EVALUATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE REPUTATION IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

Asst. Prof. İlknur SAYAN (Ph.D.) [*] [iD]

Asst. Prof. Hatice MUTLU (Ph.D.) [**] [iD]

ABSTRACT

In healthcare organisations, managers also play a central role in managing resources effectively, ensuring patient and employee safety and increasing satisfaction levels. Beyond environmental contributions, the importance of sustainable leadership practices has a great impact on the survival, differentiation and competitive advantage of the organisation through an intangible asset such as corporate reputation. This study aims to examine the relationship between healthcare professionals' perceptions of sustainable leadership and their organisations' perceptions of corporate reputation. This quantitative study was conducted among 256 healthcare professionals working in various hospitals (public, private and university-affiliated) in Istanbul and participated voluntarily through convenience sampling method. The findings revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between healthcare professionals' perception of sustainable leadership and perception of organisational reputation. In addition, significant differences were found between the dimensions of sustainable leadership according to demographic characteristics. The study emphasises that the adoption of sustainability practices contributes not only to environmental benefits but also to enhance corporate reputation.

Keywords: Sustainable Leadership, Corporate Reputation, Hospital, Health, Sustainability.

Gel Code: J20, M10, L20.

1.INTRODUCTION

The fact that the world's resources are limited and human activities have brought these resources to the brink of depletion has made the concept of sustainability one of the most important issues of our age. The United Nations (2023) defines sustainability as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". This understanding has made the sustainability approach, which is integrated with its environmental, economic and social dimensions,

[*] İstanbul Kent University, Department of Health Management, istanbul/ Türkiye, E-mail: ilknur-sayan@hotmail.com.

[**] İstanbul Beykent University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Management, İstanbul/ Türkiye, E-mail: haticemutlu@beykent.edu.tr.

the main agenda item of the business world and social structures. In this context, the use of natural resources should be compatible with the self-renewal capacity of these resources (Yavuz, 2010).

Launched in 2015 by the United Nations, the Sustainable Development Agenda, which will continue until 2030, calls for universal action to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity for all. Among the 17 goals of this agenda, the goal of "Good Health and Prosperity" directly links the concept of sustainability with the health sector (Presidency of the Republic of Turkey, Presidency of Strategy and Budget Directorate, 2023). As a critical area affecting human life, the health sector not only increases the efficiency of health services, but also bears an important responsibility in ensuring environmental sustainability.

In today's business world, an understanding that financial success alone is not enough is spreading rapidly. Organisations must also consider their environmental and social impacts (Gümüş and Öksüz, 2009). In this context, the sustainable leadership approach represents an understanding that requires businesses to prioritise not only their financial performance but also their social and environmental contributions (Coşkun, 2013). Sustainable leadership allows businesses to adopt a management style that balances environmental and social impact management with financial goals. Studies reveal that sustainable leadership practices play an important role in increasing the corporate reputation of businesses (Avery and Bergsteiner, 2011; Kantabutra, 2011).

Corporate reputation refers to the way an organisation is perceived by its stakeholders and society. This reputation is critical in creating competitive advantage, ensuring customer loyalty and achieving sustainable growth (Ünaldı, 2015). In the literature, it is frequently emphasised that sustainability is an important antecedent of corporate reputation (Gomez-Trujillo, Velez-Ocampo, and Gonzalez-Perez, 2020). Especially in a field with high public impact such as the health sector, the importance of sustainable leadership practices is becoming increasingly prominent among the factors that make corporate reputation strong.

Sustainable leadership is an approach to leadership that not only fulfils current needs but also considers the needs of future generations. This understanding refers to a strategic management style that ensures the long-term effects of leadership practices and sustainability. Yangil and Şahin (2019) define sustainable leadership as a multifaceted process with economic, cultural, social and ethical dimensions. This comprehensive approach involves leaders not only achieving organisational goals but also fulfilling social responsibilities and supporting environmental sustainability.

In the healthcare sector, this approach has the potential to increase employee motivation and commitment, as well as improve patient satisfaction and quality of care (Gayir, 2022). In addition, environmental sustainability initiatives such as green hospital practices have been observed to strengthen corporate reputation while reducing the environmental impact of healthcare services (Khairunnisa, Setyonugroho, and Ulfa, 2022).

This study aims to examine the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation in the healthcare sector with a quantitative approach based on existing literature findings. In the study, the direct and indirect effects of sustainable leadership practices on corporate reputation will be analysed using measurable data. The study also aims to reveal the contribution of this relationship to sustainable development goals in the health sector. In this context, the data obtained through quantitative methods will be comprehensively evaluated to provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics of sustainable leadership and corporate reputation in the health sector.

2. SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP AND ITS ROLE IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

Sustainable leadership is an important management approach in the health sector that aims to support both organisational success and social benefit. This leadership model aims to improve the quality and accessibility of healthcare services by integrating environmental, social and economic sustainability goals. It is also critical for increasing employee satisfaction and strengthening organisational reputation (Abid, Ali and Khan, 2023).

Sustainable leadership not only responds to current needs but also takes into account the needs of future generations. The health sector is one of the areas where this leadership model is most effective. Research has shown that this approach strengthens the cooperation between healthcare professionals and positively affects leader-member relations (Aydemir, 2023).

This leadership model has been effective in improving employee performance while enabling healthcare organisations to grow and fulfil their social responsibilities. Research shows that sustainable leadership contributes to more proactive behaviours of employees by increasing interest in green healthcare (Mansur and Gedik, 2022). For example, green hospital practices increase patient and employee satisfaction and strengthen corporate reputation by reducing environmental impacts (Gayir, 2022; Khairunnisa, Setyonugroho and Ulfa, 2022).

Sustainable leadership, which is a leadership approach based on ethical values, increases the impact of organisations on internal and external stakeholders. In this context, corporate social responsibility (CSR) projects stand out as a reflection of ethical leadership and play a role in shaping corporate reputation (Choi, 2021). In the health sector, these practices contribute to the positive impact of social perception (Bayoud et al., 2012).

Leadership is also important for the sustainability of corporate culture. This understanding can be effective in building a strong corporate reputation among employees, patients and society (Çetin and Baş, 2021). In addition, sustainable leadership practices during the COVID-19 pandemic reinforced the success of healthcare organisations in crisis management and their credibility in the eyes of the community (Yusefi et al., 2022).

In conclusion, sustainable leadership is an indispensable management approach for long-term success in the healthcare sector, not only in terms of employee satisfaction and motivation, but also in terms of organisational performance and social trust.

3. CORPORATE REPUTATION AND ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

Corporate reputation refers to the overall value of an organisation perceived by its stakeholders and is shaped by both patient and employee satisfaction in the health sector. Patient satisfaction is directly related to the quality of healthcare services and is one of the most important determinants of corporate reputation (Ünaldı, 2015). The satisfaction of healthcare professionals and their commitment to the organisation is a critical factor affecting patient satisfaction (Çetin and Baş, 2021).

Employee satisfaction is a factor that directly affects corporate performance and corporate reputation. In the health sector, the harmony and job satisfaction of employees with the leadership approach is reflected in the quality of patient care and enables an increase in organisational performance (Hasan and Yun, 2017). The level of trust and commitment of employees in the workplace is shaped by the leadership style and this process affects the long-term success of the organisation. In this context, employees' belief in organisational values and missions is directly reflected in patient satisfaction and contributes to the strengthening of corporate reputation (Hasan and Yun, 2017). In addition, increased employee satisfaction reduces turnover rates and supports organisational sustainability (Dirik and Intepeler, 2019). Corporate culture is another tool that strengthens corporate reputation by increasing

employee motivation (Çetin and Baş, 2021). For example, the adoption of a patient-oriented culture positively affects the perception of healthcare organisations in the eyes of the society.

Similarly, environmental sustainability is an important factor shaping the perception of healthcare organisations in the eyes of the society. Green hospital initiatives reduce the environmental footprint and strengthen corporate reputation by increasing patient and employee satisfaction (Terekli et al., 2013). Environmentally sensitive practices increase public trust in healthcare organisations and this trust is reflected in other elements of corporate reputation such as competitive advantage and customer loyalty (Gomez-Trujillo et al., 2020).

Social sustainability strengthens the relationship of healthcare organisations with society. In this context, corporate social responsibility projects are used as an important tool to enhance corporate reputation in the healthcare sector (Mattera and Graciá, 2015). For example, projects supporting public health or providing free healthcare services for low-income individuals increase the reputation of healthcare organisations in the eyes of society.

In conclusion, when the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation is analysed in terms of factors such as ethical leadership, corporate culture and employee satisfaction, it is revealed that this leadership approach in the healthcare sector positively shapes not only the performance within the organisation but also the perception of the society. In this context, encouraging sustainable leadership practices will contribute to the spread of a more ethical, transparent and effective management approach in the healthcare sector.

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE REPUTATION

Sustainable leadership has become an important concept in today's business world, especially in the healthcare sector, with its ability to ensure the long-term success of organisations by balancing social, environmental and economic responsibilities. This leadership model enables organisations to pursue their economic goals while fulfilling their social responsibilities and thus directly contributes to strengthening corporate reputation. Ertaş and Özdemir (2021) state that sustainable leadership enables the emergence of factors such as fulfilling social responsibilities, developing cooperation processes and ensuring the sustainability of growth.

Corporate reputation is an important element that determines the perception and reliability of an organisation in the society. Şengüllendi and Şehitoğlu (2022) emphasise that a good corporate reputation provides firms with sustainable competitive advantage and increases business performance. In the healthcare sector, sustainable management practices support patient satisfaction by increasing employee loyalty and thus strengthen corporate reputation. Özdemir et al. (2019) examined the effects of positive leadership behaviours on employee performance and job satisfaction and showed that these behaviours increase organisational flexibility. These findings clearly demonstrate the positive impact of sustainable leadership practices on organisational reputation.

Sustainable leadership is also an effective factor in increasing organisational performance. Employees' job satisfaction is closely related to corporate reputation. Güneş and Gözükara (2019) investigated the relationship between corporate reputation and brand equity and emphasised the potential of corporate reputation to increase employee loyalty. Similarly, Bahar (2019) states that corporate reputation is a critical element for long-term and sustainable success goals. Accordingly, sustainable leadership practices provide a framework that increases both employee engagement and organisational performance.

The relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation in the healthcare sector is shaped by the processes of gaining the trust of employees and society, increasing patient satisfaction and fulfilling social responsibilities. Ethical leadership plays an important role in shaping corporate culture as the cornerstone of these processes. Ethical leaders gain the trust of employees with a fair and transparent management approach and create a positive work environment (Odriozola and Baraibar-Diez, 2017). Choi's (2021) study shows that ethical leadership in the healthcare sector has positive effects on patient satisfaction by increasing employee loyalty and job performance.

In conclusion, sustainable leadership has a key role in strengthening corporate reputation and ensuring long-term success in the healthcare sector. In this context, adopting sustainable leadership practices in the healthcare sector can be considered as an indispensable strategy for strengthening corporate reputation and increasing organisational success.

5. METHOD

5.1. Research Design

A descriptive and survey design was used to assess the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation in the healthcare sector. The study was conducted on 256 healthcare professionals working in various types of hospitals (public, private, university affiliated) in Istanbul. Participants were selected through convenience sampling and voluntarily participated in the study. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method in which the researcher selects individuals who are the easiest and fastest to reach. This method provides advantages in terms of time and cost (Maden, 2024).

The following hypotheses were formulated in line with the research objectives:

H1: There is a positive and significant relationship between the perception of sustainable leadership and the perception of corporate reputation.

H2: There are significant differences in perceptions of sustainable leadership and corporate reputation according to demographic characteristics.

5.2. Population and Sample/Study Group

The population of the study consists of healthcare professionals serving in both private and public hospitals in Istanbul. Since the population size was unknown, the sample size was determined by using the unknown population sampling formula. Although 300 healthcare professionals participated in the study, only 256 questionnaires were considered valid. Therefore, the sample of the study consists of 256 healthcare professionals. The formula used to determine the sample size is as follows:

$$n = t2pqdn \tag{1}$$

Where is it?

- n: Number of individuals to be sampled

- t: The theoretical value found in the t-table at a given significance level

- p: Frequency of the analysed case

- q: Frequency of non-occurrence of the phenomenon under investigation

- *d*: Sampling error accepted according to the frequency of occurrence of the case Sample size calculated for the total population

$$n = 1{,}962 \; x \; (0{,}5 x 0{,}5) \; 0{,}082 = 146 \tag{2}$$

With a 95% confidence level, a value of 1.96 for t, a frequency of occurrence of the phenomenon p of 0.5 and a sampling error d of 0.08, the calculated sample size is 146. Since 256 health workers participated in the study voluntarily, it can be concluded that the sample adequately represents the population.

5.3. Research Process

The research data were collected through an online survey shared between May and June 2023. The study was conducted with the participation of healthcare professionals serving in both private and public hospitals in Istanbul.

5.4. Data Collection Tools

The research consists of two parts. The first part consists of the Information Form, which includes the socio-demographic information (age, gender, occupation, marital status, years of experience, years of service in the organisation) of 256 healthcare professionals. The second part of the questionnaire includes the Sustainable Leadership Scale and the Corporate Reputation Scale.

The Sustainable Leadership Scale was developed by McCann and Holt (2011), and its validity and reliability were examined by Yangil and Şahin (2019) for its Turkish adaptation. The scale consists of 15 questions and 4 dimensions (Ethical and Social Responsibility, Change, Innovation-Profitability, Culture-Concern for Human Resources). Each question is evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale. The participants were asked to tick the answer corresponding to their own views among the following options: "1. Strongly disagree", "2. Disagree", "3. Undecided", "4. Agree" and "5. Strongly agree".

The Corporate Reputation Perception Scale was developed by utilising the "Reputation Coefficient Scale" developed by Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever (2000) to measure employees' perception of corporate reputation. The validity and reliability of the scale in the context of Turkey was revealed in the study conducted by Alnıaçık, Nurullah and Alnıaçık (2010). The scale consists of 20 items organised in six dimensions: emotional appeal, products and services, vision and leadership, workplace environment, social and environmental responsibility and financial performance. Each

question is graded according to a 5-point Likert scale. Participants are asked to tick the option that best represents their views, ranging from "1. Strongly disagree" to "5. Strongly agree".

5.5. Data Analyses

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics Standard Concurrent User V 26 (IBM Corp., Armonk, New York, USA) statistical package software. Descriptive statistics were presented as number of units (n), percentage (%), mean ± standard deviation ($\bar{x} \pm s$ s), minimum (min) and maximum (max) values. Normality of the numerical data was evaluated by using skewness and kurtosis measurements. Homogeneity of variances was evaluated using Levene's test. Scale scores were compared using independent sample t-test for variables with two categories and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for variables with more than two categories. Duncan test was used as a multiple comparison tool in one-way ANOVA. Before proceeding to the correlation analysis, the coefficients (Cronbach alpha, CR and AVE) related to the reliability and validity of the research scales were evaluated. These steps ensured that the analyses were based on a solid foundation and that subsequent correlation analyses would yield more reliable results. With the correlation analysis, which was decisive in testing the research hypotheses, the relationships between the scale scores were evaluated using Pearson coefficient. The significance level values for the coefficients calculated in this analysis were considered statistically significant with a p-value of <0.05.

5.6. Research Ethics

This study was conducted on 10 April 2023 with reference number 2023/4 and ethics committee approval. The study complied with universal ethical principles and scientific standards.

6. RESULTS

A total of 256 participants were included in this study. The majority of the participants were aged between 35-44 years and 96 individuals in this age group participated in the study. Of the individuals who participated in the study, 164 were women, 168 were married, 118 were university graduates, and 66 of them had a nursing profession. In terms of work experience, 112 participants had between 1 and 5 years of experience, while 94 participants stated that they had 20 years or more of work experience. In terms of working environment, 20 participants work in university hospitals, 204 participants work in public hospitals and 32 participants work in private hospitals.

Table 1. Statistics Related to the Scales Used in the Study

	Cronbach's*a*	±*sd*	*min-max*	*α3±se*	*α4±se*
Components					
Corporate Reputation					
Emotional Attractiveness	0,901	3,31±0,86	1,00-5,00	-0,797±0,152	0,022±0,303
Products and Services	0,910	3,33±0,90	1,00-5,00	-0,678±0,152	0,196±0,303
Vision and Leadership	0,878	2,92±0,96	1,00-5,00	-0,288±0,152	0,660±0,303
Workplace Environment	0,785	3,22±0,87	1,00-5,00	-0,695±0,152	0,055±0,303
Social and Environmental Responsibility	0,879	3,34±0,91	1,00-5,00	-0,826±0,152	0,343±0,303
Financial Performance	0,871	3,16±0,86	1,00-4,75	-0,717±0,152	0,265±0,303
Total	0,966	3,21±0,79	1,00-4,63	-0,732±0,152	0,052±0,303
Sustainable Leadership					
Ethics-Social Responsibility	0,944	3,38±1,12	1,00-5,00	-0,828±0,152	-0,222±0,303
Change	0,914	3,31±1,02	1,00-5,00	-0,812±0,152	-0,107±0,303
Innovation-Profitability	0,908	3,16±1,00	1,00-5,00	-0,550±0,152	-0,494±0,303
Culture-Human Sources of Interest	0,954	3,21±1,06	1,00-5,00	0,563±0,152	-0,576±0,303
Total	0,980	3,27±1,01	1,00-5,00	0,716±0,152	-0,340±0,303

(x̄: mean, sd: standard deviation, α3: skewness coefficient), α4: kurtosis coefficient, se: standard error)

Table 1 shows the statistical data related to the scales used in this study. Cronbach's alpha values calculated to evaluate the internal consistency of the scale items ranged between 0.785 and 0.980, indicating that the scales obtained have sufficient internal consistency. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients used to determine whether the data distribution is normal vary between -1 and +1 for all scales. These values show that all scale scores have a statistically normal distribution.

Table 2. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Age Groups

	Age Statistics				GroupsTest	
	18-25	**26-34**	**35-44**	**45-64**	**F**	**p**
Components						
Corporate						
Reputation						
Emotional Attractiveness	3,30±1,03	3,23±0,96	3,39±0,80	3,29±0,79	0,471	0,703
Products and Services	3,32±1,02	3,29±0,97	3,40±0,89	3,28±0,82	0,279	0,840
Vision and Leadership	2,91±1,12	2,95±1,06	2,98±0,96	2,84±0,85	0,314	0,816
Workplace Environment	3,15±1,25	3,23±0,95	3,25±0,86	3,18±0,69	0,133	0,940
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,09±1,13	3,41±0,91	3,38±1,00	3,32±0,70	0,744	0,527
Financial Performance	3,25±1,19	3,24±0,81	3,11±0,91	3,13±0,73	0,394	0,757
Total	3,17±1,02	3,22±0,85	3,25±0,81	3,17±0,65	0,164	0,920
Sustainable Leadership						
Ethics-Social	3,42±1,12	3,47±1,08	3,36±1,12	3,31±1,17	0,258	0,856
Change	3,61±1,05	3,43±1,02	3,31±1,00	3,13±1,03	1,709	0,166
Innovation-Profitability	$3,48±1,04^a$	$3,39±0,96^a$	$3,15±0,99^{ab}$	$2,89±0,96^b$	3,800	0,011
Culture-Human Sources of Interest	3,40±1,13	3,34±1,11	3,20±1,07	3,06±0,98	1,042	0,374
Total	3,48±1,06	3,41±1,01	3,25±1,01	3,10±1,00	1,433	0,234

Data are summarised as mean ± standard deviation. F: One-way analysis of variance and superscript letters a and b in the same row indicate differences between age groups.

There is no statistically significant difference between groups with the same superscript letters.

Table 3. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Gender

	Gender		Test Statistics	
	Male	**Woman**	***t***	***p***
Components of Corporate Reputation				
Emotional Attractiveness	3,50±0,87	3,21±0,83	2,645	0,009
Products and Services	3,54±0,90	3,21±0,88	2,882	0,004
Vision and Leadership	3,11±1,05	2,82±0,90	2,307	0,022
Workplace Environment	3,48±0,76	3,07±0,90	3,858	<0,001
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,58±0,82	3,21±0,93	3,159	0,002
Financial Performance	3,39±0,79	3,04±0,87	3,173	0,002
Total	3,43±0,76	3,09±0,78	3,357	0,001
Sustainable Leadership				
Ethics-Social Responsibility	3,64±1,14	3,23±1,09	2,815	0,005
Change	3,54±1,12	3,18±0,94	2,744	0,007
Innovation-Profitability	3,31±1,06	3,08±0,95	1,784	0,076
Culture-Human Resources Area of Interest	3,47±1,09	3,07±1,02	2,897	0,004
Total	3,49±1,07	3,14±0,96	2,670	0,008

Data are summarised as mean ± standard deviation. t: Independent sample t-test.

According to Table 3, except for the innovativeness-profitability scale, the scores of male participants are statistically significantly higher than the scores of female participants in other scales. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male and female participants in the innovativeness-profitability scale.

Table 4. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Marital Status

	Marital		StatusTest Statistics	
	Single personality	**Married**	***T***	***p***
Components of Corporate Reputation				
Emotional Attractiveness	3,37±0,86	3,28±0,86	0,791	0,430
Products and Services	3,24±0,91	3,38±0,90	1,178	0,240
Vision and Leadership	2,98±0,98	2,89±0,96	0,724	0,470

Workplace Environment	3,28±0,86	3,18±0,88	0,849	0,397
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,24±0,91	3,40±0,91	1,290	0,198
Financial Performance	3,17±0,83	3,16±0,88	0,112	0,911
Total	3,21±0,80	3,21±0,79	0,003	0,998
Sustainable Leadership				
Ethics-Social Responsibility	3,42±1,06	3,36±1,16	0,402	0,688
Change	3,45±0,82	3,24±1,11	1,769	0,078
Innovation-Profitability	3,26±0,98	3,11±1,00	1,154	0,249
Culture-Human Resources Area of Interest	3,28±0,98	3,18±1,10	0,756	0,450
Total	3,35±0,92	3,22±1,06	1,042	0,298

Data are summarised as mean ± standard deviation. t: Independent sample t-test.

According to Table 4, there is a statistically significant relationship between the scale scores of married and single participants. does not exist**.**

Table 5. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Educational Status

	Education Statistics				StatusTest	
	High School	**Associate Degree**	**Undergradua te Degree**	**High Undergraduat e Degree**	**F**	**p**
Components of Corporate Reputation						
Emotional Attractiveness	3,74±0,42	3,31±1,04	3,19±0,88	3,38±0,81	2,519	0,059
Products and Services	,94±0,50[a]	3,36±1,00[b]	3,22±0,87[b]	3,35±0,93[b]	3,552	0,015
Vision and Leadership	3,59±0,39[a]	3,21±1,18[ab]	2,77±0,92[b]	2,91±0,97[b]	4,982	0,002
Workplace Environment	3,85±0,56[a]	3,52±1,02[ab]	3,10±0,86[bc]	3,15±0,83[c]	5,512	0,001
Social and Environmental Responsibility	4,00±0,49[a]	3,45±1,00[b]	3,16±0,89[b]	3,42±0,91[b]	5,358	0,001
Financial Performance	3,75±0,49[a]	3,20±0,92[b]	3,04±0,89[b]	3,20±0,82[b]	3,803	0,011
Total	3,81±0,42[a]	3,34±0,94[b]	3,08±0,78[b]	3,23±0,76[b]	5,076	0,002
Sustainable Leadership						
Ethics-Social Responsibility	4,15±0,59[a]	3,52±0,97[b]	3,30±1,18[b]	3,28±1,12[b]	3,499	0,016
Change	4,07±0,53[a]	3,55±0,89[b]	3,23±1,08[b]	3,20±1,00[b]	4,670	0,003

Innovation-Profitability	$4,03\pm0,52^a$	$3,45\pm0,92^b$	$3,04\pm1,02^b$	$3,06\pm0,97^b$	6,587	0,000
Culture-Human Resources Field of Interest	$4,11\pm0,58^a$	$3,41\pm1,05^b$	$3,06\pm1,08^b$	$3,17\pm1,03^b$	5,839	0,001
Total	$4,09\pm0,55^a$	$3,48\pm0,91^b$	$3,16\pm1,06^b$	$3,18\pm0,98^b$	5,351	0,001

According to the analysis of Table 5, statistically significant differences (p=0.001) were found in workplace environment scores according to educational status. High school graduates received statistically higher scores on workplace environment compared to associate, undergraduate and graduate graduates. On the other hand, associate degree graduates received statistically higher scores on workplace environment compared to postgraduate graduates.

Education level also showed differences in social and environmental responsibility, financial performance and total scale scores of corporate reputation. In this context, social and environmental responsibility, financial performance and total scale scores of high school graduates are statistically higher than associate, undergraduate and graduate graduates.

There are also statistical differences in terms of sub-dimensions of sustainable leadership and total scores according to educational level. High school graduates have statistically higher scores in Ethics-Social Responsibility, Change, Innovation-Profitability, Culture-Concern for Human Resources and total scale scores compared to associate, undergraduate and graduate graduates. However, there is no statistically significant difference between associate, undergraduate and graduate graduates in terms of sub-dimensions of sustainable leadership and total scores.

Table 6. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Occupational Groups

	Profession							Test Statistics	
	Health Manager	Doctor	Nurse	Midwife	Health Personnel	Health Technician	Other	F	p
Corporate Reputation Components									
Emotional Attractiveness	$3,67\pm0,82^a$	$3,36\pm0,75^{ab}$	$2,96\pm0,90^{bc}$	$2,73\pm0,78^c$	$3,40\pm0,94^{ab}$	$2,86\pm0,64^c$	$3,55\pm0,70^a$	6,123	<0,001
Products and Services	$3,72\pm0,85^a$	$3,39\pm0,83^{abc}$	$3,05\pm0,86^{bc}$	$2,45\pm0,63^d$	$3,34\pm1,06^{abc}$	$2,93\pm0.69^{cd}$	$3,54\pm0,81^{ab}$	5,758	<0,001

								F	p
Vision and Leadership	3,29±0,94 [a]	2,71±0,94 [ab]	2,69±0,91 [ab]	2,80±0,72 [ab]	2,90±1,04 [ab]	2,33±0,94 [b]	3,16±0,93 [a]	3,734	0,001
Workplace Environment	3,57±0,62 [a]	3,12±0,95 [abc]	2,92±0,89 [c]	2,87±0,93 [c]	3,12±1,10 [abc]	3.00±0,72 [bc]	3,46±0,77 [ab]	4,14	0,001
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,75±0,83 [a]	3,33±0,9 [abc]	3,08±0,83 [bc]	2,80±1,23 [c]	3,26±0,99 [abc]	3.19±0.66 [abc]	3,48±0,9 [ab]	3,613	0,002
Financial Performance	3,62±0,53 [a]	3,114±0,90 [ab]	2,88±0,90 [b]	2,35±0,88 [c]	3,02±0,85 [b]	3,11±0,53 [b]	3,340±0,875 [ab]	6,07	<0,001
Total	3,60±0,67 [a]	3,18±0,75 [ab]	2,93±0,76 [bc]	2,67±0,81 [c]	3,17±0,90 [ab]	2.90±0.62 [bc]	3,42±0,750 [a]	5,73	<0,001
Sustainable Leadership									
Ethics-Social Responsibility	3,77±1,01 [a]	2,90±1,26 [b]	3,13±1,05 [ab]	3,60±1,03 [ab]	3,48±1,05 [ab]	3,00±1,44 [ab]	3,56±1,07 [ab]	3,087	0,006
Change	3,45±1,02 [ab]	3,02±1,08 [ab]	3,10±1,02 [ab]	3,13±0,85 [ab]	3,45±0,94 [ab]	2,90±1,24 [a]	3,61±0,94 [ab]	2,511	0,022
Innovation-Profitability	3,32±0,89 [a]	2,70±0,93 [b]	3,02±0,93 [ab]	3,00±0,88 [ab]	3,48±0,99 [a]	2,68±1,21 [b]	3,39±1,03 [a]	3,211	0,005
Culture-Human Resources Area of İnterest	3,50±0,90 [a]	2,94±1,01 [ab]	2,99±1,05 [ab]	3,08±1,03 [ab]	3,26±1,07 [ab]	2,69±1,21 [b]	3,46±1,08 [a]	2,651	0,016
Total	3,51±0,92 [a]	2,89±1,02 [ab]	3,06±0,97 [ab]	3,20±0,92 [ab]	3,42±0,97 [ab]	2,82±1,25 [b]	3,51±1,01 [a]	2,818	0,011

Data are summarised as mean±standard deviation, F: One-way analysis of variance, a, b and c superscripts are groups in the same row between groups with the same superscript. There is no statistical difference between groups with the same superscripts.

According to the analysis of Table 6, the scores evaluated on various criteria show statistically significant differences between occupational groups. A summarised explanation of these differences is given below:

• *Emotional Attractiveness:* Participants in health managers and other positions had higher emotional attractiveness scores compared to nurses, midwives and health technicians ($p < 0.001$). Allied health personnel and doctors also scored higher than midwives and health technicians.

• *Products and Services:* The scores of health managers are statistically higher than other health profession groups ($p < 0.001$). Similarly, the scores of allied health personnel and nurses are higher than midwives.

• *Vision and Leadership:* Scores of health managers and respondents in other positions were rated on health

technicians ($p = 0.001$).

- *Working Environment:* Participants in health managers and other positions were more likely to work in the workplace than nurses and midwives.

had higher scores (p = 0.001).

- *Social and Environmental Responsibility:* Participants in health managers and other positions scored higher than nurses and midwives (p = 0.002).

- *Financial Performance:* Health managers scored higher than all other health professional groups; doctors and participants in other positions scored higher than midwives (p < 0.001).

- *Organisational Reputation Total Scores:* Participants in health managers and other positions scored higher than nurses, midwives and health technicians; doctors and allied health personnel scored higher than midwives (p < 0.001).

- *Sustainable Leadership (Ethics and Social Responsibility, Change, Innovation-Profitability, Interest in Culture-Human Resources and Total Scores):* Health managers and participants in other positions received higher scores than other occupational groups. In particular, ethical and social responsibility scores of health managers are higher than doctors; change scores are higher than participants in other positions; innovation-profitability scores are higher than assistant health personnel and doctors; and interest in culture-human resources scores are higher than health technicians (Change p=0,022, Innovation-Profitability p=0,005, Interest in Culture-Human Resources p=0,016, Total Scores p=0,011).

These differences show that there are significant statistical differences between occupational groups in the dimensions of emotional attractiveness, products and services, vision and leadership, working environment, social and environmental responsibility, financial performance and sustainable leadership.

Table 7. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Years of Employment

	Total Working Time (years)					Test Statistics 1-5 6-	
	10	**11-15**	**16-20**	**>20**		*F*	*p*
Components **Corporate Reputation**							
Emotional Attractiveness	3,23±0,93	3,55±0,60	3,38±0,79	3,45±0,77	3,15±0,96	1,605	0,174
Products and Services	3,22±1,02	3,56±0,75	3,51±0,73	3,36±0,77	3,15±0,88	1,910	0,109
Vision and Leadership	$2,82\pm1,04^{ab}$	$3,23\pm0,84^{bc}$	$2,94\pm0,93^{abc}$	$3,33\pm0,85^{c}$	$2,65\pm0,82^{a}$	3,219	0,013
Workplace Environment	3,11±1,06	3,48±0,70	3,22±0,73	3,52±0,55	3,06±0,63	2,317	0,058
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,30±1,05	3,65±0,70	3,41±0,88	3,39±0,68	3,04±0,72	2,341	0,056
Financial Performance	3,10±1,00	3,46±0,71	3,21±0,70	3,20±0,90	2,93±0,61	2,085	0,083
Total	$3,13\pm0,91^{ab}$	$3,49\pm0,60^{b}$	$3,28\pm0,69^{ab}$	$3,38\pm0,67^{b}$	$3,00\pm0,69^{a}$	2,581	0,038
Sustainable Leadership							
Ethics-Social Responsibility	$3,29\pm1,12^{ab}$	$3,98\pm0,62^{c}$	$3,35\pm1,31^{ab}$	$3,61\pm0,97^{bc}$	$2,87\pm1,13^{a}$	5,519	<0,001
Change	$3,36\pm1,00^{a}$	$3,65\pm0,78^{a}$	$3,26\pm1,12^{a}$	$3,48\pm0,75^{a}$	$2,76\pm1,14^{b}$	4,168	0,003
Innovation-Profitability	$3,19\pm1,00^{a}$	$3,49\pm0,79^{a}$	$3,12\pm1,02^{a}$	$3,34\pm0,86^{a}$	$2,67\pm1,08^{b}$	3,654	0,007
Culture-Human Resources Area of Interest	$3,22\pm1,07^{a}$	$3,58\pm0,82^{a}$	$3,12\pm1,17^{a}$	$3,53\pm0,80^{a}$	$2,70\pm1,07^{b}$	4,059	0,003
Total	$3,26\pm1,01^{a}$	$3,68\pm0,70^{a}$	$3,21\pm1,12^{a}$	$3,49\pm0,83^{a}$	$2,75\pm1,07^{b}$	4,520	0,002

When Table 7 is analysed, statistically significant differences emerge in the effect of year of employment on the total scores as well as on the vision and leadership, corporate reputation components and sub-dimensions of sustainable leadership. A detailed summary of these findings is given below:

- *Vision and Leadership:* The vision and leadership scores of the participants with 16-20 years

of work experience are significantly higher than those with 1-5 years and 20 years and more experience (p=0.013). In addition, the scores of the participants with 6-10 years of work experience are higher than those with 20 years of experience and above.

• *Total Scores of Corporate Reputation Components:* The scores of the participants with 6-10 years and 16-20 years of work experience are statistically higher than those with more than 20 years of experience (p=0.038).

Sustainable Leadership:

• *Sub-dimensions and Total Scores:* The ethical-social responsibility scores of the participants with 6-10 years of work experience are statistically higher than those of the participants with 1-5 years, 11-15 years and more than 20 years of experience. This finding suggests that individuals in this work experience range may be more sensitive to ethical and social responsibility issues.

• *Change, Innovation-Profitability, Culture-Concern for Human Resources and Total Scores:* In these dimensions, the scores of the participants with more than 20 years of work experience are statistically lower than those who have been working for 20 years or less. This indicates that long-term employees have lower scores in these areas and have less innovation and adaptability.

These findings suggest that work experience has a significant impact on professionals' vision and leadership skills, perceptions of organisational reputation and sustainable leadership capacities. Statistically significant differences may reflect varying levels of professional development and motivation depending on work experience.

Table 8. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Total Work Experience

	Total Working Time (years) Statistics					Test	
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	>20	*F*	*p*
Components Corporate Reputation							
Emotional Attractiveness	3,32±0,98	3,15±1,09	3,39±0,74	3,49±0,78	3,26±0,79	0,988	0,414
Products and Services	3,50±0,97^a	2,96±1,00^b	3,53±0,81^a	3,57±0,90^a	3,20±0,81^{ab}	3,898	0,004
Vision and Leadership	2,95±1,11	2,91±1,01	3,06±0,90	3,11±1,09	2,77±0,84	1,204	0,310
Workplace Environment	3,37±0,97	3,02±1,14	3,33±0,81	3,24±0,94	3,16±0,70	1,048	0,383
Social and Environmental Responsibility	3,49±0,96	3,11±1,00	3,52±0,97	3,41±0,94	3,26±0,79	1,571	0,182
Financial Performance	3,45±0,90	2,94±0,89	3,27±0,80	3,23±0,95	3,05±0,79	2,329	0,057
Total	3,35±0,89	3,01±0,95	3,35±0,75	3,34±0,82	3,12±0,67	1,834	0,123
Sustainable Leadership							
Ethics-Social Responsibility	3,79±0,89	3,28±1,17	3,32±0,95	3,52±1,16	3,21±1,22	2,104	0,081
Change	3,88±0,63^a	3,22±1,20^b	3,32±0,96^b	3,40±1,03^b	3,08±1,03^b	4,520	0,002
Innovation - Profitability	3,79±0,68^a	3,13±1,10^{bc}	3,26±0,82^b	3,33±1,04^b	2,80±0,98^c	8,168	<0,001
Culture-Human Sources Interest	3,65±0,95^a	3,21±1,19^{ab}	3,22±0,98^{ab}	3,40±1,03^{ab}	2,95±1,05^b	3,552	0,008
Total	3,78±0,76^a	3,21±1,13^b	3,28±0,8^b	3,41±1,03^{ab}	3,01±1,03^b	4,411	0,002

Data are summarised as mean±standard deviation, F: One-way analysis of variance, a, b and c superscripts are groups in the same row between groups with the same superscript. There is no statistical difference between groups with the same superscripts.

According to the analysis of Table 8, there are statistically significant differences between the total work experience groups in terms of product and service scores, sustainable leadership (change, innovation-profitability, culture-interest in human resources) and sustainable leadership total scores. The explanation of these differences is given below:

• *Product and Service Scores:* The scores of participants with 6-10 years of work experience are statistically lower compared to other work experience groups ($p=0.004$). This finding suggests that professionals in a certain work experience range may have lower satisfaction or performance with products and services compared to other groups.

• *Sustainable Leadership Change Scores:* The change scores of participants with 1-5 years of work experience are statistically higher than those with longer work experience ($p=0.002$). This means that professionals at the beginning of their careers may be more open to change.

• *Innovation-Profitability Scores:* The innovation-profitability scores of participants with 1-5 years of work experience are statistically higher than those with longer work experience ($p<0.001$). In addition, the scores of participants with 11-15 and 16-20 years of work experience are higher than those with more than 20 years of experience. This suggests that newer employees may be more focussed on innovative thinking and profitability.

• *Culture-Human Resources Interest Scores:* The scores of the participants with 1-5 years of work experience are statistically higher than those with more than 20 years of experience ($p=0.008$). This indicates that employees with shorter seniority may have a higher interest in workplace culture and human resources.

• *Sustainable Leadership Scores:* The total scores of the participants with 1-5 years of work experience are statistically higher than all other work experience groups ($p=0.002$). This shows that, in general, individuals at the beginning of their careers have higher sustainable leadership competences compared to other groups.

These findings suggest that work experience has a significant impact on professionals' perceptions and performance in various important areas. The higher performance of short-term employees in certain areas can be attributed to the energy and motivation resulting from their recent entry into the workforce.

Table 9. Comparison of Scale Scores According to Employment Organisation

	Employment			OrganisationTestStatistics	
	University Hospital	**State Hospital i**	**Private Hospita l**	**F**	**p**
Components of Corporate Reputation					
Emotional Attractiveness	$3,17\pm0,85^a$	$3,26\pm0,89^a$	$3,73\pm0,42^b$	4,531	0,012
Products and Services	$2,93\pm1,08^a$	$3,28\pm0,89^a$	$3,89\pm0,51^b$	9,068	<0,001
Vision and Leadership	$2,43\pm0,87^a$	$2,91\pm0,97^b$	$3,33\pm0,83^b$	5,693	0,004
Workplace Environment	$2,67\pm0,75^a$	$3,21\pm0,87^b$	$3,63\pm0,80^c$	7,864	<0,001
Social and Environmental Responsibility	$3,13\pm0,99^a$	$3,29\pm0,91^a$	$3,83\pm0,69^b$	5,752	0,004
Financial Performance	$3,10\pm1,02^a$	$3,07\pm0,82^a$	$3,78\pm0,77^b$	10,167	<0,001
Total	$2,90\pm0,76^a$	$3,17\pm0,80^a$	$3,70\pm0,58^b$	8,273	<0,001
Sustainable Leadership					
Ethics-Social Responsibility	3,00±1,13	3,37±1,14	3,67±0,97	2,221	0,111
Change	3,17±1,03	3,30±1,04	3,48±0,93	0,642	0,527
Innovation-Profitability	2,88±1,18	3,16±1,00	3,33±0,86	1,278	0,280
Culture-Human Resources Area of Interest	3,02±1,03	3,19±1,09	3,50±0,83	1,575	0,209
Total	3,02±1,06	3,26±1,03	3,49±0,85	1,438	0,239

Data are summarised as mean±standard deviation, F: One-way analysis of variance, a, b and c superscripts indicate differences between groups in the same row. There is no statistical difference between groups with the same superscript.

According to Table 9, sub-dimension and total scores of Corporate Reputation Components differ statistically according to the institution of employment. Emotional appeal, product and service, social and environmental responsibility, financial performance and total scores of employees working in private hospitals are statistically higher than those working in public and university hospitals. The vision and leadership scores of employees working in public and private hospitals are statistically higher than those working in university hospitals. Workplace environment scores of employees working in private hospitals are statistically higher than those working in public and university hospitals; workplace

environment scores of employees working in public hospitals are statistically higher than those working in university hospitals.

Sustainable Leadership sub-dimension and total scores do not differ statistically according to the institution of employment. This shows that sustainable leadership competencies are similar among professionals working in different health institutions.

These findings indicate that there are significant differences between individuals working in different healthcare organisations in terms of corporate reputation perceptions and workplace environment satisfaction. The fact that employees working in private hospitals generally have higher scores in corporate reputation components may indicate some advantages of working in such organisations. However, the finding that sustainable leadership competencies are similar regardless of the type of organisation implies that leadership development in the health sector is consistent across a wide range of settings.

Table 10. Validity and Reliability Examination of Perception of Sustainable Leadership and Perception of Corporate Reputation Scales

Variables	CR	AVE	Cronbach Alpha
Components of Corporate Reputation	0,920	0,690	0,910
Emotional Attractiveness	0,911	0,694	0,904
Products and Services	0,901	0,699	0,912
Vision and Leadership	0,747	0,502	0,899
Workplace Environment	0,851	0,658	0,802
Social and Environmental Responsibility	0,814	0,686	0,904
Financial Performance	0,905	0,761	0,909
Sustainable Leadership	0,905	0,512	0,918
Ethics-Social Responsibility	0,871	0,575	0,879
Change	0,905	0,761	0,916
Innovation-Profitability	0,801	0,556	0,939
Culture-Human Resources Area of Interest	0,814	0,718	0,933

Table 10 shows the coefficients related to validity and reliability analyses. Cronbach's alpha measures the internal consistency of a scale, i.e. the degree to which the items are compatible with each other, and values above 0.70 are generally considered acceptable. CR (Composite Reliability) shows the

overall reliability of the construct and, unlike Cronbach's alpha, it offers a more precise reliability assessment by taking factor loadings into account. AVE (Average Variance Extracted) shows how much of the total variance of a construct is explained by the explanatory factor and values above 0.50 indicate that the construct is valid (Yaşlıoğlu, 2017). These three measures provide a holistic approach to assessing the reliability and validity of the scales and increase the accuracy of the analysis results.

Convergent validity means that the measures of a construct are highly correlated with other measures used to measure the same construct. The CR value is expected to be above 0.70 and the AVE value is expected to be above 0.50; however, AVE is acceptable up to 0.40. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981) and Ahmad et al. (2016), convergent validity is considered to be achieved when AVE is below 0.50 and CR is above 0.60. Although the AVE>0.50 condition was not met in the dimensions of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance, the CR>AVE condition was met and it was concluded that convergent validity was achieved.

Table 11. Evaluation of the Relationship between Employees' Perception of Sustainable Leadership and Perception of Corporate Reputation

	Sustainable Leadership				Total
	Ethics-Social Responsibility	**Change**	**Innovation Profitability**	**Interest in Culture-Human Resources**	
	r	r	r	r	
Components of Corporate Reputation					
Emotional Attractiveness	0,642	0,677	0,636	0,679	0,683
Products and Services	0,643	0,663	0,683	0,674	0,690
Vision and Leadership	0,737	0,744	0,753	0,770	0,779
Workplace Environment	0,743	0,729	0,709	0,762	0,764
Social and Environmental Responsibility	0,747	0,715	0,705	0,749	0,757
Financial Performance	0,611	0,610	0,638	0,631	0,646
Total	0,777	0,780	0,777	0,804	**0,814**

Table 11 reveals that there is a statistically significant and strong positive correlation between the components of corporate reputation and sustainable leadership. All correlation coefficients are statistically significant and show that there is a strong relationship (r: 0.814) between perceived high corporate reputation and sustainable leadership capacities. In this case, hypothesis H1 is supported.

These findings underline that organisational reputation and the quality of the work environment are highly positively evaluated by employees, especially in private healthcare organisations. Moreover, the positive correlation between corporate reputation and sustainable leadership suggests that organisations' reputation may have a positive impact on leadership development. This means that healthcare organisations can provide opportunities to develop the leadership competencies of their employees and strengthen organisational reputation.

Table 12. Table of Results of Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Conclusion
H1: There is a positive and significant relationship between the perception of sustainable leadership and the perception of corporate reputation.	Supported
H2: There are significant differences in perceptions of sustainable leadership and corporate reputation according to demographic characteristics.	Supported

7. CONCLUSION

In today's business world, the concept of sustainability is becoming increasingly important. Organisations need to consider not only their financial success but also their environmental and social impacts (Gümüş and Öksüz, 2009). Sustainable leadership is a critical concept for organisations to achieve their sustainability goals (Gün and Aslan, 2018).

Sustainable leadership is an approach that involves leaders managing business activities not only with profit-oriented goals, but also with a focus on environmental and social impacts. It refers to the integration of sustainability principles into leadership approaches. Sustainable leaders balance environmental and social impacts while considering financial performance (Coşkun, 2013).

In particular, sustainability issues are becoming increasingly important among consumers and stakeholders and companies' sustainable leadership approaches are becoming a determining factor in shaping their corporate reputation (Avery and Bergsteiner, 2011; Kantabutra, 2011; Kantabutra and

Avery, 2013).

Corporate reputation is the image of an organisation as perceived by its stakeholders and target audiences (Ünaldı, 2015). Having a strong corporate reputation is imperative to gain competitive advantage, encourage customer loyalty and facilitate sustainable growth (Saylı and Uğurlu, 2007). Corporate reputation is recognised as a very important factor that helps organisations achieve their sustainability goals. Therefore, the management of corporate reputation has emerged as a strategic priority for businesses (Aydemir, 2008). Accordingly, this study attempts to examine the link between sustainable leadership, which is important for businesses, and corporate reputation in the health sector.

Firstly, the study investigated whether there are noticeable differences in the perceptions of corporate reputation and sustainable leadership depending on the demographic characteristics of the participants. When the perception of corporate reputation was analysed, it was revealed that male participants, high school graduates, managerial staff, participants who have been working between 6-10 years in their current workplace and those affiliated with private hospitals exhibited higher average scores. On the other hand, there are no statistically significant differences in the perception of corporate reputation depending on the age, marital status or total years of professional experience of the participants.

When the perception of sustainable leadership is analysed, it is revealed that the mean scores of the participants between the ages of 18-25, male participants, high school graduates, participants in managerial positions, participants who have been working in the current workplace for 6-10 years and participants who have been working for 1-5 years are significantly higher. On the other hand, there was no statistically significant difference in the perception of sustainable leadership in terms of marital status or organisational commitment of the participants.

Studies examining the perception of corporate reputation and sustainable leadership according to the demographic characteristics of the participants have revealed different results in the literature. For example, significant differences were found in the perception of corporate reputation in terms of gender (Kırpık, 2018), age (Işık and Zincirkıran, 2016), marital status (Yarmacı and Pelit, 2017), educational status (Özgüleş, 2017) and total work experience (Işık and Zincirkıran, 2016). However, there are also studies in the literature that do not find a significant difference in the perception of corporate reputation

according to the gender (Elitok, 2019), age (Seren, 2019), marital status (İlker, 2019), educational status (Bürkük, 2020) and total work experience (Seren, 2019) of the participants. Similarly, studies in the literature have found significant differences in the perception of sustainable leadership depending on the gender (Çayak, 2018), age (Polat, 2022), educational status (Yollu, 2017) and total work experience (Çalışkan, 2021) of the participants. On the other hand, there are also studies (Arovic, 2018; Ertaş, 2020) showing that there is no significant difference in the perception of sustainable leadership according to gender, age, marital status, educational status and total years of work experience of the participants. Studies examining the perception of corporate reputation and sustainable leadership.

According to the demographic characteristics of the participants, leadership yielded different results. This difference may be due to differences in the sample groups, methodologies and measurement tools used in the studies. These different findings underline the complexity of the impact of participants' demographic characteristics on corporate reputation perception and sustainable leadership perception and emphasise that no single generalisation can be made. Moreover, the contradictory results in the literature reveal the importance of considering other factors (such as cultural differences, sectoral differences, organisational structures) in addition to demographic characteristics in evaluating the effects of demographic characteristics on corporate reputation perception and sustainable leadership perception.

In the study, the relationship between the perception of sustainable leadership and the perception of corporate reputation was also analysed. According to the correlation analysis conducted in this context, a strong, positive and significant relationship was found between the perception of sustainable leadership and the perception of corporate reputation. Sustainable leadership is a values-based leadership approach in which leaders direct business activities by considering environmental and social impacts. This type of leadership emphasises commitment to ethical principles and social responsibility. These values and ethical principles form the basis of corporate reputation and enhance the reputation of the company in the eyes of society and stakeholders (Avery and Bergsteiner, 2011; Kantabutra, 2011; Kantabutra and Avery, 2013). Sustainable leaders aim for long-term success. Sustainability aims to create long-term sustainable value instead of a short-term profit focus. This shows the company's concern for sustainability and success for future generations. This long-term perspective strengthens corporate reputation (Kantabutra and Avery, 2013; Verhezen, 2016). Sustainable leaders build strong relationships with internal and external stakeholders. These relationships are based on transparency, co-

operation, shared values and trust. Corporate reputation reflects the quality of a company's relationships with its stakeholders. Sustainable leadership develops strong stakeholder relationships and strengthens corporate reputation (Avery and Bergsteiner, 2011; Kantabutra, 2011). In this context, finding a strong, positive and significant relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation is considered to be an important contribution to the literature. Although there are studies in the literature showing a positive relationship between leadership types such as ethical leadership (Mutlucan, 2019), strategic leadership (Kızıl and Naktiyok, 2019), charismatic leadership (Demir and Yirci, 2018), authentic leadership (Özkan, 2017) and instructional leadership (Özdoğru and Güçlü, 2020) and corporate reputation, there is no study examining the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation. In this respect, it is considered that the findings of the study make a significant contribution to the literature.

Based on the research findings, some suggestions can be offered to practitioners to strengthen the relationship between sustainable leadership and organisational reputation. Firstly, it is important to emphasise values and ethical principles. By adopting a sustainable leadership approach, organisations can provide their employees and managers with training and awareness programmes that emphasise the importance of values and ethical principles.

Second, stakeholder relationships can be strengthened. Sustainable leadership fosters strong communication, co-operation and trusting relationships with both internal and external stakeholders.

By building relationships characterised by transparency and shared values, organisations can enhance their corporate reputation.

Finally, the integration of innovation and sustainability is crucial. Sustainable leadership encourages innovation processes that support sustainability goals. Organisations can increase their competitive advantage by integrating sustainability-aligned innovations into business processes and product/development.

Some suggestions are offered for researchers to better understand the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation. Firstly, it is suggested to conduct studies in different sectors and to use various measurement tools and methodologies. This approach may contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the perception of sustainable leadership

and corporate reputation. In addition, longitudinal studies are important for analysing long-term effects. Research can explore how sustainable leadership and corporate reputation evolve over time and contribute to organisational performance and sustainability outcomes. Finally, although this study examined the relationship between sustainable leadership and corporate reputation through correlation analysis, future research could test a regression model that includes other variables such as performance, sector and trust that may be associated with the relationship.

REFERENCES

Abid, G., Ali, A., and Khan, M. (2023) "Sustainable Leadership and Wellbeing of Healthcare Personnel: A Sequential Mediation Model of Procedural Knowledge and Compassion", Frontiers in Psychology, 14, Article 1039456.

Ahmad, S., Zulkurnain, N.N.A., and Khairushalimi, F.I. (2016) "Assessing the Validity and Reliability of A Measurement Model in Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)", British Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science, 15 (3), 1-8.

Akkaş, M., and Aksu, M. (2022) "Sürdürülebilir Eğitim Liderliği: Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması", Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 42(1), 1-15.

Alnıaçık, E., Alnıaçık, Ü. ve Nurullah, G. (2010) "Kurumsal İtibar Bileşenlerinin Algılanan Önemi Demografik Özelliklerden Etkilenmekte Midir?", Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 13(23), 93-114.

Arovic, A. (2018) "Sürdürülebilir Liderlik Uygulamaları ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki", Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Avery, G.C. ve Bergsteiner, H. (2011) "Sustainable Leadership Practices for Enhancing Business Resilience and Performance", Strategy and Leadership, 39(3), 5-15.

Aydemir, B.A. (2008) "İşletmelerin Yeni Rekabet Aracı Olarak Kurumsal İtibar", ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 10(2), 27-53.

Bahar, A. (2019) "Kurumsal İtibar ve Kurumsal Başarı", Journal of Yaşar University, 14(54), 1-15.

Bayoud, N. S., Kavanagh, M. H., and Slade, C. (2012) "Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure and Employee Commitment: Evidence from Libya" Social Responsibility Journal, 8(4), 1-15.

Bürkük, E. (2020) "Sağlık Çalışanlarında Kurumsal İtibar Algısının Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi Üzerine Bir Çalışma", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.

Çalışkan, Y. (2021) "Öğretmenlerin Çevresel Kimlikleri ile Çevresel Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkide Sürdürülebilir Liderliğin Aracı Rolü", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Alparslan Türkeş Bilim ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, Adana.

Çayak, S. (2018) "Okul Müdürlerinin Sürdürülebilir Liderlik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi: Bir Karma Yöntem Araştırması" Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Çetin, M., and Baş, H. (2021) "Kurum Kültürünün Devam Ettirilmesinde Sürdürülebilir Liderlik", Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 12(2), 1-20.

Choi, S. B. (2021) "The Impact of Ethical Leadership on Employee Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis", Journal of Business Ethics, 169(2), 1-15.

Coşkun, İ.L. (2013) "Türkiye'de Tüketici Bakış Açısıyla Kurumsal Sürdürülebilirlik Bileşenlerinin Marka Varlığı Bileşenleri ile İlişkisi", Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Demir, C. ve Yirci, R. (2018) "Okul Müdürlerinin Karizmatik Liderlik Özelliklerinin Okulların Kurumsal İtibarına Etkisi", Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19(3), 234-256.

Dirik, S., and İntepeler, M. (2019) "The Impact of Employee Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment: A Study in the Healthcare Sector", International Journal of Management Economics and Business, 15(1), 1-15.

Elitok, U. (2019) "Entelektüel Sermayenin Kurumsal İtibar Üzerine Etkisi ve Bankacılık Sektöründe Bir Araştırma", Doktora Tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

Ertaş, B.D. (2020) "Sürdürülebilir Liderlik ile Öğrenen Örgüt Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi", Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Fombrun, C.J., Gardberg, N. A. and Sever, J.W. (2000) "The Reputation Quotient: A Multi-Stakeholder Measure of Corporate Reputation", The Journal of Brand Management, 7(4): 241-255.

Fornell, C., and Larcker, C. F. (1981) "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error", JMR, Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39-50. doi:10.1177/002224378101800104

Gayir, G.B. (2022) "A Qualitative Research on the Necessity of Green Hospitals", RandS-Research Studies Anatolia Journal, 5(2), 205-225.

Gomez-Trujillo, A.M., Velez-Ocampo, J. and Gonzalez-Perez, M.A. (2020) "A Literature Review on The Causality Between Sustainability and Corporate Reputation: What Goes First?", Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal, 31(2), 406-430.

Gümüş, M. and Öksüz, B. (2009) "Key Role in Reputation Process: Corporate Social Responsibility Communication", Yaşar University E-Journal, 4(14), 2129-2150.

Gün, İ. and Aslan, Ö. (2018) "Leadership Theories and Leadership in Health Enterprises", Health and Nursing Journal of Management, 5(3), 217-226.

Güneş, E., and Gözükara, İ. (2019) "The Relationship Between Corporate Reputation and Brand Equity: The Mediating Role of Advertising", Journal of Business Research - Turk*, 11(1), 1-15.

Hasan, I., and Yun, S. (2017) "The Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction and Organisational Performance in the Healthcare Sector", International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 32(3), 1-15.

İlker, İ. (2019) "Determination of the Relationship between School Administrators' Corporate Reputation Perceptions and Organisational Commitment Levels", Master's Thesis, Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.

Işık, M. and Zincirkıran, M. (2016) "The Relationship Between Corporate Reputation Job Satisfaction and Organisational Identification Concepts and a Research", Is, Guc: The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 18(3), 193-210.

Kantabutra, S. (2011) "Sustainable Leadership in a Thai Health Care Provider", International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance, 24(1), 67-80.

Kantabutra, S. and Avery, G. (2013). "Sustainable Leadership: Honeybee Practices at a Leading Asian Industrial Conglomerate", Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration, 5(1), 36-56.

Khairunnisa, R.A., Setyonugroho, W. and Ulfa, M. (2022) "Green Hospital Implementation in Health Aspects: A Systematic Review", United International Journal for Research and Technology, 3(9), 46- 58.

Kırpık, G. (2018) "The Relationship between Generational Differences and Corporate Reputation Perception and Organisational Identification: A Research in TRC1 Region", PhD Thesis, İnönü University, Malatya.

Kızıl, S. and Naktiyok, A. (2019) "The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the Effect of Managers' Strategic Leadership Behaviours on Corporate Reputation Perception", Istanbul Business Research, 48(1), 64- 83.

McCann J. and Holt R.A. (2011) "Sustainable Leadership: A Manufacturing Employee Perspective", SAM Journal of Advanced Management, Autumn: 4-14.

Maden, Ş. (2024) "Green Practices in Health Institutions: Comparison of Public and Private Hospitals with a Qualitative Study".

Mansur, A., and Gedik, N. (2022) "The Effect of Proactive Personality Trait of Health Workers on Green Organisational Behaviour", Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 12(1), 1-15.

Mutlucan, N.Ç. (2019) "A Theoretical Study on the Relationships between Ethical Leadership, Ethical Organisational Culture, Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Reputation in Reputation Management", Journal of Empirical Economics and Social Sciences, 1(2), 19-35.

Odriozola, M., and Baraibar-Diez, E. (2017)" Ethical Leadership and Its Impact on Organisational Culture", Journal of Business Ethics, 146(1), 1-15.

Özdoğru, M. and Güçlü, N. (2020) "The Relationship Between School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Behaviours and Corporate Reputation Perception", Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Journal, 41(3), 1869-1914.

Özgüleş, B. (2017) "The Effect of Perceived Corporate Reputation and Work Commitment on Emotional Labour Behaviour: Sağlık Çalışanları Örneği", PhD Thesis, Haliç University, Istanbul.

Özkan, S. (2017) "The Role of Workplace Wellbeing, Collective Competence and Corporate Reputation Variables in the Effect of Authentic Leadership on Emotional Organisational Commitment", PhD Thesis, Gebze Technical University, Kocaeli.

Polat, S. (2022) "Examination of the Relationship between Sustainable Leadership, Organisational Justice and Organisational Identification in Educational Institutions", Master's Thesis, Kültür University, Istanbul.

Saylı, H. and Uğurlu, Ö.Y. (2007) "An Evaluation of the Analysis of the Relationship between Corporate Reputation and Managerial Ethics", Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 12(3), 75- 96.

Seren, F. (2019) "Examining the Effect of Corporate Reputation on Individuals' Staying Behaviour in the Organisation", Master's Thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa.

Şengüllendi, A., and Şehitoğlu, M. (2022) "Investigation of the Effect of Spiritual Leadership on Corporate Reputation", Beykent University Journal of Social Sciences, 15(1), 1-15.

Presidency of the Republic of Turkey, Presidency of Strategy and Budget Directorate, http://www.surdurulebilirkalkinma.gov.tr/amaclari (05.03.2023).

Terekli, M., and et al. (2013) "The Impact of Green Hospital Initiatives on Patient and Employee Satisfaction", Journal of Environmental Management, 114, 1-15.

Ünaldı, N. (2015) "The Importance of Reputation in Institutions Providing Health Services", Journal of Health and Nursing Management, 2(2), 100-111.

Ünal, S. (2015). "The İmportance of Patient Satisfaction in Healthcare Services: A Study in Turkey", Journal Of Health Management, 17(2), 1-15.

Üzüm, A., and et al. (2019) "Wise Leadership Scale Adaptation Study into Turkish", Journal of Business Research - Turk, 11(2), 1-15.

United Nations (2023) "Sustainability", United Nations Academic Impact. https://www.un.org/en/academic-

impact/sustainability#:~:text=In%201987%2C%20the%20United%20Nations,to%20meet%20their%20own%20needs.%E2%80%9D

Verhezen, P. (2016) "The Vulnerability of Corporate Reputation: Leadership for Sustainable Long-Term Value", Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

Yangil, F.M. and Şahin, M.D. (2019) "Sustainable Leadership Scale: Validity and Reliability Analysis", BMIJ, 7(5), 2124-2147.

Yarmacı, N. and Pelit, E. (2017) "The Role of Demographic Characteristics in the Sustainability of Corporate Reputation: A Research on Hotel Employees in Istanbul", 1st International Sustainable Tourism Congress, Kastamonu, Turkey.

Yaşlıoğlu, M. M. (2017) "Factor Analysis and Validity in Social Sciences: Using Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses", Istanbul University Journal of Business Faculty, 46, 74-85.

Yavuz, V.A. (2010) "Sustainability Concept and Sustainable Production Strategies for Businesses", Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 7(14), 63-86.

Yollu, S. (2017) "School Principals' Application Levels of Sustainable Leadership Strategies", Master's Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Yusefi, A., and et al. (2022) "Crisis Management in Healthcare Organisations During The COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study", International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 37(1), 1-15.

KATKI ORANI / *CONTRIBUTION RATE*	AÇIKLAMA / *EXPLANATION*	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR / *CONTRIBUTORS*
Fikir veya Kavram / *Idea or Notion*	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak / *Form the research hypothesis or idea*	Asst. Prof. İlknur Sayan (Ph.D.)
Tasarım / *Design*	Yöntemi, ölçeği ve deseni tasarlamak / *Designing method, scale and pattern*	Asst. Prof. İlknur Sayan (Ph.D.)
Veri Toplama ve İşleme / *Data Collecting and Processing*	Verileri toplamak, düzenlenmek ve raporlamak / *Collecting, organizing and reporting data*	Asst. Prof. İlknur Sayan (Ph.D.) Asst. Prof. Hatice Mutlu (Ph.D.)
Tartışma ve Yorum / *Discussion and Interpretation*	Bulguların değerlendirilmesinde ve sonuçlandırılmasında sorumluluk almak / *Taking responsibility in evaluating and finalizing the findings*	Asst. Prof. İlknur Sayan (Ph.D.) Asst. Prof. Hatice Mutlu (Ph.D.)
Literatür Taraması / *Literature Review*	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak / *Review the literature required for the study*	Asst. Prof. İlknur Sayan (Ph.D.) Asst. Prof. Hatice Mutlu (Ph.D.)

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek:. Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Teşekkür: -

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Acknowledgement: -