state was the Ahilik system. Ahilik was a Turkish artisan union which was born out of historical and socio-economical needs. The Ahi organization played a crucial role to arrange both the commercial activities and social life of Anatolia in the 7th and 8th centuries, and in the 13th century it was institutionalized (Karatop, Karahan, & Kubat, 2011). Besides being a fellowship for craftsmen and artisans, the Ahilik system also provided shelter for the poor, foreign travelers, as well as a systematic education and health services for the

citizens (İnalçık, 2009). With such a background, philanthropy has increased the effectiveness of CSR in the contemporary Republic of Turkey.

Due to the lack of institutional leadership in CSR discussions about Turkey, a better understanding of tools and systems couldn't be realized (EU Report, 2007). According to research, subordinates of multinational companies give us examples of CSR by adhering to their corporate policies. They also are the main source of funding for CSR within non-governmental organizations in Turkey. Examples of philanthropic campaigns are principally directed towards supporting health care and education (Ararat & Ceyhun, 2006; EU Report, 2007). A study on CSR practices of the Turkish media sector has not been conducted yet.

CSR in Media Industry

On the one hand, media organizations have a societal function and thus also a social responsibility in that they are the major providers of information to citizens. To fulfill their responsibility toward society, media organizations have to comply with journalistic and editorial standards such as independence. On the other hand, media organizations are usually defined as economic players in pursuit of maximizing profits while trying to achieve their business goals to the utmost level of satisfaction, focusing on enhancing efficiency, profit, and their own market share (Owen & Wildman 1992; Kiefer 2005, as cited in Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2012).

Fierce competition and decreasing advertising income is that economic goals come into prominence and tend to replace social and editorial objectives. Thus, present conditions have created instability and developed conflict between the two main values that escort media organizations: the economic goal of profitability is becoming ever more pivotal while the media's responsibility to society and democracy is being eroded (Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2012).

Nowadays media organizations are increasingly becoming aware of the importance of their reputation. In order to present themselves as 'good corporate citizens', they are involving themselves in media governance and corporate social responsibility (CSR) actions. Thus, a growing number of media companies engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities and also communicate this engagement, which may have positive effects for their reputation (Pivato et al. 2008; as cited in Ingenhoff & Koelling, 2012). According to Ingenhoff & Koelling, (2012) fields of responsibility of media organizations consist of the following factors; editorial responsibility, responsibility for employees, responsibility for environment, responsibility for the society and exceeding editorial responsibility. Besides these, societal, environmental, employee, sponsorship and volunteerism factors were investigated in this study.

Method

84 Turkish media companies comprised of 35 TV channels, and 49 newspapers listed in the official web site of the "Office of The Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information of the Republic Of Turkey" (Başbakanlık Basın Yayın ve Enformasyon Genel Müdürlüğü) www.byegm.gov.tr under "links to Turkish Press,

newspapers and TVs” create our universe. Since all the 84 components of our universe are studied, the total population method was used in our research.

To this end, in order to understand the general trends in the Turkish Media industry about CSR between the years of 1980 and 2015, the websites of corporate social responsibility platforms were studied. The content analysis of the websites were done between March-April 2015. Since our research aim is to demonstrate the state of the examined topic at a specific given period, the methodology is cross sectional.

Research questions that guided this study included:

RQ1. How effectively do Turkish media Companies benefit CSR practices to build corporate reputation?

RQ2. What are the general CSR characteristics of the Turkish media industry?

In this study our main hypothesis was formed by the following relationship. This hypothesis includes:

H1: There is a positive relationship between CSR and corporate reputation.

The content analysis was concentrated on studying the affiliation between Turkish media companies, CSR campaign names, the names of media companies, and the general characteristics and aims of CSR projects. In order to analyse which CSR activities are displayed, a content analysis of the website of the responsible media companies, as well as annual and sustainability reports about campaign websites -if any- were also examined.

CSR activities of Turkish media companies were also analyzed in accordance with Ingenhoff & Sommer’s (2011) ‘topic coding’ and therefore five categories were differentiated: society, environment, employees, sponsoring and volunteerism.

Besides that, in order to demonstrate the relationship between the CSR practices of the Turkish media companies and corporate reputation, the results of the Capital Magazine’s study “CSR Leaders of Turkey” and again the list of media companies that was published in the same magazine’s “the Most Admired Companies of Turkey” study were analysed comparatively beginning from 2013.

The Capital Magazine’s “CSR Leaders” study which we took as a sample, puts forth the most prominent leaders, companies and projects of Turkey in institutional social responsibility beginning from 2015 and demonstrates the performance of Turkey regarding CSR. During the period when our study was taking place (April 2015), the details of the CSR 2014 study hadn’t been published. Our objective in comparing the lists of companies included in the study results is to explore the relationship between company reputation and CSR activities.

Findings

The developments and advances in CSR including the media industry are very encouraging in Turkey. According to the results of our study on CSR practices in Turkish media companies and their relation with reputation, the ownership structure in the Turkish media industry owned 84 media companies in 2015.

These media companies are comprised of 35 TV channels and 49 newspapers. According to this, the total number of newspapers in Turkey is more than the total number of TV channels. In Turkey, 45 media companies operate in affiliation with 15 media groups. The proportion of the media companies within our study that operate in affiliation to one media group is 53.57 %.

The number of media companies that operate without any affiliation to any media group is 39. This number equals to 46.42%. Table 1 below demonstrates the overall picture of the ownership structure in the Turkish media industry.

Table 1. Structure of Media Ownership in Turkey (March 2015).

	Investigated Turkish Media Companies	TV	Newspaper	Non-Affiliated Media Companies	Media Companies That Are Affiliated to a Media Group	Turkish Media Groups
N	84	35	49	39	45	15
%	100%	41.66%	58.33%	46.42%	53.57%	100%

Table 2 below shows the number and percentage of Turkish media groups that conduct a CSR project or media groups that did not conduct any CSR project. According to these results 7 out of 15 media groups that operate in Turkey are utilizing a CSR project and 8 of them are not utilizing a CSR project.

Table 2. The Number and Percentages of Turkish Media Groups That Conduct a CSR Project and Do Not Conduct a CSR project (1980-2015).

	Turkish Media Groups	Turkish Media Groups that Conduct a CSR Project	Turkish Media Groups that do not Conduct a CSR project
N	15	7	8
%	100%	46.66 %	53.33%

In Table 3 below, the CSR projects that were conducted by 84 media companies in operation in 2015 are demonstrated. These projects were conducted between 1980 and 2015. According to this, the total number of CSR projects of media companies between 1980 and 2015 is 27. This number is considerably low for a period of 35 years. 26 out of 27 CSR projects, in other words 96.29 % of them, were conducted by 7 big Turkish media groups. The percentage of media groups that conducted a CSR project is 87.5%. The number of media companies that conducted a CSR project without any affiliation to a media group is 1, and the number of projects that were

conducted without any affiliation to any media group is only 1. CSR projects in Turkish media companies are carried out largely by big media groups. The media groups sometimes support the affiliated media company's specific CSR project and sometimes conducted CSR projects as a group.

Table 3. CSR Project Numbers and Percentages in Turkish Media Companies (1980-2015).

	Turkish Media Companies CSR Project Number (1980-2015)	Turkish Media Groups that Conduct CSR Projects	Independent Turkish Media Companies that Conduct CSR Projects	The Number of Projects of Turkish Media Companies that Conduct CSR Projects	The Number of Projects of Independent Turkish Media Companies that Conduct CSR Projects
N	27	7	1	26	1
%	100%	87.5%	12.5%	96.29%	3.70%

Table 4 below shows the names together with the number and percentages of CSR projects of Turkish media groups that have CSR practices. According to this, the most influential media group regarding CSR projects is the Doğuş group with 10 CSR projects. The Doğan group follows this with 5 CSR projects. The Ciner group with the Sabah newspaper it acquired between 2002-2007 followed an active policy with 4 CSR projects. The Ciner group conducted 3 CSR projects with the media companies it has today. Turkuvaz Media Group, Koza İpek Holding, Demirören Holding, Albayrak Media Group and Dünya newspaper owned by Dünya Group takes part in our study with 1 CSR project.

Table 4. Media Groups and Independent Media Companies' CSR Campaigns (1980-2015).

Media Groups and Independent Media Companies' CSR Campaigns	CSR Campaign (N)	CSR Campaign (%)
Doğuş Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTV • Star TV • Cnbc-E TV 	10	37.03 %
Doğan Group Holding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanal D TV • Cnn Türk TV • Hürriyet Newspaper • Posta Newspaper • Fanatik Newspaper • Hürriyet Daily News Newspaper 	5	18.51%
Ciner Publishing Holding- Sabah Newspaper- Note: Between 2002-2007 <u>Sabah</u> Newspaper was owned by Ciner PUBLISHING Holding.	4	14.81%
Ciner Publishing Holding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habertürk Newspaper • Bloomberg Ht TV • Show TV • Habertürk TV 	3	11.11%
Turkuvaz Media Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sabah Newspaper • Takvim Newspaper • Yeni Asır Newspaper • Fotomaç Newspaper • Daily Sabah Newspaper • ATV • A Haber TV 	1	3.70%
Koza İpek Holding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bugün Gazetesi • Millet Gazetesi • Kanaltürk Tv • Bugün Tv 	1	3.70%
Demirören Holding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milliyet Newspaper • Vatan Newspaper 	1	3.70%
Albayrak Media Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yeni Şafak Newspaper • Tvnet TV 	1	3.70%
Dünya Group of Companies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dünya Newspaper 	1	3.70%
Total CSR Campaign Number	27	100%

As it is understood from Table 5 Turkish Media Companies conduct mostly societal CSR projects. Results show that the media industry in Turkey primarily communicated CSR activities that address society in general. This is followed by CSR projects on society, volunteerism, sponsoring and environment. Turkish media companies don't have any CSR project on "Employees".

Table 5. Turkish Media Companies' CSR Topics (1980-2015).

Society	Environment	Employees	Sponsoring	Volunteerism	Total
12	3	0	5	7	27

As can be seen below from Table 6 in 2009, there is 1 media company on the selection list for the CSR leaders in Turkey. On the list for the Most Admired Companies in Turkey, there is 1 media company as well. This media company on the CSR Leaders list was also on the Most Admired Companies list. Moreover, CSR leadership has an impact factor of 100 per cent on the popularity of companies. In 2010, 2 media companies were on the list of CSR Leaders, and 1 Media Company on the Most Admired Companies list. 1 of the 2 companies on the CSR Leaders list was also on the Most Admired Companies list. This gives an impact factor of 50 per cent for CSR leadership on the popularity of the companies. As it is understood from Table 6, the impact factors for subsequent years were 50 per cent respectively. Cumulatively, over these five years, 4 of the CSR leaders also appear on the list of 9 companies on the Most Admired Companies in Turkey list. Hence, the average impact of CSR projects in the popularity of the companies over the previous five years is high: 44 percent. Thus, our hypothesis is accepted since there is a positive relationship between CSR and corporate reputation. In addition that big media groups were significantly more likely than independent media companies to communicate their CSR actions.

Table 6. Among the Turkish media companies, comparison of the CSR Leaders in Turkey and Most Admired Companies in Turkey studies over five years (Capital Magazine)

Year:	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total over five years
Number of Turkish Media companies on the CSR Leaders lists	1	2	2	2	2	9
Number of Turkish Media companies on the Most Admired Companies lists	1	1	1	1	0	4
Number of Turkish Media companies on both the CSR Leaders and Most Admired Companies lists	1	1	1	1	0	4
Impact of CSR leadership on the popularity of Turkish Media companies	100%	50%	50%	50%	50%	44%

Conclusion

A company's reputation has become one of its most important assets, and CSR has become one of the main components of corporate reputation. Therefore, CSR is crucial for the intangible value of a company (Curran 2005). When we look at the media industry in Turkey it is possible to say that the media companies in Turkey are owned by big media groups. In this aspect, it could be said that the Turkish media sector is an oligopoly. The Turkish media groups were also not sufficiently aware of the importance of CSR since the 1980's. Turkish media companies benefit CSR practices to build corporate reputation, but this utilization may be increased. When we consider the development in CSR, the advances are very encouraging in Turkey including the media industry. Big media groups were considerably more likely than small media organizations to communicate their CSR activities.

When we compare the CSR practices of independent media companies and media groups, we see that it is mostly in the agenda of media groups. In other words, CSR should be on the agenda of media groups with large amounts of capital. In the Turkish media industry, and mostly social service, volunteering and sponsorship practices are dominant. Turkish media companies don't run any CSR project on employees. As a result of our study it is understood that the impact of CSR projects on making Turkish media companies reputable and popular is 44% within a period of five years. That is not a percentage to be underestimated. That is to say, there is a positive correlation between CSR and corporate reputation. This result is consistent with pioneering research in the field. A company's reputation has become one of its most valuable assets, even though it is an intangible asset that is difficult to measure. Hence, it must be considered that there may be many factors affecting corporate reputation. Further research is needed to demonstrate the relationship between CSR and reputation within the Turkish media industry.

REFERENCES

- Abrott, R., & Kleyn, N. 2012. Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate reputations Reconciliation and integration. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46 (7/8), 1048-1063.
- Albinger, H. S., & Freeman, S. J. 2000. Corporate social performance and attractiveness as an employer. *Journal of Business Ethics*(28), 243-253.
- Ali, I., Khan, S.-U. R., & Rehman, I. U. 2013. How Corporate Social Responsibility And Corporate Reputation Influence Employee Engagement? *Transformation in Business & Economics*, 12 (1A), 354-365.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldır, E. 2005. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS Uygulamalı* (4 ed.). Sakarya, Turkey: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Anderson, J. W. 1989. *Corporate social responsibility: Guidelines for top management*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Ararat, M., & Ceyhun, G. 2006. *Drivers for Sustainable Corporate Responsibility, Case of Turkey*. CSR Association .
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. 2003. Consumer-Company Identification: A Framework for Understanding Consumers' Relationships with Companies. *Journal of Marketing*, 2, 67-76.
- Blowfield, M., & Jedrzej, F. G. 2005. Setting New Agendas: Critical Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility in the Developing World. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3569630>, Ed.) *Royal Institute of International Affairs*-Chatnam House, 81(3), 499-513.
- Brammer, S., & Millington, A. 2005. Corporate reputation and philanthropy: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61(1), 29-44.
- Carroll, A. B. 1991. The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*(4), 39-48.
- Carroll, A. B. 1999. Corporate social responsibility – evolution of a definitional of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 3(38), 268-295.
- Carroll, A. B. (2008). A History of Corporate Social Responsibility - Concepts and practices. *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 19–43.
- CSR Turkey. 2010. *CSR Turkey Baseline Report*. İstanbul.
- Curran, M. 2005. Assessing the Rate of Return of the Adoption of Corporate Social Responsibility. University of Edinburgh; *Unpublished P.h.D Thesis*, 1-199.

Curran, M. M. 2005. Assessing the Rate of Return of the Adoption of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives. *Unpublished Ph.D Thesis*. University of Edinburgh.

Ersöz, H. Y., Orman, S., Özel, M., Kapu, H., Yıldırım, E., Ersöz, H. Y., . . . Öztürk, A. O. 2009. *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk*. In S. Orman, & Z. Parlak (Eds.), *İşletmelerde İş Etiği* (pp. 131-171). İstanbul, Türkiye: İTO Yayınları-Sosyal Yayınlar.

EU Report. 2007. *Baseline Study On CSR Practices In The New EU Member States And Candidate Countries*. European Union.

European Commission Green Paper Report. (2001). **Green Paper: Promoting a European framework for corporate social responsibility**. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities-European Commission.

Figge, F., & Schaltegger, S. 2000. What is "stakeholder value"? *United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)*. Luneburg/Genf/Paris: University of Luneburg/Pictet/In association with.

Fombrun, C. J. 1996. *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image*. Boston, MA, USA: Harvard Business School Press.

Fombrun, C., & van Riel, C. 2003. *Fame and Fortune: How Successful Companies Build Winning Reputations*. NJ.: FT Prentice Hall.

Fombrun, C., Gardberg, N., & Sever, J. 2000. The reputation quotient: a multi-stakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 7(4), 241-55.

Fombrun., C., & Shanley, M. 1990. What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal.*, 33(2), 233-58.

Gaines-Ross, L. (2008). *Corporate Reputation:12 Steps to Safeguarding and Recovering Reputation*. New Jersey, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gotsi, M., & Wilson, A. M. 2001. Corporate Reputation: Seeking a Definition. Corporate Communications: *An International Journal*, 6(1), 24-30.

Holliday, C. O., Schmidheiny, S., & Watts, P.2002. *Walking the talk: The business case for sustainable development*. :. San Francisco: Greenleaf Publishing.

Hond, F. d., Rehbein, K. A., de Bakker, F. G., & van Lankveld, H. K. 2014. Playing on Two Chessboards: Reputation Effects between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Corporate Political Activity (CPA). *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(5).

Ingenhoff, D., & Koelling, a. M. (2012). Media governance and corporate social responsibility of media organizations: An international comparison. *Business Ethics*, 21(2), 154–167. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2011.01646.x>.

Inyang, B. J., Awa, H. O., & Enuoh, R. O. 2011. CSR-HRM nexus: defining the role engagement of the human resources professionals. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(5), 118-126.

İnalçık, H. 2009. *Devlet-i Aliyye*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Karatop, B., Karahan, A. G., & Kubat, C. (2011). First Application Of Total Quality Management In Ottoman Empire: Ahi Organization. In 7th Research/Expert Conference with International Participations "QUALITY 2011", Neum, B&H, June 01 – 04, 2011 (pp. 1109–1114).

Keinert, C. 2008. CSR Conceptualisation. In W. A. Müller, & M. Bihn (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility as an International Strategy* (pp. 37-76). Leipzig: Physica-Verlag Heidelberg-springer.com.

Khan, M., Majid, A., Yasir, M., & Arshad, M. 2013. Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Reputation: A Case of Cement Industry in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(1), 843-858.

Lange, D., Lee, P. M., & Dai, Y. 2011. Organizational reputation: a review. *Journal of Management*, 37, 153-184.

Long, T. 2000. A conceptual framework and empirical tests of the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: a study of consumer markets. *Unpublished Ph.D. thesis*, Ohio State University.

Martin, G., & Hetrick, S. 2006. Burlington, MA 01803, USA: Butterworth-Heinemann is an imprint of Elsevier.

Melo, T., & Morgado, A. G. 2012. Corporate Reputation: A Combination of Social Responsibility and Industry. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*(19), 11-31.

Park, J., Lee, H., & Kim, C. 2013. Corporate social responsibilities, consumer trust and corporate reputation: South Korean consumers' perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 295-302.

Pomering, A., & Johnson, L. W. 2009. Constructing a corporate social responsibility reputation using corporate image advertising. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 106-114.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. 2002. *The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy*. Harvard Business Review.

Ray, J. R. 2006. Investigating Relationships between Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation and Employer Attractiveness. The George Washington University. USA: *Unpublished PhD Thesis*.

Rose, C., & Thomsen, S. 2004. The impact of corporate reputation on performance: Some Danish evidence. *European Management Journal*, 22(2), pp. 201–210.

Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. 2007. Toward a Political Conception of Corporate Responsibility. Business and Society Seen from a Habermasian Perspective. *Academic Management Review*(32), 1096–1120.

Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. 2001. Does doing good always lead to doing better? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225-243.

Srivoravilai, N., & Melewar, T. C. 2008. *Corporate reputation building An Asian perspective*. In T. C. Melewar, & T. C. Melewar (Ed.), Facets of corporate identity, communication, and reputation. New York: Routledge.

Swift, T., & Zadek, S. 2002. *Corporate responsibility and the competitive advantage of nations*. London: Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability with the Copenhagen Centre.

T.J.Brown, Dacin, P. A., Pratt, M. G., & Whetten, D. 2006. Identity, intended image, construed image and reputation: an interdisciplinary framework and suggested terminology. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), 99-106.

Toplu, D., Yaslioglu, M., & Erden, N. S. 2014. Corporate Reputation in the Era of Social Media: A Study in Turkish Banking Industry. *The IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, 11(2), 28-42.

Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. 1997. Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 658-672.

Visser(b), W. 2009. Corporate Social Responsibility in Developing Countries. In A. Crane, D. Matten, A. McWilliams, J. Moon, & D. S. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 473-499). Oxford University Press.

Visser, W., Matten, D., Pohl, M., & Tolhurst, N. 2007. *The A to Z of Corporate Social Responsibility*. London, UK: Wiley.

Weber, M. 2008. The business case for corporate social responsibility: A company-level measurement approach for CSR. *European Management Journal* (26), 247–261.